

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
16th Day

Tuesday, March 9, 1971.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

\$12 MILLION GRANT TO ATHABASCA FOREST INDUSTRY LTD.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier. I noticed in this morning's Leader-Post, on the front page, there is a news report from Ottawa which quotes the Regional Economic Minister, John Marchand as saying that the \$12 million grant to Athabasca Forest Industry Limited has not yet been approved by the Federal Government.

I am wondering if the Premier would tell us when the application was made to the Minister and the Ottawa Government for the grant.

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — The whole matter as I indicated during the debate, has been under discussion for well over one year. However we are not able to make formal application for the Federal grant until all the details had been settled. That was about ten days ago.

I have, and during the debate I shall table, a letter from the Minister Mr. Marchand. The letter states that the project has been agreed to in principle. Now that doesn't mean to say that the dollars have been finalized or the project itself has been finalized. Only the Federal Cabinet can finalize the matter. We do expect to have some final decision in the next few weeks. I am most confident that Ottawa will proceed with the full amount of the grant. They approved a similar grant in Alberta. I think it would be quite inconceivable that the Federal Government would approve dozens of projects in Quebec and then suddenly turn this one down in Saskatchewan. I think they are just as interested in finding, <jobs up in that area as we are. So I don't anticipate any difficulty.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. In the light of the newspaper report and the Premier's answer, can the Premier tell the House if the Provincial Government has determined the reasons for the delay in the grant being committed from Ottawa?

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — There is no delay. We only officially applied about ten days ago. We have been discussing it in principle, as I said, for more than a year, but the company only sent specific details down to Ottawa about ten days ago.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we proceed further with the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Weyburn, represented by Mr. Pepper, 69 students from the Weyburn Junior High School under the direction of their teacher Mr. Weinmaster; from the constituency of Moose Jaw North, represented by Mr. Snyder. 59 students from the King George School under the direction of their principal, Mr. Murray; from the constituency of Lumsden, represented by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), 24 students from the Elsas School, Vibank, under the direction of their teacher Mr. A. Ell; from the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, represented by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), 39 students from the Montmartre School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Hamelin; from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University, represented by Mr. Charlebois. 32 students from St. Patrick and Cardinal Leger School, under the direction of their teacher Mr. Pulack; from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, represented by Mr. Brockelbank, 32 students from the St. Goretti School, under the direction of their teachers Mr. Morari and Mr. Regier; from the constituency of Regina South, represented by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), 31 students from the Grant Road School, under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Neuman and Mrs. Hesch.

I am sure all Hon. Members would wish to extend an extremely warm welcome to these students and to express the sincere wish that they will find their stay educational and informative and wish to all of them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

RESIGNATION OF CHIEF OF MOSQUITO INDIAN RESERVE

MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, with your permission. I wonder if the Premier or anyone in charge of the Indian and Métis Branch- I think it's the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey)- are aware of the following. I have a news release here datelined North Battleford:

Chief Solomon Mosquito, Tuesday, announced his immediate resignation as Chief of the Mosquito Indian Reserve near this community. He said he resigned because for more than one year he has been trying without success to get the Department of Indian Affairs to implement a self-help

program on the reserve.

Chief Mosquito said that the situation on the reserve is getting worse because of the 100 per cent welfare system. Nominations are to be received March 11th for the Chief and three councillors.

We have heard a great deal about what is being done for the Indians to get them off aid. I know that this was directed at the Federal Government. I have heard Members on the other side of the House Say that they don't wait for the Federal Government and that the Indian and Métis Branch jumps in whenever it is necessary. I wonder if they have done anything about Chief Mosquito's complaints?

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member has indicated this is entirely a Federal responsibility and we haven't heard anything from Chief Mosquito, but I will say that I don't think there is anything that would help that area more than a new pulp mill. If my Hon. friends want to be sympathetic and get jobs for them just vote for it in a hurry and we will get the jobs that are needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Indians are employed. Why are there more people on social aid in Prince Albert than there ever was with the Prince Albert mill?

MR. STEUART: — There aren't.

MR. KRAMER: — There are, Mr. Speaker. Why this community is so broke they couldn't even meet the United Appeal objective.

MR. STEUART: — NDP up there.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 - EARLY AND EFFECTIVE ACTION TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East) moved, seconded by Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan early and effective action to fight unemployment, provide jobs and stem an alarming migration of workers and their families from Saskatchewan to other provinces, as well as accompanying heavy losses to the Province's economy, on lines that would include:

- (1) publicly financed or assisted public housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs and similar projects;
- (2) improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage, to assist the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes;
- (3) the institution of special methods to aid industrial development and expand technical, and vocational training and upgrading.

He said: — We, in the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, believe that unemployment is both tragic and wasteful. Tragic because it deprives the workers of their right to make a living for themselves and their families. Wasteful, because society loses the productive capacity of the energies and skills of the unemployed.

In a nation like ours so richly endowed with resources as Canada and where so much remains to be done for people, to have even a fraction of 1 per cent of workers unemployed would be bad enough, but to know, as we do, that the massive unemployment was forced on the people of Saskatchewan and deliberately created by the Liberal Governments of both capitals, Mr. Speaker, is cruel and inhuman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The men who run our governments in Regina and Ottawa must be accused and stand guilty of the economic depression they force upon the people of this great nation and this great province.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years back, the Economic Council of Canada, a government agency, told the people of this country and advised the government that we must not allow at any time unemployment to go beyond 3 percentage points of our labor force, because the economic and social consequences are too disastrous. Despite this sound advice the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, in December of 1969, told the people of this country that he would push unemployment and to quote him: "To 6 per cent and higher as a means to fight inflation."

Mr. Speaker, not a single economist agreed with his proposed method of fighting inflation. All Federal Opposition parties rejected his notion. The labor movement was outraged; the people of Canada generally, and wage earners particularly, were stunned and frightened. When the Prime Minister was questioned by the press about the wisdom of such an unacceptable approach of fighting unemployment and told, "You really don't mean this?" he replied in his usual arrogant way, "Just try me."

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister proved that he had a lot of courage. Unemployment went up to 6 per cent, then up to 7, then up to 8 and has exceeded this point, and if the count of all unemployed was taken, we are told it would be above 10 per cent today. He has a lot of guts for a man who has never had an empty one, to play with the lives of little people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, men like Dr. Firestone, a noted Canadian economist, tell us that the end of rising unemployment is still not in sight, nor have we reached the end of price increases and continuing rise in the cost of living. Dr. Firestone tells us that the economic measures the Government is proposing to stimulate the economy will not have the desired effect of stopping unemployment for at least another year. The Government on the other hand is saying they are washing their hands clean of trying to stop the cost of living from rising.

What have these guilty men in the Province of Saskatchewan been doing during this entire period, Mr. Speaker? Did the Premier of Saskatchewan protest to Mr. Trudeau about this insane policy of deliberately creating unemployment, Mr. Speaker? No, he did not. Did he submit any alternative proposals to halt rising prices and yet have an expanding economy with full employment? No, he did not, Mr. Speaker. Did he take measures on a provincial basis to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan were not hurt? Mr. Speaker, he did no such thing.

The Premier of Saskatchewan was dancing along in his merry way taking one step in one direction, another step in another direction, moving left, then right and then backwards. He re-introduced the Saskatchewan Liberal Depression Jig of the '30s.

He first applauded the Prime Minister for having the courage to create massive unemployment as a means to try to halt inflation. He addressed a meeting of the Canadian Petroleum Association, Saskatchewan Division, last winter and even made this statement. Let me quote: "The state owes every man a job, unless he is too lazy to work." He had just returned from a two-week vacation and business trip. He had visited Israel and told the people on his return to Saskatchewan that he was extremely impressed. He called Israel, "A Garden of Eden." "No unemployment." Let me quote him again: "It's one example of a country where Socialism has worked. I suppose if I were in China I should probably be a Communist. They have nowhere to go but up."

In his exuberance in the winter of 1970, after returning from Israel, he announced a \$20 million crash public works program to create employment. He said that it was \$20 million more, over and above the normal budget. We, in the Opposition, pointed out that no additional \$20 million was going to be spent on public works. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart)

replied by saying that we didn't understand his Budget.

He even said he believed in high wages. But what did he do a few weeks later? He cancelled all Government Public Works projects and even decreed that all construction must stop where the Government was providing any grants from the Provincial Treasury. He extended his unrealistic guidelines to apply to construction workers and extended Bill 2 to apply to them in order to control their wages. For a man who believes in high wages, he permitted the Saskatchewan minimum wage to drop to the lowest level in Canada and has allowed the average wage in Saskatchewan to drop over \$15 a week below the Canadian average. His policies, or lack of policies, placed about 15 per cent of Saskatchewan's non-agriculture labor force on the unemployed rolls. He drove 22,000 people out of the province in the last 12 months and not once did he mention his promise to create 80,000 new jobs.

What is the real incidence of Saskatchewan unemployment? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics gave us a figure of 21,000 at mid-January. New figures will be released either this Thursday or the Thursday next. We know that the Indian and Métis population, living on reserves, are not included in this count. Based on the native population of over 70,000 in Saskatchewan, we can estimate a labor force of some 20,000 who are primarily unemployed. Consider that out of the present estimated gross Provincial labor force of 338,000 about 85,000 are farmers and another 35,000 are self-employed, not subject to unemployment and we begin to see the gravity of the unemployment problem. Add to this the thousands who are employed on a part-time basis only and whose pay cheques have been reduced proportionately, and we see a fuller dimension to the problem.

But even this does not give us the complete view of how bad things might have been, if it were not for some 100,000 people leaving Saskatchewan since this Liberal Administration took office. Out of this large body of people who left Saskatchewan some 35,000 were our labor force. In 1970 alone, the Saskatchewan labor force dropped by 7,000, while Alberta had an increase of 19,000 and Manitoba's labor force increased by 16,000 in 1970.

The Globe and Mail report on business of January 20 and 22 states:

One cause of the increase in the number of unemployed in Manitoba is the migration to the province of unemployed workers from Saskatchewan.

The other report says:

The high unemployment in Alberta is attributed partly to the influx of job seekers from Saskatchewan.

While the export of our work force to other provinces has meant that Saskatchewan has been able to keep its jobless figures

down, Saskatchewan ought not to rejoice. We know that the preponderance of those who left were skilled and professional workers. It takes about \$20,000 to train a skilled worker and in case of professionals, it costs more. What this all means is that, as Saskatchewan exported 35,000 workers out of the province, we lost an investment in people's skills, Mr. Speaker, of between one-half and three-quarter billions of dollars, in fact, much more when we consider their families. This investment was made by individuals who left, by employers, but the large amount was money of the taxpayers.

We know that the vast majority of those who left were young workers who would have made a contribution towards the development of Saskatchewan for many years to come. Most of them will never return.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, Hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, our investment in them was by way of sending them through elementary and high school, technical and vocational schools, apprenticeship courses, university and other public training, and learning on the job. We lost them as consumers and we lost them as taxpayers. To minimize this loss by saying - as the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) do - unemployment in Saskatchewan is less severe than in most provinces, is economically and socially foolish. I recognize that no province can force people to stay within its borders. Some would have left even if the economy was buoyant. However, if we had an expanding economy with full employment very few would have emigrated and others would have been attracted. This the Premier promised to do in 1964 and 1965.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, consider with me for a moment the economic loss Saskatchewan has suffered as a result of unemployment and the people exported. Last year the average unemployment, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, stood over 15.000. That is for each day of the year this large number of workers were unemployed. In the winter it had climbed up to 30,000. We also know that the Indians and Métis living on reserves are not included in these figures as I've stated before. Consider with this the fact that 35,000 of our work force left Saskatchewan since the Government took office, and we are advised by the Provincial Treasurer that the average wage in Saskatchewan in 1970 stood at \$114.74 per week or \$6,000 per year. Had all these workers stayed in Saskatchewan and were employed the wages they would have earned last year, in 1970, would have totalled \$300 million, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The value of production equals three times the value of wages. Therefore in terms of production Saskatchewan last year lost \$900 million, Mr. Speaker. I will concede that the 15,000 average unemployed did get some income from other sources, such as welfare benefits and unemployment insurance, but it is safe to say that these would amount to less than half of their wages. The actual income loss was therefore well over \$34 million, but those who left, all their wage losses were a debit to the provincial economy. In terms of provincial and municipal taxes, had they all stayed and had we had full employment we should have realized at least \$50 million more in taxes.

To sum up, in 1970 unemployment and the exodus of people cost Saskatchewan over \$250 million in wage or income losses; some \$900 million in production losses; about \$50 million in provincial and municipal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, in my Budget address I pointed out that in three years between 1967 and 1970 retail sales in Saskatchewan dropped by almost a quarter billion dollars. We all know our agricultural economy has gone through a very rough period. Most of it is due to the lack of national policy and partly due to international factors. However, in the area of commercial, industrial and resource planning and development the province has the jurisdiction. If Saskatchewan had a policy of economic and social planning in this area and a plan for full employment and industrial expansion to create the 80,000 jobs, the Premier had promised, and had this Government endeavored to take action which “will retain the natural population increase of this province and attract other citizens from Canada and other parts of the world” - as the Premier did promise in 1965 - •• Saskatchewan would not have faced this economic depression.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Even with the farm crisis retail sales would not have dropped but in fact would have increased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the fact is this Government does no economic and social planning. It flies by the seat of its pants and hopes that something will happen to take us out of what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) calls ‘doldrums’. I call it ‘an economic depression’.

Let us look again at the public works. In 1970 the Government said \$20 million more would be spent in public works but no sooner had the Legislature prorogued than it was cancelled. The Government's excuse for scrapping the public works program of last year - even though as we said, no \$20 million of additional funds was provided - was because the unionized plumbers in the province and the Regina City electricians went out on strike.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that when construction work starts electricians and plumbers are not the immediate required construction workers. Excavation and foundation work could have proceeded including erection and structural steel. Workers in these trades, laborers, iron workers, carpenters and sheet metal workers and other trades were not out on strikes. Had this been done some of the construction work could have advanced to enclose the projects for winter construction which would have eased the number of unemployed for this winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The strikes of plumbers and electricians would have been settled by the time when their skills were required. But the Premier (Mr. Thatcher), with his contempt for labor and his madness to balance budgets - even though last year he did introduce a deficit budget - put a halt to all construction work. This bull-headed attitude only aggravated the already serious unemployment problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — What are the results? Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at Regina - this year, this winter, at the present time; 50 per cent of iron workers are unemployed and hundreds have left the province in the last year and a half; 35 per cent of the plumbers are jobless; 35 per cent of the painters are unemployed - some have not had any work for the last eight months; 40 per cent of our carpenters are unemployed; 10 per cent of laborers are only working. The same or worse is true of other construction trades - electricians, sheet metal workers, installators - most of them are unemployed at the present time.

In Regina the cement plant workers were laid off last September and are not working to this date. The house construction industry is at a standstill. Many contractors have gone bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, the much-advertised public works program for 1971 is not going to do a good enough job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The Government has for months been misleading the people that it has a special \$17 million public works program in motion. After the Budget was handed down we learned that in the two capital programs, government and the Crown corporations, \$5 million less is appropriated for this year than was appropriated last year. Also several projects under the Public Works Department are not going to get off the ground for many months to come because no blueprints are ready, architectural work has not been done, even the sites have not been selected. So what is being

appropriated in the Estimates for 1971-72 will not be spent, Mr. Speaker.

The Federal Government is virtually spending no money in Saskatchewan on capital construction. Saskatchewan is going to receive only \$4.8 million for public works but a very small amount of this \$4.8 million is for new construction. Most of the money is for maintenance and operating costs.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the Treasurer's comments about the Canada Pension Fund. He had this to say and let me quote:

Once again we took advantage of all funds available by the Canadian Pension Plan at a substantial saving since interest rates average 8.06 per cent. This money was used for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and telephone capital expenditures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Members may recall that on the day following the opening of this Session I asked the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) whether this Government is going to take advantage of the \$5 million made available by the Government of Canada for job-creating public works projects. He answered. No. This money is available at exactly the same interest as the Canada Pension Plan fund rates are. The only condition Ottawa set is that the projects must be of a permanent nature. It could be used for road construction, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the Province of Quebec is in the main going to use this money for highway construction.

For the Provincial Treasurer to say, as he did, that we don't borrow money for public works is just not in accordance with the facts, Mr. Speaker. This Government has borrowed money for highway construction, for university capital expenditures, and other programs. Who knows, at this stage, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada may in the future decide to forgive all or part of these loans - this has been done before. It could happen again and if it does, Saskatchewan will again be the loser of some \$5 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I have given a lot of facts and quoted quite a number of statistics. But there are no statistics to measure the human suffering and degradation of people because of unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Who can measure in dollars or cents the pain a mother feels because her son or daughter landed in jail. We know that as unemployment rises so does the incidence of crime, Mr. Speaker.

There is no equation to measure the embarrassment and humiliation of getting one's furniture or other property repossessed and to be recorded thereafter as a poor credit risk. Or the loneliness of a wife and children whose husband and father has left for far away places in search of a job - a job that he is unable to find elsewhere, either. What are the real costs of the premature school dropouts, Mr. Speaker, because there was no money to send the youngster to school any longer? Yes, Mr. Speaker, unemployment means all this and more. It has meant that \$6.5 million more had to be appropriated and will be spent on welfare payments this year than was estimated last year by this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, let me make some suggestions to the Government by which it could get the economy back on the tracks, get our people back to work, stimulate our economy and prevent human suffering.

Some 25,000 Saskatchewan workers are paid minimum wage rates only of \$1.15 or \$1.25 per hour and less if they are 17 years of age. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the Government to increase the minimum wage to \$1.75 per hour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — This would place about \$25 million a year more in the hands of consumers. This will help the workers to get a better standard of living. It will raise retail sales by an equal amount. Workers on minimum wages do not and cannot place any part of their pay cheques into savings. It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that some 50,000 Saskatchewan workers still work more than a 40-hour work week. Some work 44 hours. There are those that still work 48 hours a week. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Government to introduce immediately a bill to reduce the legal work week to no more than 40 hours a week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The Government ought to take immediate legislative action to provide for control of over-time during periods of high unemployment. Several thousand additional jobs would be created through the reduction in the legal work week and control of overtime hours.

The Government advised us that the Saskatchewan average wage, as I've already stated, last year stood at \$114.74. The national average wage in November of 1970 was \$130.23. In other words, Saskatchewan's average wage was \$15.49 per week below that of the whole of Canada. If the Saskatchewan non-agricultural labor force received wages equal to the average Canadian workers, their earnings would have been some \$200 million more than they were last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — This too would do much to improve the standard of living and stimulate the economy generally and increase retail sales. The controls and the guidelines and the restrictive labor legislation has demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan's average wages have been dropping ever since this Government took office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — The removal of these restrictive laws is necessary so that we can catch up to the average wages that workers in Canada are earning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, we have previously proposed, and the New Democratic Party program calls for, the establishment of a Saskatchewan Development Corporation which would mobilize capital for public investment for economic development. We have suggested a fund of \$100 million, the fund to be raised from a variety of sources, including direct investment by the province and by shares offered to individuals, organizations and companies. We urge the Government to establish immediately such a fund to be used for provincial development and to create the much-needed jobs . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . to be used for a larger expansion of Canadian control of our economy and the development of our resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — We have proposed a program to modernize and re-develop many of our villages and towns including construction of many needed community centres and sports facilities, the extension and improvement of parks and recreational facilities.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) tells us that the reason the school construction budget has been cut this year by \$3.7 million is because enough schools have been built. Nothing can be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Again I point to my constituency with a large population, where we have no high school. I know similar problems, perhaps not as extreme, exist in other communities.

We are advised that \$7.5 million is being made available this year by the Government of Canada as capital grants pursuant to the Adult Occupational Training Act. This was money made available by Ottawa for construction of technical and vocational schools, for the training and upgrading of our work force. The Federal Government provided 75 per cent of capital costs. Since this Government took office it has only spent \$8.3 million on such facilities, three-quarters of this amount was provided by Ottawa, yet this Legislature appropriated \$13.4 million in the last six years - an under-expenditure of more than \$5 million for technical school facilities.

Last year virtually no money was spent on technical and vocational school construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, this year's Budget does provide \$2 million to begin construction of an Institute of Applied Arts and Science in the city of Regina. I welcome that decision. May I also suggest that immediate consideration be given to the construction of a technical and vocational institute in Northern Saskatchewan to be used primarily for the training and upgrading of our native population.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — In meeting with the leaders of the native population, Indian and Métis, I find they resent the Government policy of job placement or employment on an enforced quota basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — They want a system which will stress competence, a system which will place the native workers on an equal basis to compete for jobs. This can and will only come when these people are adequately trained, educated and skilled to do any job that is available. Provision of a technical and vocational school in Northern Saskatchewan, perhaps combined with a community college, would go a long way to help educate and train our native people properly, so that they may compete for jobs on an equal basis.

The Government will receive \$7.5 million from Ottawa for development of such facilities. Let us put this money to use now. Let us not use these funds to finance other government services and programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us develop a meaningful public works construction program. Let's make it in the order of the Manitoba plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Back in October, 1970 Premier Schreyer introduced not a \$17 million program or a \$15 million public works program, he announced a \$74 million plan in October . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . and in December he added a new plan of \$56 million for housing construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear. Hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — This is the kind of a bold measure that needs to be taken. This Government in its Budget proposes a Public Works' plan of \$15.8 million, and a housing program that is almost nothing, in fact \$750,000 less money than last year. We need a Housing Authority to undertake a plan for the construction of, say, 10,000 dwellings in urban and rural communities. Such a plan could provide 25,000 jobs alone on a year-round basis.

The Government should immediately try to re-negotiate the potash agreement. It is totally unfair to our potash industry and to our workers to operate at 46 per cent of its capacity, while the American industry is operating at 90 per cent capacity. Saskatchewan got a raw deal out of this agreement. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that doubling the capacity of potash industry is not going to double employment but it would increase employment considerably. The province would also benefit from increased production by getting more revenue from royalties.

Saskatchewan should provide leadership, and work with our neighboring provinces to establish a farm implement manufacturing, importing and distribution industry. Consideration should be given to establishing a provincial pension plan similar to the Canada Pension Plan. To start out with, it could be on a voluntary basis, except where public funds are being used to pay salaries as is the case in hospitals and perhaps in the case of municipalities. Many of the present plans are underwritten by insurance companies where the funds are drained out of the province. The funds could be used for Saskatchewan economic development. Many small employers and self-employed people would undoubtedly join, since establishing a plan for a small group of workers and small industry is often expensive.

I urge the Government to reconsider its position in respect of the \$5 million loan for job-creating projects offered by the Government of Canada. Since the interest rates are more favorable, equal to those of the Canada Pension Plan, specifically I recommend that this money be used for the construction of needed nursing home facilities. If private operators can borrow money at higher interest rates and build nursing homes and make hand- some profits, we can do it as a public operation, on a lower interest rate basis, we can provide a better service and at lower cost to the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government to increase benefits under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. The food, clothing and shelter allowances are not adequate to provide a decent standard of living at today's high cost of living. May I suggest that this Government immediately make strong representations to the Government of Canada: (1) to double at least the Federal Government public works project in the Province of Saskatchewan so as to increase employment; (2) the immediate implementation in respect of the Unemployment Insurance benefits by raising them to a \$100 a week level; (3) urge the Federal Government to increase its contribution in respect of the Canada Assistance Plan so that benefits could be increased to welfare recipients. The Government of Canada should be asked to provide at least 60 per cent of the funds, perhaps two-thirds of the funds; (4) proceed forthwith with the establishment of a national guaranteed income plan. Establish a guaranteed net income plan for the farmers as recommended by several of my colleagues in previous debates; (5) establish 60 years of age as the age of retirement and make old-age security in the Canada Pension Plan take effect as of the age 60.

These are important representations to be made to the Government of Canada and I urge the Premier and his Cabinet to do this immediately.

The paltry sum allotted for the Student Aid Fund in the Budget is not enough. I urge the Government to establish at least a \$3 million bursary program and institute a provincial student loan fund to complement the Canada Student Loan Fund.^

Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed in the plan the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) outlined last Friday for summer student employment. Let me first answer the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) when he said that I should have waited to hear what the plan was before I criticized it. Well, perhaps the Provincial Treasurer ought to have done likewise. He should have waited to find out what the plan was before he announced it in his Budget address. The Provincial Treasurer said this and I quote:

Our Government is launching a program that will provide at least 2,000 student jobs during the next six months.

The Minister told us the plan would 'provide only three months employment. It is a three-month plan, not a six-month plan. The Treasurer then said the plan would pay one-half the wages to "farmers and businesses." The Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) says it will only apply to farmers, businesses will not be included. So, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer should have found out what the plan was going to be all about before he started making noises about it in his Budget.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that a large portion of those

students who will be employed by the Government under this plan be employed in social research and study projects; such as the extent and effects of poverty in Saskatchewan; problems of pollution; studies on economic and social problems of our native population; numerous problems of our urban communities, especially the larger cities; the drug culture or drug problem; what needs to be done to strengthen our rural communities; can the population shift be stopped, and how can the exodus of people be stopped, as well. These are important studies to be undertaken. We must come up with positive solutions for these problems. The students would enjoy the work and perhaps perform a most useful service to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I ask this Government to declare an all out war on unemployment and poverty. Let's mobilize all our provincial funds and human resources to stop the human suffering and waste caused by unemployment. Let us declare in intent and by action, that nothing short of full employment is good enough for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw North) .

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 18

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) for Return No. 18 showing:

The average number of unemployed in Saskatchewan in 1964.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion for Return No. 18 be amended as follows:

That the following words be added after the figure “1964”: and the number of unemployed at mid-January, 1963.

MR. W. G. DAVIES:(Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I have no special objection to the amendment except that if the Minister wanted to get some really fruitful information he would take a number of comparative years as of mid-January as in the case of the amendment here. In this case he has taken only mid-January, 1963. The motion of course asked for the average number of unemployed in Saskatchewan in 1964, giving the average for the whole of that year, which is a meaningful figure in that kind of a comparison. The securing of the information for mid-January, 1963, in this sort of context is virtually meaningless but if this is what he wants for his

own reasons I shan't object to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 19

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) for Return No. 19 showing:

The average number of unemployed in Saskatchewan in 1970.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — I move that Motion No. 19 be amended as follows:

That the following words be added after the figure "1970": and the number of unemployed at mid-January, 1971.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 20

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East) for Return No. 20 showing:

Whether the average weekly wage of Canada exceeded that of Saskatchewan in 1964. If so, the amount.

HON. D. G. MacLENNAN: (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker. I move that Motion for Return No. 20 be amended as follows:

That the word "1964" be deleted and the following substituted therefore: September, 1964, in constant (1961) dollars.

MR. W. E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I must oppose the amendment simply on the grounds that wage rates that are reported are not reported in constant dollars in various reports. Certainly his own Department does not report wages in these terms for 1970, that is 1961 constant dollars. We want the real figure of what they actually were and what the average wage was for the year, not for a particular month. Really the Minister is trying to make a farce out of the Motion and I urge the Members to oppose the amendment that the Minister has proposed.

MR. DAVIES: — Mr. Speaker, I think, too that in addition to the

reasons that my colleague from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) has just given that there is this. The Motion as put by the mover asks for the average weekly wage of Canada compared to that of Saskatchewan in 1964, so that what the mover wanted was an average for the whole of the year. Again this would be a figure that would mean something to us because you can get some tremendous variations in weekly wages from January to December of any year either on the Canada-wide basis or on the Saskatchewan or provincial basis. So that the information that we want in this query will give us the average for the whole of the year. The amendment as submitted by the Minister of Labour would reduce this information to that for only September of 1964. This again will give us, not only misleading information, but not the full information that would have been secured by the Motion. For this reason it seems to me that this is a bad amendment and I shall not vote for it.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 50

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W. G. Davies for Return No. 50 showing:

1. (a) The Department of Public Works' construction projects commenced in 1970: (b) in each case, their value; (c) the location, and the dates that they were commenced.
2. The number of building construction workers who were directly employed in each of these projects (a) as of March 1, 1970; (b) as of July 1, 1970; (c) as of December 1, 1970.
3. The number of the said projects that were still uncompleted as of February 1970, and the names of each.
4. The number of building construction workers that were employed with respect to each of the uncompleted projects, as of February 15, 1971.

and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Coderre:

- That all the words after the word "projects" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore; that were in progress during 1970.
- (b) that involved Government assistance, licence or approval during 1970; (c) in each case their value; the location; the dates of completion, actual or estimated.
2. The estimated number of man days for each project.

MR. W. G. DAVIES: (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, on the amendment which is proposed to the motion I must say that this is just another attempt so far as I can see of the Government denying to this House information that would be most valuable in a discussion of the matters coming before us. All that will be provided by the amendment will be the most unspecific and general information involving not specific projects of the Department of Public Works but projects that involve Government assistance, licence or approval. So I suppose that where some inspector has approved the construction of some project totally unrelated to any financial assistance even this would be one of the projects which in the answer would be included as one that had involved the Government approval. And that would be quite apart from what we wanted to get in the motion and I think that we are not interested in knowing what the Government itself has done with respect to projects that would have assisted the working people of this province, help purchasing power and eliminated a large part of the unemployment that we have before us at this particular time in the province.

I think that, as I have suggested, this is just another bare faced effort to elude the straight forward kind of information that should come to this House and that this Government has the responsibility to provide. I think that everyone in this House today should have a feeling of disquiet that this kind of amendment has been proposed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DAVIES: — The amendment calls, for example, for information on projects that involve Government assistance or licence. I " suppose again that in these two respects the kinds of projects that would fall under these two words might not have involved a dollar of Government assistance directly, certainly not so far as licences are concerned. I would ask the Government again to withdraw this amendment and to let the motion as originally placed before this House receive approval so that we can know what in the last year constituted the effort of the Department of Public Works in the area of construction projects that they authorized, the number of persons who worked in each one of these projects as of the dates that have been requested so that we shall be in an intelligent position to debate these matters in the House today. I say it is most irresponsible, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we should be presented with this kind of an amendment which again denies to this House what the Members have a right to receive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member can't speak again

to this. He moved this amendment.

MR. G. T. SNYDER: (Moose Jaw North): — It was on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Beg your pardon? He can't speak on the amendment, He's already moved it. He spoke to it when he moved it.

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker. I just had a few comments to pass along the lines of the remarks made by my colleague from Moose Jaw South.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! We have a point or order.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — He adjourned the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Who did?

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — The Hon. Mr. Snyder from Moose Jaw North.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — He can't speak a second time on it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, he hasn't spoken.

MR. SNYDER: — I just adjourned the debate, I didn't speak on it.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — But he adjourned it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Oh, just a minute until I dig into my bag of tricks for reference material.

A point of order has been raised to the effect that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) now rising to speak cannot now re-enter this debate because when he spoke previously he secured the adjournment of the debate and having done so, did not rise to re-enter the debate at the earliest possible opportunity. He now seeks to re-enter the debate and the point of order is that he cannot do so having already spoken.

To the best of my knowledge, we have never faced a problem of this nature in this Legislature although it has often occurred in others, and parliamentary authorities are quite explicit on the subject.

It is quite true that Rule No. 28 of our Legislature states in part as follows:

No Member may speak twice to a question.

It is, however, well established by precedent and tradition in this Legislature and others that a debate can be adjourned and that when this occurs, its resumption is governed by well defined established rules of Parliamentary Procedure.

I wish to draw all Hon. Members' attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. Citation 122, Page 122, which states as follows:

On resuming an adjourned debate, the Member who moved its adjournment is, by courtesy, entitled to speak first if he rises in his place when the Order is called, but if he does not avail himself of this privilege he is not thereby debarred from subsequently joining in the debate.

I want to further draw Hon. Members' attention to May's Parliamentary practice, 17th Edition, Page 444, which states in part:

On resuming an adjourned debate, the Member who moved its adjournment is, by courtesy, entitled to speak first on the resumption of the debate: But for that purpose he must rise in his place in order to avail himself of his privilege, as, unless he rises, it is not the duty of the Speaker to call upon him; though if having obtained this advantage he does not avail himself thereof at the resumption of the debate he is not thereby debarred from subsequently joining therein.

There is no doubt that this particular procedure was designed to protect the fundamental right of freedom of speech.

It is clear from the foregoing authorities that the Member has the undoubted right to re-enter this debate.

This is the first time in my life when after having prepared dozens and dozens and dozens of rulings trying to second guess the House and in order to be all prepared for something that might occur, this is the first time that I've been able to whip one right out on the spur of the moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I just wanted to make just . . .

MR. STEUART: — . . . I will be, Gordon!

MR. SNYDER: — When you're around a little longer you'll be all right too, Davey. You'll catch on when you've been around a little while.

I just wanted to pass on a few observations that I think are pretty evident to most of us in this House, particularly over the last number of years. The difficulty which Members on this side of the House seem to find is in grinding some kind of tangible information from Ministers on the Treasury Benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear. Hear!

MR. SNYDER: — We placed on the Order Paper some days ago a question asking the amount that was allotted in the Government's work projects in the announcement of December 1970. The question dealt specifically with the amount for the Saskatchewan Training School in Moose Jaw. The question also asked of this amount, the total that had been expended as of February 15th, 1971. Well, the answer came back saying that no accounts had been paid and this of course isn't very definite in that there could have been some work proceeded with for which accounts had not been paid.

I phoned the Deputy Minister of Public Works asking him if there had been any work proceeded with. I couldn't reach him because he was in Moose Jaw on that particular day so I expected he would have some up-to-date information when he came back to Regina. I called him the following day only to be told, Mr. Speaker, that upon the advice of the Minister that this kind of information can't be given to Members of this Assembly.

Now what kind of a situation is this, Mr. Speaker, when you can't go to the Deputy Minister of this Department of Government to find out whether a work project in your constituency has or has not been proceeded with? There is a veil of silence being placed over Deputy Ministers to the point where they dare not issue this kind of information to a Member.

I finally came back to the Minister and asked him then in light of the fact that his Deputy couldn't provide the information for me, if he could tell me if anything had been proceeded with and he said, he didn't know that he would have to go back and check with his Deputy Minister. I received some information to the effect that the \$72,000 program had been broken down into three different areas: (1) a \$7,000 sewage program and the design has been completed on that, Mr. Speaker, but nothing has been done; (2) a \$50,000 roofing job which the Department of Public Works has concluded should not be proceeded with because it's going to take more money and more time than they are willing to spend on it; and (3) \$15,000 for kitchen renovations on which I understand there has been some work done.

Should we be placed in a position in this House, Mr. Speaker, where we place a question on the Order Paper, get incomplete information, then go to the Deputy Minister, who in turn says, 'you'll have to go to the Minister', who in turn has to return to his Deputy in order that we can get this kind of information?

Surely this isn't the way that a business-like government operates, Mr. Speaker. It's like pulling teeth to get anything that resembles information from any department of government . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — . . . because there has been a veil of silence thrown over Deputy Ministers where they hardly dare to speak their piece on matters that should be public information. If this is business-like government, Mr. Speaker, certainly I fail to see where this Government is acting responsibly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear. Hear!

MR. I. H. MacDOUGALL: (Souris-Estevan)The Member for Moose Jaw's (Mr. Snyder) memory must be awfully short because we sat in the House as Opposition Members for four years and any time that an Opposition Member would stand up and ask a question of the Government it would be changed into a Motion for Return and then they would say well, you'll get that information in Crown corporations. You'd ask the question in Crown corporations and they'd say, put a question in the House and you never got the information anyway. Now this Member stands up here and gives us all this garbage for ten minutes when they did exactly the same thing seven or eight years ago, and worse. We never got any information from them. None whatsoever and we tried to get information year after year and we met with the same results and so I don't think they have much to complain about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, the Member moved the amendment and spoke to the amendment. The debate before the House is now on the amendment and the person who moved the motion cannot adjourn his own debate.

MR. N. E. BYERS: (Kelvington): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this particular question but I am particularly annoyed and I think, a good many Saskatchewan people are, at the attitude displayed by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) in rewording this question so that even if we got the answer it would be meaningless.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — And the attitude of the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) who seems to take the view, which he has said repeatedly in Crown corporations, if the New Democratic Party in this Legislature wants any information it is my duty to hold

up my hand to see that they don't get it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a well accepted principle in the British parliamentary system of government, and I am sure these are the types of things that the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan learns about the parliamentary system when he goes abroad to England and other places as a representative of this Legislature, that there is one cardinal fact about the legislative process and it is the duty of the government to give the people of this province information which they do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — I say that we have had far too many examples of this type of arrogance. It seems to me that when the government takes this particular point of view that it is saying that there is one body of information which can be used to put into the Liberal propaganda mill for election purposes but there is another type of information which we in the Opposition are not entitled to so that we can make them stand up to determine the authenticity of the information which it is giving. I think that if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) will look at the amended portion of his question, where we want to know the number of projects in progress and this type of thing, I invite him to look at No. 2 - the estimated number of man-days for each project. What does that mean, Mr. Minister of Public Works? Total man-days that will be involved over the next five years, two years or one year, or for what period of time is this? That question is vague. The answer, even if he gives it, will not give us the relevant information that we are attempting to get.

I call on the Premier to encourage his Ministers to provide information of this particular type. And this is certainly not too much or too difficult information for any department to be expected to provide to any Opposition or to any Legislature or to any people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to address my remarks to the amendment that is before the House, Mr. Speaker.

I want to concur in all that has been said by the Members on this side. The Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) said it so ably. I do also want to draw to the attention of the Members of the House that the amendment is meaningless in more than just sub-paragraph 2, which the Member for Kelvington drew to the attention of the House. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment says that all the words after 'projects' be deleted and substitutes — and I direct the Members' attention to the words — 'that were in progress during 1970'. What in the world

does 'in progress' mean during 1970? Due to the Government's own standards 'in progress' could be anything from having a particular construction job, at the working drawing stage, to use the words of the Minister, at the University Hospital addition.

It could be in progress simply because this Government said that it is going to be in the Budget Address of 1970 or 1971, and yet not one nail has been pounded into the construction, not one hole has been dug.

We have been saying in this Legislature and outside this Legislature that the \$20 million that the Government and the Treasurer have promised the people of Saskatchewan in the 1970 crash public works' program, that that program in fact, far from being a public works' program, was nothing more, nothing less, than a bust program as far as construction is concerned in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear. Hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I have been saying inside the House and outside the House, that very, very little of that \$20 million so-called was actually ever spent in 1970 to get construction going and to make work available for our working men in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now the Government inside this House and on the hustings says that we are not telling the truth, that we are misrepresenting the information to people. And the main motion as put forward by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) will precisely settle that argument as to who is telling the truth to the people of Saskatchewan, whether or not that \$20 million was spent.

What does the main motion say? Very specifically it asks the Government to tell the people: 1. How many workers were employed in public works in 1970. 2. It asks the number of projects that are not yet completed. We shall be denied this information by this amendment. 3. We asked for the number of workers employed as of February, 1971. This amendment will also deny that valuable piece of information.

I can only say that if the Members opposite use the majority of the Government to impose this amendment against the will of the majority of the people in Saskatchewan, that it will only prove and substantiate the arguments that we are making on the hustings and everywhere, that this Government hasn't spent a cent on the \$20 million construction works' program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — That this Government is in fact responsible for the

unemployment rate which is at the highest level in Saskatchewan's history precisely because of no public works' programs being started.

I want to reiterate, if I can, Mr. Speaker, finally what I find in my three and one-half years as an MLA, the recurring experiences of information being denied by the Government opposite. Legitimate questions that request legitimate answers, time and time again are being amended. This is the second issue, Mr. Speaker. I say this amendment is the second issue now of freedom of speech for this Assembly and the provision of information to all the people of Saskatchewan that the Government opposite is denying . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . because they are afraid. Afraid that the information will go against them. We, on this side, respectfully urge all the Members to turn down this proposed amendment by the Minister and in fact support the main motion as introduced by my colleague, Mr. Davies.

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD: (Cannington): — On this particular subject, Mr. Speaker, while the Member opposite likes to talk about the responsibility of the Government to provide the information, I should like to say a word about the responsibility of the Opposition to know the truth when they see it. They never do.

They certainly don't know the truth because The Commonwealth, the party propaganda paper of the Opposition, if the Government could put out the truth in the Legislature all day and all night, for 24 hours a day, The Commonwealth still wouldn't know the truth and anyone who reads it can accurately tell that.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member spoke to the main motion and then moved an amendment in that debate. A Member who has moved an amendment cannot move the adjournment of the debate on that amendment.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — On the point that you just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, you said that a person who has brought in an amendment, once the amendment is part of the motion, cannot close that debate. He is unable to answer any of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — A Member who has moved an amendment cannot close the debate on the amendment. A Member can only close the debate on the main motion provided he is the mover thereof. The mover of a main motion is the only person who has the opportunity to close

a debate.

The amendment was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 25
Messieurs

Thatcher
Howes
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Barrie
Loken
MacDougall

Grant
Coderre
Estey
MacLennan
Gallagher
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Radloff
Weatherald
Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor

NAYS — 19
Messieurs

Bowerman
Kramer
Messer
Romanow
Davies
Dewhurst
Berezowsky

Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank

Baker
Matsalla
Wooff
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

The debate continues on the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Minister of Public Works cannot close the debate because he did not move the motion. The only Member that can do so is the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies).

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on it. In any event I should like to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member has already spoken to the main motion, he did so when he was moving the amendment. The amendment stood in the name of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and when he rose to move the amendment, he spoke to the main motion and also spoke to the amendment. He has spoken to both at the same time.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — May I just speak on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: — It is questionable. This has always been a cardinal principle of parliamentary procedure. I am sorry, but that is the best I can do about it.

HON. L. P. CODERRE: (Minister of Public Works): — Point of order, no, not personal privilege. It is on a point of order that I am speaking of. I know what I am talking about and you don't.

Mr. Speaker, I brought in the amendment, I spoke on the motion and I gave my reasons why the motion was not fair. I brought in an amendment. Members opposite spoke on the amendment and brought in matters which are either irrelevant or not true as the case may be. Surely, there must be a procedure in Parliament whereby a Member can answer the accusations that are made in a motion that he is in possession of. There has been no opportunity for myself to answer some of these statements that have been made in respect to the amendment. There is always the method of closing the debate.

MR. DAVIES: — I would suggest to the Minister that he had full opportunity when he got up to move his amendment to say all that he needed to say and wanted to say on the motion. He had nothing to say about it at that time and he should just subside a little bit and let us have the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: — It is quite obvious that when the Member rises to speak on this motion, he is speaking to the main question. A Member can only speak once to one question before the House. When he moves an amendment he is speaking to both the motion and the amendment. Nor do we follow the practice here of allowing Members to close the debate on an amendment. If we did then indeed he could speak, but we have never followed that practice.

No Member who has moved an amendment has ever been allowed to close the debate on the amendment. Only the mover of the main motion has been allowed to close a debate. That is the practice and custom of this House.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

RETURN NO. 79

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 79 showing:

Whether the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies (i) paid; (ii) rebated; or (iii) suspended charges in 1970 for overweight permits in respect of Waskesiu Holdings or any other hauler of timber to the Prince Albert Pulp Company.

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Cameron, that this motion by Mr. Berezowsky be amended as follows:

That all the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(a) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan suspended any charges which otherwise would have been required in 1970 in respect of overweight permits for the haul of pulpwood to the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited by Waskesiu Holdings Limited or any other hauler.

(b) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan rebated any payments received for such permits.

(c) Whether payments received in respect of such permits represented a part of the cost of pulpwood delivered to the Prince Albert Pulp Wood Company Limited.

(d) The amount of payments received in respect of such permits.

The Members opposite will note that once again the Government of Saskatchewan is giving them more information than they wanted. All the details. While it is often said here, and said very recently, that the Government attempts to deny information, the Opposition has a very cute trick of asking just very select information. It is like taking something out of context, a very clever trick pulled off by some unscrupulous lawyers, none of which are on this side, of course. And so we do as we have done in the last debate and we shall do in this debate, we want to give the Opposition all the truth and when the strong sunlight of truth shines down on Socialists when winter is here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order:

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — On a point of privilege. I just want to tell the Hon. Member I am not an unscrupulous lawyer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I haven't heard what the Member for Cumberland said and I do wish to goodness his compatriots down here would be quiet while he is saying it.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Well, it may be a little bit in, fun, Mr. Speaker, I just said to the Hon. Member who sat down when he referred to the person who drew this up as, "an unscrupulous lawyer, " and I wanted to let him know and the House know that I am not an unscrupulous lawyer - I wish I were a lawyer though.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm sure that all Hon. Members of the Legislature will take note that the Member for Cumberland is not a member of the legal profession.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The debate continues on the amendment.

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, we should like to have a look at this, therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.