

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature
35th Day

Saturday, April 3, 1971

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

THIRD READING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. D. G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Bill No. 36 - An Act to assist Athabasca Forest Industries Ltd. in establishing a Pulp Mill in Saskatchewan be now read a third time.

MR. W. S. LLOYD (Biggar): — I want, Mr. Speaker, simply to say that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) had hoped to speak on this Bill. He is not here and I want to ask the indulgence of the Government to stand it until such time that he is present.

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, with regret we cannot give that.

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to take part in this debate further at this time and I for one will regret the decision announced by the Premier that the Bill couldn't wait until the presence of my colleague, the Leader, who had hoped to speak on it. I should suggest this is a courtesy which is usually allowed but under the circumstances, we shall submit to the ruling of the Premier.

I think there is little to be added with respect to the position of those of us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. It has been very clearly indicated by a number of my colleagues our concern with respect to this Bill. That concern has to do with the fact of uncertainty with respect to the extent of the public risk that is involved. It has to do with some disagreement with respect to the extent to which we are pledging, and some of them forever, public resources to support what is considered and what is called to be a private enterprise undertaking. I think we ought to look for a moment at the extent to which this is or is not a private enterprise undertaking. It's a Bill in which the resources to be used are public resources, the forests and the waters of the people of Saskatchewan. It's a Bill in which transportation is to be provided to a considerable extent out of public funds. It's a Bill for which power, insofar as it's used from outside, and gas as it is used, are to be provided by public corporations. It's a Bill into which goes a sizeable - so we are told - public grant from the Government of Canada. It's a Bill which provides for a grant out of the public treasury of the Province of Saskatchewan. It's a Bill which provides these kinds of arrangements, certainly it is not what one would call a great triumph for private enterprise. It is private enterprise bolstered and subsidized by the public treasury to a very considerable extent and those of us on this side of the House have been skeptical of the propriety of that.

We remain also, Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated, unconvinced that adequate concern has been taken to make sure that

April 3, 1971

there will be no long-standing harm done to the environment in that part of Saskatchewan. We have expressed the very considerable concern with regard to this great area of water and territory which is one of the last pollution-free areas on the North American continent. Certainly the Government's own consultant firms, as I have said on previous times, have provided neither comfort nor assurance that this area will remain untouched and unspoiled as a result of the operation of the mill.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no point in delaying the Legislature. I again regret the absence of my Leader on this occasion. We have made our points clear. We voted against the Bill on second reading and we shall do so on third reading as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate but in view of the Government's position of not permitting our Leader to take part by not allowing this Bill to stand, I want to make a few observations in reference to the number of jobs this mill is supposed to create.

We have been told by the Premier and Government Members that during the period of construction this project will create something like 1,200 jobs and 1,600 jobs when the mill goes into operation. During debate other Government Members said that it would provide 1,400 jobs. When the Bill was in Committee we heard new figures and that the mill and the woods operations would create 1,000 jobs. Whom are we to believe? One time it's 1,600, the next time it's 1,400, the third time it's 1,000. The truth is that the Government Members do not know how many jobs this mill is to provide. There is also a suggestion that some 4,000 additional jobs will be created as a result of the mill being created in that area. We are told that some 20 per cent of the people who will be employed will be of native origin. The Premier tells us on one occasion that this is guaranteed in the agreements. On checking the agreements we find that there is no such provision guaranteeing employment to the native people to the tune of 20 per cent of jobs that are to be created.

You know, Mr. Speaker, how reminiscent are those words of the pulp mill in the Prince Albert announcement by the Premier on February 11, 1966. He said the Prince Albert mill would create 1,500 jobs during the period of construction, that it would create 500 jobs for the people in the mill and another 3,000 jobs in the woods. Well, what has been the result? We find that during the period of construction the Prince Albert mill created 1,000 jobs. However, Mr. Speaker, in checking other records we find that while in total there might have been 1,000 plumbers, electricians, carpenters and others employed during the two and one-half year period, but at any one given time no such number of jobs were created.

It is interesting also to note the contradiction in the case of the operations in the woods. We are told now that 500 jobs were created in the woods but in the annual report of Saskatchewan Pulp Wood Limited of a year ago we find the figure is only 206 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in case of the Indian employment we find now that in Prince Albert only 67 Indian and Metis people are

employed in that operation. So when Government Members tell us that a huge number of jobs will be created for Indians, we have reason to be skeptical.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that this Athabasca mill will do exactly the same thing to the native people in Meadow Lake, Buffalo Narrows and Ile-a-la-Crosse as the Prince Albert pulp mill did in the Prince Albert area. This mill has drawn many native people from the Reserves and away from their natural habitat where they had been able to make a living at hunting and fishing and other natural occupations, only to swell the ranks of welfare recipients in the Prince Albert area, except that in this case they will move to the Meadow Lake area and other urban centres.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said that the Prince Albert pulp mill provides an annual payroll of \$9 million. Mr. Speaker, there are less than 800 jobs in Prince Albert. To say that here is a payroll of \$9 million means that the average person employed in the woods operation and in the mill is getting over \$11,000 per year. I don't believe them, Mr. Speaker. If this were true they would be the highest paid workers anywhere in North America. Mr. Speaker, in checking the newspaper advertisement that was inserted by Mr. Landegger on February 4th we find that the figures that were quoted are in conflict. The newspaper advertisement notes that, "At Prince Albert approximately 420 workers are employed in pulp wood at average wages of \$3.97 per hour." This means \$8,257 per year or a gross payroll of about \$3.5 million. Now, if we allowed an equal payroll in the case of the woods operation, that brings the payroll up to \$7 million not \$9 million as the Provincial Treasurer told us.

Because of these conflicts in statistics we have cause for concern and have the right to question the Government's figure. It is interesting too, Mr. Speaker, that while the Athabasca mill capacity will be 55 per cent greater than in Prince Albert, they tell us that the number of jobs will be doubled or more than doubled. A capacity that's only 55 per cent greater will not mean the doubling of employment.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall how indignant the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was a few days ago when we suggested that the Government take action to try and negotiate the potash agreements so that additional jobs could be created. His answer was that even if the production was doubled, this would only mean that job numbers would increase by about 10 per cent. Yet in the case of the Athabasca pulp mill, whose capacity would be about 55 per cent greater than that in Prince Albert, they tell us that the employment will more than double. We know that jobs will be created but the numbers that they are throwing around are hard to believe and we have reason to doubt them.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that if this amount of money was spent on other projects such as helping the farm people of Saskatchewan in active urban and rural housing construction plans, helping small business people, active development of a tourist industry, new parks and recreation facilities, perhaps the Government might consider the promotion of a paper mill in conjunction with the pulp mill in Prince Albert. This would be developing a secondary processing industry. More investment in the food processing industry should be encouraged, the establishment or initiating of a Prairie farm machinery manufacturing and importing industry, urban and rural redevelopment and construction of schools. If this amount of money was spent on

April 3, 1971

these kinds of projects, Mr. Speaker, this would create many more jobs for a longer period of time than the proposed Athabasca pulp mill will create.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very much concerned about the misinformation that we are being provided as to the amount of revenue that the province will derive. We were told earlier when this Bill was being considered that the Province will derive some \$1 million a year from royalties and stumpage fees, rentals and other dues in regard to the Athabasca pulp mill operation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been provided with facts from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) about the extent of revenues we receive from the Prince Albert operation. What is the result? In the first year that the pulp mill started operating, the net income to the Province in royalties and fees amounted to \$42,800. In 1968-69 fiscal year, when the mill was in operation or the full year, the income from royalties, dues, fees and rentals amounted to \$153,000. In the year following in 1969-70 \$105,000. In the first three years where complete figures are available, the Province of Saskatchewan received an income of only \$301,000, Mr. Speaker. We are provided with estimates for 1970-71 and are told that the income from these sources will be about \$252,000 and the projected figure for 1971-72 is \$280,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it will take more than six years for us to get \$1 million from royalties, stumpage fees and other dues and fees in regard to the Prince Albert operation, yet we are told that in the case of Athabasca in one year we shall get \$1 million. This, I submit, is not in accordance with the facts based on the Prince Albert experience.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the kind of stumpage fees that are collected from the Prince Albert operation of 70 cents for spruce and 60 cents for jackpine, 38 cents for popular and other species, with these rates to continue until the end of 1979 and then take a look at the proposed agreement in the Athabasca case, the rates there are not going to be substantially more. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we are not going to get \$1 million annually in revenue. In making some comparisons of Saskatchewan rates as compared to other provinces, we find that the Saskatchewan Government is only charging about half the rates charged by British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and other provinces. Mr. Speaker, neither this Government nor any other government, had the right to give away our resources in this kind of way.

Mr. Speaker, we have cause for concern in the give away of our resources. We have even greater cause when this give away of resources is offered to foreign operators and to foreign-controlled companies. The Premier says we invited numerous Canadian pulp and paper companies to build and operate a mill in Meadow Lake. The other day we did ask for correspondence to be tabled as to what negotiations had taken place. We were given a list of names and copies of advertisements but no one from the Government side of the House has given us the assurance that the same kind of offers were made to the Canadian companies as were made to Parsons and Whittemore.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer is quoted on February 19th in the Leader-Post as saying he was confident that a large portion of the \$107 million will be borrowed by Athabasca pulp mill on the Canadian market to finance the construction of the mill. It is very interesting. Here we find that really it is not American capital that will be supplied to develop this

project; it will be Canadian capital except that the Americans will own the operation.

When are we as Canadians going to start smartening up? More than two-thirds of our economy is now foreign controlled. We find that some 94 per cent of the capital that is being invested by foreign companies operating in Canada is in fact Canadian capital. We find at the present time that Americans are taking about a billion and a half a year of profits that are made out of Canadian operations in the form of dividends. Mr. Speaker, if being a Canadian is to mean anything, Canada must belong to us. It is time that we put a halt to this give away of our resources to foreign-controlled industrial operations. This \$177 million project is going to add to the problem. Somewhere we as Canadians have to decide that we want to control the economy of this nation ourselves. I think that the financial deal is not a good deal. The \$107 million guarantee is only part of the money. We know that there is another loan, a contingency loan which is guaranteed by both Parsons and Whittemore and the Government of Saskatchewan of \$6 million. There is the other load by SEDCO of \$13 million for a total of \$126 million in the form of loans that this Government will be responsible for.

In the case of grants, what do we find? The Federal Government is to provide \$12 million, the Government of Saskatchewan is to provide cash in the form of equity of \$7.2 million; \$3 million for road grants or \$22.2 million of Government money that is going to be invested. Parsons and Whittemore will only invest \$16.8 million, not in immediate cash, but in profits that they will earn during the period of construction, and then \$12 million for equipment is to be financed on a time basis. Mr. Speaker, these are not all the funds that are to be expended. In Committee when we questioned the Provincial Treasurer he told us that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will be responsible for another \$2.6 million for the gas line to be built. There is the road to be constructed, the telephone line to be put in, another \$5 million or \$6 million, Mr. Speaker. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the financial deal that has been made is a bad deal. We have no assurance that the mill will not pollute our waters, rivers and lakes in the northern area. We are not given the assurance that there will be proper management of the forest resources. For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we must oppose this Bill. We will oppose this Bill not only here but we will oppose the project all the way through. May I add this, that we as a New Democratic Party say to the Government and to the people of Saskatchewan that we will reserve our freedom of action in the future in the event that the mill is proceeded with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. HEGGIE (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, during second reading and during the clause by clause consideration of this Bill various Government speakers dealt with the purpose and the financing of this great industrial complex soon to become a reality in this Province.

I want to deal with the deal with the development of secondary industries which will result from the building of the mill and the growth of the town site at Doré Lake. Let me first say that in addition to the 1,200 persons who will be employed to build the mill and 1,600 others who will work in the mill when it is

April 3, 1971

built, and in the forests on a permanent basis after the mill is in operation, there will be thousands of other workers employed in secondary and service industries to keep the mill in operation. The Premier has forecast that 4,000 other people will be employed in support industries. I dare say this is a reasonably accurate forecast and one that will grow and increase as the mill opens up the resources of the North.

How can one forecast that this will be so? We only have to look at other industrial towns that have sprung up as a result of mine shafts and oil fields in this province and in others. These industrial towns owe their existence to industry. If there was no industry, there could be no town, it is as simple as that. Fort MacMurray grew up as a modern industrial town because of the great Athabasca Tar Sands deposits. Here is a flourishing town with all the modern conveniences to be found anywhere involving a population of more than 5,000 people. Who can deny that the town of Fort MacMurray is not a living example of what happens when investors, industrialists and entrepreneurs open up the sleeping wilderness and develop the natural resources of the area where they serve a useful purpose. I was in Fort MacMurray in 1968 and I saw these things for myself and would challenge any Member of the Opposition to deny it.

Let us look at Lynn Lake, Manitoba, another industrial town which grew up as a result of Sherrit-Gordon Nickel Mine. This town has a population of 3,000 people of which 1,210 are employed in the mine. The rest is made up of approximately 1,800 people making up the families. Here is a breakdown of employment. I'll give it to you under two headings, the name of the industry or department and the number employed. In local government 58 people employed; in the Provincial Government 20 employed; in the Federal Government 17 employed. Now in the community service industries - retail trade a total of 101; hotels and restaurants 42; automotive services 28; personal services (that would include people like barbers and hairdressers) 24; recreation 13; religious 3. Now we get to industry - construction (this is after the mine shaft was built) 13; transportation (which always forms an important part in any new industry or town) 50; fishing 6; then of course in mining itself 835; for a total of 1,210 employed people. There were 1,695 dependents of employees in Lynn Lake which include 819 school children. When you add the 1,210 employed persons to 1,695 dependents, you get a total population of 2,905 which approximates the 3,000 figure I referred to.

One could go on to break down all the various trades and professions and businesses but suffice to say that trades, professions and businesses in Lynn Lake are represented by branches of national companies such as Eatons and Simpson-Sears as well as local retail outfits of every type and description. What has happened at Fort MacMurray, at Lynn Lake, at Thompson, Manitoba at Flin Flon and Uranium City, will happen at Doré Lake. A whole new life will be carved out of the wilderness for some 4,000 citizens bringing opportunity for the first time to many of them. The Government has plans for the town site which will proceed hand in hand with the building of the pulp mill. As a practising lawyer (corporate or otherwise) I already have entertained inquiries about the building of hotel and motel facilities, recreation units and other forms of enterprise. There are private people already prepared to spend into the hundreds of thousands of dollars to get in on the ground floor. The Minister tells me that his office is already crowded with inquiries by people in the private sector prepared to risk and commit sizable

amounts of local investment money into retail, wholesale and recreational projects.

The people have faith in this province and are prepared to come in and build as soon as they know that the Government and Parsons and Whittemore can go ahead. Does the Opposition realize that Parsons and Whittemore are in the pulp mill business in a big way around the world? They operate 51 pulp mills on a world-wide basis. Does the Opposition think that one mill at Meadow Lake is a risky venture? A company with this kind of experience and resources is not going to fail and its engineering studies are more than adequate to show that the Athabasca mill is a viable industrial project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEGGIE: — Now I want to say a word about pollution as it relates to the mill because it ties in with the whole overall picture. The NDP say they oppose the mill on four main grounds: first, the mill is a risky financial proposition; second, we are selling out the forest resources to the Americans; third, the mill will fail to supply the jobs that the Government predicts; and fourth, pollution of this primeval lake and forest area is inevitable.

Since points one and two have been dealt with adequately by other speakers and I have dealt with point three covering job opportunities, there is only point four on pollution on which I want to say a few words.

Now, the Socialists can't have it both ways. If we want jobs for our people, including our native Indian people, then we have to make use of the resources as we find them. To leave the forest standing in perpetuity is not good resource management. The natural cycle of trees is to grow from seedlings or saplings into mature trees, stand for a number of years and die out through insects, disease and fire. The virgin forest is continuously renewing itself. Forest management means that economic use can be made of the trees in their period of maturity and then replaced by reforestation. Europe has been doing this for centuries. I think the Black Forest area in Germany, which I saw last May during a trip to the Rhine country, is a living example. When you think that this forest area has been worked over by countless generations of Germans since Roman times and yet today it is as thick and beautiful a forest as you could see anywhere in the world. This is living proof that proper forest management and reforestation can preserve a forest in perpetuity. The same thing can be done in our North by employing sensible conservation policies. I have no doubt that we are gaining in sound conservation policies as the years go by and our conservation program will be geared to the particular soil and climate of the North in a successful enterprise. Certainly Doré Lake and other lakes will be polluted if we allow the mill indiscriminately to dump untreated effluent into the lake and river system. Parsons and Whittemore are bound to spend \$10 million on pollution control and there is no reason in the world, with vigilant environment control by the mill itself, by the provincial Government in its new proposed environmental program, and by the Federal Government, that we can prevent pollution of this beautiful virgin forest area. Either we take steps to control pollution or we shall all suffer as a result. The resources are there to be used and it is our duty to use them and husband them and renew them as God intended the forest to be used.

April 3, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East—Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out first of all, Sir, to the Premier and his supporters that should they pass this third reading of this Bill with their majority, then in my opinion, the people of Saskatchewan will condemn them for a political crime. I want to say to them that this is a more serious venture than any other that I recall in all the time I have been in this Legislature. I certainly think it is a venture which we are not sure of and even the Government is not sure of because they have said themselves it contains some very serious risks. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that before such a Bill should pass its final reading in this House, there should have been some public opinion expressed on this particular development, if only because, Mr. Speaker, we live in a democracy. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are here by the will of the people and we are here to look after the monies that they provide. I think it is our duty to do what the people desire us to do. The Government to this time has not proven to this House that the people of Saskatchewan are willing to see this Bill passed.

Now I am referring to resources. If the Government must make use of primary resources which belong to the people then I think, as I have said, that the people first of all must be consulted before any Act such as contemplated by the Government comes into operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely there are many questions being asked today across the province. I understand an election is in the offing. Members of the Legislature have been out on the hustings, have been out in their constituencies. I have been out in mine and I have been out in some others and many questions have been asked. They are asking this mainly: are our resources being wasted? And I could say, Mr. Speaker, with all sincerity that if the Government proceeds with this Bill and asks to turn over the resources to the company intended by this Bill, then they will be wasted; not only wasted forest but the soil and the water. Mr. Speaker, I say then that if private industry should be established just for industry's sake, that this is wrong. This will not resolve the problems of economics or the problems of the unemployed, or the problems of the people of Saskatchewan. This again is just another national waste. Mr. Speaker, we know that in Saskatchewan there is an over-abundance of land and other primary resources. Because of modern techniques we find ourselves with a small population in a state of over-production - too much wheat, too much potash, too much copper and zinc, too much sodium sulphate and apparently there is too much forest. So the Government is prepared to give away the forest that belongs to the people, the forest that has been inherited and preserved by the people. They are now prepared to give our forest away to private industry.

Now, if the answer should be and we should agree that there should be some specific industry, then I should say to the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who just sat down, that that industry probably should be secondary industry. Had the Government been wise and had we wanted to spend public money, then I think they should have gone ahead with something like a paper mill in the city of Prince Albert where you could be using this surplus pulp that is now being stored in Saskatoon and other places, in the production of materials such as newsprint and

other paper products. But they have not seen fit to do so. They are prepared to pass this Bill in order to produce more primary products which are not saleable today, which have been stockpiled, for which there is no market and which the Minister himself, in a recent interview in a committee, admitted was being sold much lower than it probably should be sold. In spite of this the Government is forcing the passing of this Bill. And I say obviously what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, if we do anything at all, is turn to other industries. But that is not the subject of this debate on its third reading and I am not going to touch on that.

Yet no one, Mr. Speaker, questions the need for industrial economic growth and I would agree that such a policy is essential to our survival and I think you'll all agree in this House that it has to be so but it has to be done wisely. And I think the passing of this Bill would not be a wise venture. I have no objection to Government investing public money in industries where it is wise to do so. I also say that when the Government does so it should never lose control of the policies concerning our resources. But when you give away a resource such as the Government is willing to give away under this Bill, it is completely losing control of the forest resource.

I say, Mr. Speaker, and may I say it once again, all of us in this House know that it takes capital to establish industry and we know that to keep jobs, we need manufacturing industries but we know many of these are costly and the question is whether a government should involve itself in the kind of industry that is proposed in this Bill. We know that it takes today an investment of about \$30,000 on an average to provide a job for one person. We realize that there will be some jobs provided if this Bill goes through and the forest industry established. But we also know, every Member of this House knows, that there will be people who will be losing their jobs and we have already discussed this thing in a previous debate. We find that the number of people who may be employed there are going to be substantial. There won't be that much difference. You dispossess some of jobs and then you give these same people other jobs.

I had some experience the other day when I was at a meeting down in the northern part of Saskatchewan where I found people who used to have jobs in the forest industry and today have no jobs. This is something the Government hasn't taken cognizance of. I can say that \$130 million is a huge capital investment, Mr. Speaker, whether it is in guarantees or in cash and it is only natural for the people who have put up the money - in the case of this Bill, the people of Saskatchewan - for them to hesitate and to question and to have second thoughts. And that is what they have been doing. That is what our job is here, on this side of the House, to point out what the people are saying in the Province of Saskatchewan. I can't help but say that if the Government has money to invest why should it be invested for industrial empires that belong to individuals or to private corporations? This isn't done elsewhere. It isn't done in Alberta where a pulp mill is going up. It isn't done in British Columbia where pulp mills are going up. Why should it happen in Saskatchewan? Why does the Saskatchewan Government have to assist an individual or a company if you want to call it that, with \$130 odd millions so that corporation can establish itself? By what prerogative have we been sent to this Legislature to take public tax money and to mortgage the people of Saskatchewan to do just that?

April 3, 1971

I say we have no right and we have no right to pass this Bill. I can only quote, Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Landegger, who will be the beneficiary of this Bill - if it gets third reading - has said to the press. He has said that this mill, the largest mill in Canada, is being built by him in order that he can pass it on to his sons. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he's building an empire for his sons with our money and with the approval of the Liberal Government that sits opposite here. That is, Sir, what he is doing. And he said so in an interview with the Financial Post. If the Hon. Members can read, and I believe they can read, they should have read what he said on February 27th that this industry, this mill, is built for himself. These are the words of Mr. Landegger. He is the sole owner of the mill, the mill over which this Government will have absolutely no control, even if they do say that they have 30 per cent interest in the industry.

Of course it brings up this point, Mr. Speaker, and I can say this at this time, that such private enterprise corporations plan for power and for profit. For whom? For us? No! For themselves! Let anybody try to deny that. So I ask, Sir, is there any reason why the Government opposite and especially in the field of resource development where we have conserved and protected and spent our public money, should be giving away these resources to one private corporation? You know, Mr. Speaker, it is just as stupid as if I, a farmer, went and cleared my land, picked the stones on my land - I've done that - put in a crop, sprayed the crops, spent all my money on that crop and then told somebody from New York to come down and take that crop for himself and give me 30 per cent. If I did a thing like that, or any farmer in Saskatchewan did something like that, he would be considered nuts.

So this kind of course by this Government is not only a dereliction of responsibility, not only is it bad politics, but I should say it is a betrayal of the people of Saskatchewan, betraying them with their own money. That is what it is.

How can you vote and pass this Bill? There are countries, for example, like Sweden - it has been quoted in this House a number of times - where they have had the same problems with resource development. We know that we also are an exporting nation; we know that we must take our primary resources and send them out and so they did in Sweden. But Sweden didn't do what this Government is doing. Sweden has a mine at Kiruna and they hired experts for the mine to put in equipment and machinery but, Mr. Speaker, who owns the mine in Sweden? Who owns the primary resource there at Kiruna? The Swedish Government owns 90 per cent of it and private interests have 10 per cent. That is what it is in Sweden.

But this Government wants us to approve a Bill, give it third reading, and only retain 30 per cent for the people of Saskatchewan and give away the controls, lose all controls over forestry, over fire protection, over everything. This is what this Government is prepared to do. To me it indicates only one thing, Mr. Speaker. When the Government insists on pushing this Bill through with their majority, it only proves one thing, that this Government doesn't know what it is doing and it doesn't know what it is doing because it has not done any planning, Mr. Speaker. There has been no Legislative Committee invited to consider the agreement or the agreements and the costs it involves. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when taxes are concerned,

when resource and conservation is involved, then the only sane course the Government should have followed was to arrange, plan and have sittings and representation from people to find out what is in the best interest of our people. But this has not been done. The people who are putting up the money have not been consulted. There has been no committee set up to have a complete discussion of the pros and cons. I'm very much concerned about the electors of this province, the taxpayers of this province. They will have much to say if the Premier dares to call an election. They will tell him what they think of this deal and other deals of that kind. I say to them, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) . . .

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, I'm saying it to you. You won't be back. You won't be back, you'll be down in Estevan with your heavy water, that's where you'll be.

Because, Sir, if the Government fails to consult with the people, whether it is by plebiscite or by election, this can only bring about considerable dissatisfaction and unhappiness with your Government that is in power in this province. Certainly the people will lose faith in all government and this is one of the dangers we must all be concerned with. So I say again that the Government must see that theirs is an intelligent action and not a political one which apparently it is and that it should not be an action which does not receive the approval of the electorate. Because if it proceeds as it intends to proceed, then I can only tell the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that the project will fail. It may cost the Government of Saskatchewan a considerable amount of money as it has cost the Government of Manitoba a considerable amount of money. And the unfortunate part is that it isn't the politicians who have to dig into their pockets to pay these costs. It has to be the people of the provinces concerned. And we know what happened in Manitoba at The Pas, and this is the same road into which this Liberal Government is directing the people of this province - into a situation where they are going to sign agreements and the people of Saskatchewan will be loaded down with millions and millions of dollars of debt. That's what will happen. And the people of Saskatchewan have not decided either through an election or a plebiscite that the Government has the prerogative to proceed with this Bill.

The people whom I represent, Mr. Speaker, will want some answers to some questions. They would like to know what are the objectives of this Government? What is the reason for the project? So far we have had no satisfactory reasons for it. As I said, if they wanted more employment they could have had secondary industries as was pointed out by the Hon. Member from Hanley. Why didn't they get into the secondary industries? Why didn't the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), who promised the people of Prince Albert that there is going to be a paper mill undertake that? After we build the pulp mill, he said, why we shall have the product and we'll have a paper mill in Prince Albert and we'll have ancillary industries. What other industry have you got today in the city of Prince Albert, which you and I represent? Nothing! All you are doing is exploiting the forest, taking it all, clear-cutting, but there is no secondary industry. With such maybe we should have agreed. The people are asking other questions, Mr. Speaker. They are asking, "What is it

April 3, 1971

going to cost us, the taxpayers?" Well, we know it is going to cost them \$130 million.

In connection with the Prince Albert pulp mill the Minister said it would only cost \$65 million. It was supposed to be built for \$45 million but they found out that they couldn't build it for \$45 million, they had to pay \$65 million and now we find it has cost them \$75 million or \$80 million. When you add the \$21 million of roads, when you add all the other losses in Saskatchewan pulp and everything else, I say that it is \$100 million. And the same thing will happen with this pulp mill down there in the northwestern part of the province where the timber isn't as good as at Prince Albert where the capacity is only 400 tons of softwood per day. Yet they plan to produce 1,200 tons. I don't know how long it is going to last but not only that, by the time they get through with that industry, it isn't going to be \$177 million. I prophesy right here and now that it will cost them \$300 million. Just like the Prince Albert mill, it will double itself. These are the questions my people are asking.

And they ask: who is getting the major benefits? I've already said that the one who gets the benefits is Mr. Landegger and no one else. And they ask: what is going to happen to our Saskatchewan environment? Who will control the policies for environmental controls and economic development? Well, it is going to be Mr. Landegger. Much he cares whether the trees grow there, much he cares whether we get a cent of profit. As a matter of fact, sometime ago the Minister, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said that we won't get any share of the profits that will be made in the Prince Albert mill until - what is it, 1975? Well, you know a Crown corporation - if you'd have had the courage to build that kind of industry - would have given you the profits every year it made them and the profits would have gone into the Treasury. But there are no profits forthcoming from the Prince Albert pulp mill and there won't be any profits coming from the other mill because Mr. Landegger, in an interview, said he doesn't believe in passing on dividends to the shareholders, which in this case would be Mr. Landegger and the Government. He doesn't believe in that. He keeps the money in the industry. So, what benefit is it to the people of Saskatchewan when they can't even get the dividends that they are entitled to. Yet they want to proceed with this kind of a Bill.

The people of Saskatchewan have also been asking me: what is it we may lose? I'll tell you, Sir, we are going to lose a great deal; we are going to lose that beautiful environment where we could have developed other industries and we could have developed tourism, which would probably have brought to the Province of Saskatchewan much more money, much more employment than will be possible under this industry. Yet they want us to vote for that Bill.

My people ask me: is this project going to be for the greatest good of the greatest number of people, or is it just a political dream of one or more persons? Just like that bridge in Montreal, a beautiful structure, and yet it collapsed. That is what is going to happen to this industry, I prognosticate, I may not be here next time but I can see just where you are headed with this kind of a Bill, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I not only say but I demand of this Government on behalf of all those people whom I represent that

before this Bill is passed that the people of Saskatchewan should be given a complete and full accounting of facts, costs and inventory of the potential pulp mill in the Doré Lake area in the western part of Saskatchewan. I demand that they be given the economic implications, honest figures, and the Government must make it clear as far as I am concerned and as far as my people are concerned, how the conservation of water, our wildlife and our land resources will be safeguarded before this industry is approved by this Government, as well as a full exposure of the pitfalls and dangers, money-wise and otherwise, that the establishment of another pulp mill at Doré Lake of the size proposed by this Bill.

Again I demand, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my people of Prince Albert East—Cumberland that after all the essentials are publicized through the press, through the radio, through the TV, that the Government then call a plebiscite. If they don't dare to call an election, let them call a plebiscite before they proceed with this Bill, asking the people to support or to turn down the proposal of this Bill and then the Government could act according to the decision of our people. That would be democratic.

If you don't do that, then I ask: what are you scared of? Are you afraid that the people will say no? Or are you afraid they will say yes? Well, you shouldn't be afraid if they say yes, because you are saying yes, now. Yet you are not here because you decided to sit here. You are here because the people have elected you. You are servants of the people and you are responsible to the people and the least you can do as a Government is to go to the people and ask them what they think. Mr. Speaker, we, the people of Saskatchewan, still believe in democracy in spite of the autocratic attitude of the Government opposite, in spite of the Premier who comes into this House and says, "I am the Government." The people of Saskatchewan still believe in democracy and if the Government doesn't act democratically it will be put out, one and all, and the people will elect a democratic government - the NDP on this side - which will listen to the people and be servants of the people as it should be.

I can't help but ask what is happening this morning. I think and ask myself, 'what are the objectives of this Government?' We have sat in this Opposition, we have put up arguments which we think are fair.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Political arguments!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — They are not political. Yours is the political situation. You are the ones who are forcing this debate through this morning because you want to proceed with the agreements. Maybe you are forced to go ahead, maybe the lawyers that Mr. Landegger has got have threatened this Government. Maybe they have. But even if they have you have no right, I say, to go ahead because the cost to the taxpayers in this Bill is going to be too high, as I pointed out previously. Certainly you are not forcing the issue because you feel that you are on safe ground. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), the Premier and other speakers who say they know something about cost and figures - and I am not an accountant - have said there are risks. Oh, yes, grave risks. What is your hurry then? What is your hurry if there are grave risks? Why don't you wait

April 3, 1971

until there is an election and people put you back in if they ever do? Why don't you have the plebiscite I have suggested? Because the way it is, Mr. Speaker, the only one that can win is Mr. Landegger and no one else.

If it is just for the forthcoming election, is it that the Government must show the people something? Well, I told the Government a year ago if you want an issue, you made the pulp mill an issue and we will fight the election on that issue. You backed down a day or so ago and you are trying to find other issues. Well, let's go back to the pulp issue. I charge you with that. Let's go to the people of Saskatchewan and let's tell the people what the situation is and if you return I will then have to confess that I was wrong. At the moment I think that I am right and the people will not give you the support.

I suggest that you use this Bill as an issue in view of the fact that you are pushing this Bill through this Legislature today.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion as a retiring Member - and maybe I won't retire if I get my spirit worked up - is that a venture such as this at Doré Lake should be above politics. I am prepared to see that it should be above politics. It is you people who are making it partisan and political. And it should come about with public agreement because the public weal is involved. You are thinking about partisan provincial goals, hoping such a proposal as the mill would become an election issue. Don't let anyone say that someone has prepared my speech for me. I never had one speech, in 20 years, prepared by anyone else except by myself. I have notes here on a speech I intended to deliver and I didn't get up on second reading. Now, out of these notes I am trying to make a speech so that I can get the truth across to you. The junior Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Charlebois) proves that he is only a junior Member by making charges of that nature and insulting a Member of this House.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is that a fitting way to speak to me?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — That's no point of order, Mr. Speaker, and he knows that he is the junior Member and if he isn't a junior Member, then let him not behave like one.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University has been consistently heckling the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland. The point of the matter is that he is trying to provoke the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland. I think that it is unfair for him to get up and try to make a point of order out of it.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Mr. Speaker, I should appreciate a ruling on this because that is an unfair charge, too.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! It is not for the Chair to decide who has been provocative and who has not. I should suggest that we

continue the rest of the debate in silence.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, you know that I am a very well behaved Member. I do not insult other Members and I do not like to be insulted when I am trying to make a presentation. I should like the Hon. Members on the Government side to remember that. If I flare up it is the little bit of Irish in me.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have to qualify that, with the exception the Member has the floor. I am sorry.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on but I am going to give the Provincial Treasurer the chance to reply. I should like to say one or two more things. I should like to say a few words on the social and economic values of this project which we are supposed to approve.

We have heard arguments so far from the Government on the economic value of the mill. I think they are wrong. They have told us how it would bring employment to our Saskatchewan people and I think they are wrong. They talk about all the money that some people will make and with that I agree, because it will only be one person who will make money. But, Mr. Speaker, the financial benefits, if any, are certainly doubtful and certainly the social values of that mill are going to be doubtful. I can only point out what Mr. Landegger has been saying to the press that he is going to build a city, yes, his city of 5,000 people. The Provincial Treasurer gets up and says we're going to have a city not quite 5,000 but there will be 4,000 people - this is no social value. The social values we should be concerned with right now are the needs of people in the cities of Saskatoon, Regina, Prince Albert, and places like Nipawin, Carrot River, which are dying - even Saskatoon has slipped, I understand, in its population. That's one of the loveliest cities which we have. These are important. Let's forget about a 5,000 population town somewhere in the wilderness, where there are no railway, no roads and nothing, but they're going to build one there. They'll have to tax the rest of us. The real social values will come when there is true understanding of the kind of industries we obtain, secondary industries in the cities you have right now and not in the wilderness, Sir.

Centralizing employment in a pulp mill, as I say, will not bring social values for the Province of Saskatchewan, nor is it good for the many small operators who are presently operating and who have been operating and who may lose their jobs. Maybe they will get jobs in the mill and maybe they won't. I know in Prince Albert too many that didn't. I know also too many that have left this Province of Saskatchewan and when you add up all the people, and some of them were timber operators who have left this Province, it amounts to 103,000 in the last two or three years and this is a disgraceful situation in our Province. And I'd hiccup too if I was the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) because his policies are partly responsible for what has happened to this great Province of Saskatchewan.

I'd like to point out some of the social values considered by an expert in that field, by the Dean of the University of California, who writes on page 3045 in the last issue in Vital Speeches:

April 3, 1971

There are certain values of resources which are normally captured and made available through the operation of market economies and there are other values which are characteristically made available outside the marketing system . . . In the first group all economic values and the second group all social values.

I, for one, put social values for our province as a primary consideration. I agree that we must have employment and I agree that we must have industry, but I agree that we must also have happy communities and organized communities where people can live and enjoy the benefits of civilization. I think there are many people in the world who agree with that philosophy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Question?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — That's all right. I am just giving you a moment or two to think, which you don't very often do. I don't want to be nasty but the Hon. Members opposite can get nasty and what I am going to say now is not because I am nasty.

I want to say that in my opinion another reason for pushing this deal through this morning, as the Government is doing, is simply because we have two men in this Legislature - one was a hardware merchant and the other one used to be a furniture dealer or a grocery clerk - and they think that they know so much about business that they can put circles around Mr. Landegger. But every time you hear what Mr. Landegger says you see - if you have any eyes to see and any mind to understand - that Mr. Landegger has put circles around them. This is the tragedy of Saskatchewan today, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. You come into this House, you come into Committee, and you keep on telling us what a wonderful deal you made. And any business person who takes a look at it - and I shall quote no one else except the Financial Post which has said, "This is a good deal for Mr. Landegger." Landegger is the one, I say, who has put circles around you. But the unfortunate part is that when this has been done to you, this has been done to the people of Saskatchewan.

I have another expert whom I can quote, who very recently said - and he is known very well on the other side of the House. He suggested that the Provincial Treasurer didn't even know how to read a financial statement. I respect the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) quite a bit. He is a good neighbor and he is a good man and he has a good quip. But I think that maybe I shall have to agree with Mr. Gardiner when I consider the pulp mill business.

They have set themselves up, Mr. Speaker, as financial experts. They will try to persuade this House and the people of Saskatchewan that this is the greatest deal that Saskatchewan has ever seen. They are prepared to sign with Mr. Landegger the agreements proposed - if this Bill is passed - a deal that no other company or corporation would look at. These are the words of the Premier, "We have gone to every Canadian company and to every American company and they wouldn't look at it."

But I remind you, Mr. Speaker, this is a reason why Mr. Landegger took up that deal, because Mr. Landegger said on February 27th in the Financial Post:

Because the Government has gone to all these people, this has given a bad name to this industry in

Saskatchewan. It has made financiers hesitate and the Government had to come across with some guarantees.

And this is what the Government has done. They couldn't get other corporations to come in because it wasn't a viable thing but they were able to get Mr. Landegger to come in to build a mill for himself and for his sons because they were prepared to mortgage the people of Saskatchewan with cash and guarantees. That is what has happened. That is the truth of the story.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are not gullible, they are not to be insulted, neither are the Members on this side of the House. Maybe the Members on the other side will go along for political reasons with the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer but I am telling you that we will not go along with this kind of a deal and neither will the people of Saskatchewan.

I can only say in conclusion, I'll just pose one thing, something mentioned by me at the beginning. Here we have resources that are worth millions of dollars, here are resources that we protected and cherished, here is the heritage that was handed down to us by the previous generation and it has cost us money to sustain. And here you have a Government which proposes a Bill today saying, 'We are going to make an agreement to give all of this resource to Mr. Landegger and we shall retain only 30 per cent. We shall have no control over it. We shall have no say about anything because we are minor shareholders.' And Mr. Landegger says, "Yes, this is going to be my mill. This is going to be my last mill." He doesn't say - our mill. He doesn't say a mill that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. He says, "My mill." This is the last mill that I am going to build. And he ends the interview with the Financial Post on February 27th by saying this:

And when I die I hope I go to heaven but I shall leave this industry to my sons.

Mr. Speaker, I have sons and you have sons and Saskatchewan people have sons, and this is our resource. I hope when I go to heaven, and I hope I do, that I shall leave my estate to my sons and I hope that this Legislature which represents all of the fathers of the Province of Saskatchewan see to it that this resource goes into the hands of their sons and not into the hands of Mr. Landegger's sons.

I shall vote against the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, at long last we are coming to the end of this debate. I should like to deal with the suggestion that was brought up on the other side of the House this morning that somehow or another we had not allowed the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) to have his say on this Bill. Well, I should like to point out that the Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate on second reading. He made two very lengthy speeches on second reading which was his right. He adjourned the debate. We allowed him to. Then he spoke several times in committee which was again his right. Then when we rose out of committee to have third reading, he asked this House for permission to adjourn the debate. We gave it to him. We informed

April 3, 1971

the Opposition yesterday that this Bill would come up on Friday. The Leader of the Opposition was out of the House. We said, "Fine, we shall leave the Bill until Saturday" - today - which we did. So I don't think it is fair to say that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't had a chance to speak. He's spoken at least four or five times and he has adjourned the debate on two separate occasions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I should like to say a few words about the tirade from the Hon. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). I can tell you one thing when he dies he says he hopes to go to heaven. Well, I tell you Bill, you are going to have to change your politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I got it right from the top, there's no NDP allowed there. That's the first thing you are going to have to do.

And another thing, I can't stand these long farewells. This is at least the fourth speech you've made, Bill. He's just got to leave now, there is no question about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — That's the least you can do. We have listened to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and he's promised to leave after his farewell speech. You've made four farewell speeches - I'm sorry you have to leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — He said one interesting thing. I don't know whether he noticed what he said but the truth sometimes comes out when speaking from notes. He said, "no one ever prepared my speeches," which I thought was rather sporting of him not to blame anyone else. He also said, "We've got to be concerned about the people in Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Moose Jaw." That's the people we've got to be concerned about. But he forgot to mention, and I think he did it on purpose and this is the problem with the Opposition - we are concerned about the people in these cities but we are even more concerned about the people who live in Buffalo Narrows and La Loche and Ile-a-la-Crosse. That's why we are going ahead with this mill, that's why we are taking the risk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Very interesting! Here is a Member who represents the North, a rather small constituency in the northeast part of the province, covers a few square miles I'll admit and he shows absolutely no concern for Northern people. He gets up here to speak today but he fails to mention that the people in his area have benefited to a tremendous extent from the pulp mill in Prince Albert. He doesn't speak out for the people who live in the northwest part of Saskatchewan, who today and for

generations including the 20 years these Socialists were in power, haven't had a chance to get a decent job, haven't had a chance to hold up their heads, have been forced by that government for 20 years and our Government for seven years, to live largely on welfare but now we are doing something about it.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up this deal let me say this: I've tabled in the House and I've told the House that we are dealing with Parsons and Whittemore. They will own 70 per cent and we shall own 30 per cent. Parsons and Whittemore have two subsidiary companies involved - I tabled proof in the House - those companies are owned 100 per cent by Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated. That company is owned by Karl F. Landegger. The reason I bring this up again today is because there have been some remarks made that maybe this is like the Manitoba deal, that we don't even know whom we are dealing with. Well that is nonsense and I'd like to lay that to rest and to make it clear that we know exactly whom we are dealing with. We are dealing with Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated of New York, sole owner, Karl F. Landegger. We also know that this gentleman and his company are one of the largest and soundest firms in the world engaged in the pulp and paper industry. We have had experience with them. They have already entered one deal with the people of Saskatchewan. They have kept their word. They built a good mill in Prince Albert. It is a successful mill. It pumps \$25 million a year into the economy of this province and has brought new life and new hope to many of our people in the city of Prince Albert and the central part of Northern Saskatchewan. I also tell the House very clearly that we have taken all the precautions and the safeguards that are necessary.

First, to ensure ourselves that this is a viable deal, that this mill can be built, that it will operate as per plan and that it can operate profitably. And this is important because the people of this province will own 30 per cent of the mill and they will enjoy 30 per cent of the direct financial benefits. We've also pointed out to this House that we have checked and double-checked to ensure that there is enough wood to supply a 1,400 ton a day mill with both hardwood and softwood and that's what that mill will operate on.

We have also proven to this House that in regard to pollution or environmental control we have taken far greater precautions. We've gone to far greater care, we've gone into far more detail, we have been far more cautious than with any other deal ever made in the history of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — . . . because we recognize that there is a greater concern today - and should be - about our environment, about pollution control. That's why we have taken the steps we have. That's why we brought in The Clean Environment Control Bill to this Legislature and that's why we hired the best consultants we could find. We instructed them to tell us what we have to do to ensure proper control of pollution in regard to this mill. They told us that it could be done. It will cost a great deal of money but they told us that it can be done and we told this House and the people of the province that it will be done. These safeguards are our first concern, then the concern of the Water Resources Commission in this province, headed by Judge Pope, who have the responsibility to control and safeguard the

April 3, 1971

environment of the Province of Saskatchewan. And as a final control we must satisfy, before we build the mill, the authorities in Ottawa who are taking a far greater interest in pollution control and in environmental protection than they ever did before and rightly so. The final control and the final safeguard is we should never get a license to operate the mill from the Federal Government Department of Fisheries if we do not live up to their very high standards.

So we know that we have the wood, we know that we shall continue to renew this resource, we will protect the environment, we have checked the viability of the deal, we're dealing with well-known people and we're dealing with people we've already dealt with, we find them reliable and successful. In spite of all these assurances, in spite of the fact that that northwestern part of the province is crying out for some industry to give those people the same kind of chance that the people have in Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Regina and the rest of this province, in spite of all these assurances, in spite of the demand that's there, the crying need for anyone to see - the Opposition have and will continue, by their own words, to oppose and do everything they can to sabotage this mill just as they did with the Prince Albert pulp mill.

I predict today, Mr. Speaker, that what this will mean in fact is that when we go into that new mill that if we don't watch out or if we don't take the necessary steps to safeguard against it, we'll again see strike after strike after strike. And I want to tell the people of this province that if this happens, they can point the finger at only one place and that is the NDP Opposition in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — And I want to tell the people of this province something further, and this is proven by their own words, if by some freak of chance, if by some unbelievable series of events, those people opposite are re-elected when we call the election this year, that the Prince Albert pulp mill will be taken over and I predict a very short life for it because it will go the way of the box factory and the woolen mill and all the other industries they got their sticky fingers into when they tried their half-baked Socialist experiment in the 20 years - unfortunate for this province - that they held office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I predict today, like the Member for Prince Albert East—Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) - we must be prognosticators - based on the words from their own mouths, that the Prince Albert pulp mill will have a very short and unfortunate life if the people of this province ever give that bunch over there the power to run this province after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up, this Act will give us permission to proceed with this great complex. Let me say that we were elected to make decisions and we make them. They talk about democracy, going back to the people. I find it amusing, I find it ironic, that the people on that side of the House - all of them - drawing \$9,000 a year as MLAs, for what? For about two months work and everyone of them - the same on this

side of the House - everyone of them with other jobs; farmers, lawyers, school teachers, everyone with a second income - \$9,000 and a second income. I should be willing to bet that the average income on that side of the House and on this side of the House is better than \$15,000 or \$16,000 a year. So here we sit in this House, averaging about \$15,000 or \$16,000 a year and what do those people on that side of the House say to the 1,300 people in La Loche, who probably average less than \$2,000 a year, or the Meadow Lake people, whose main industry unfortunately has to be social aid and has been social aid for 30 or 40 years, or the people in Ile-a-la-Crosse, who are forced to get by on \$2,000 or \$2,500 a year? What do these \$15,000 or \$16,000 a year smug people say to them? They say, "We're not prepared to take the risk to give you a chance to earn a decent living." They say, "We'll take the cheap easy way out of this thing. We'll attack this because there are some Americans involved and they are rather unpopular today. We'll attack this because there might be some pollution in the river system and that's rather unpopular today. We'll attack and sabotage this because we can possibly make it stick that you're giving away our resources or you're raping or pillaging the forests." They know in their hearts this is nonsense! We will protect the forests. We will have to protect the environment and we know that this deal will succeed. Then why are they doing it? Why are they denying those people a chance for a decent living? For one reason and one reason only - that they are afraid to go to the people on their own record. Right now with these threatened strikes crippling the economy, especially the farm economy of this province, they want a red herring to divert the attention of the people of Saskatchewan, especially the rural people, that they are tied up hand and foot, they are in bed with and they are controlled by, and they are bought and paid for lock, stock and barrel by the big unions. Your deathbed repentance and that timid weak little wire that you sent to Ottawa won't help. We know you sat nearly all night the other night and fought it out hammer and tongs and said, "Boys, we have to send a wire asking for compulsory arbitration. If we don't the people in rural Saskatchewan will defeat us from one end of this province to the other." Now you think you have your red herring.

Mr. Speaker, let no one be diverted. What we're doing in this Bill is building a complex that will bring new life and new hope to over 5,000 people in Northwestern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — We've got the courage of our convictions and I tell the people of this House and the people of this Province that we will go ahead with this deal. If they want to make it an election issue, we welcome it, right along side of labor courts and it will ensure the defeat of about 50 per cent of those Members. I'm glad this Bill will pass. I'm ashamed of those Members over there who will not vote for it and I hope all Members in this House vote for it and give us a chance to get on with the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time on the following recorded division:

April 3, 1971

YEAS - 28
Messieurs

Thatcher
Boldt
McIsaac
Loken
Coderre
MacLennan
Heggie
Mitchell
Charlebois
Schmeiser

Howes
Steuart
Guy
MacDougall
Larochelle
Gallagher
Radloff
Gardner
Forsyth

McFarlane
Heald
Barrie
Grant
Estey
Hooker
Weatherald
McPherson
McIvor

NAYS - 15
Messieurs

Bowerman
Davies
Smishek
Brockelbank
Wooff

Wood
Meakes
Whelan
Baker
Kowalchuk

Lloyd
Berezowsky
Snyder
Pepper
Byers

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.