

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Seventeenth Legislature
3rd Day

Friday, July 30, 1971.

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

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Press Conference Held by Minister of Agriculture

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House view with alarm and dismay the fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in a Government office held a press conference, a full-blown press conference, this morning to announce this particular Bill respecting family farm property. It has always been customary in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, for many, many years, that when the Legislature sat that these Bills were presented to the House. This was a flagrant violation of the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, in the worst regard by a brand new Government. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Canadian Press report, and 'phoned Canadian Press, the implications of this Bill were carried across this country at dinner time, and except by pure accident, those of the Opposition learned of it this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, we granted leave to introduce this Bill despite the fact that it requires 48 hours notice. We granted leave for this Bill to be introduced simply on the basis that it would give the people of Saskatchewan the weekend to study this Bill, which we understand by press reports, is terrifically complicated. It is only, Mr. Speaker, that we have consented to this Bill being introduced that anyone in Saskatchewan will be permitted to see it if it is produced and presented on our desk this afternoon because we exempted ourselves from the 48 hours and granted that leave. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is not a precedent set by the Government opposite to flagrantly violate what is the democratic rights of the Opposition in this particular province. We hope that the Minister will stand up and say that he regrets that he has carried out this action
...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We hope that the Minister will stand up and tell the House that he has been wrong in this action and this it will not be carried out in the future. Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty dismal start for a Government that has 45 Members to those 14 who are on this side.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in answering the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), I am not knowledgeable of there being any formally written rule in regard to press conferences as he has made mention of. I am certain that there have been instances of such practices before. I apologize to them if they think that we have in any way infringed upon the democratic right of this Legislative Assembly. However, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) knew that the Bill was coming in, he

was 'phoned yesterday and informed that we were going to try and have the Bill ready for Thursday. He knew then because it was not brought forward on Thursday, it would be today. The press conference was held and the Bill will be laid on the table before the end of the Session this afternoon so that you will have the opportunity over the weekend to scrutinize that Bill. The reason for some urgency in having the press conference to give some insight as to what the Bill was about for the people of Saskatchewan as well as the people of this Legislative Assembly. We feel there is need of and some urgency in getting it to those people as well as to the people of this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Wildlife Crop Insurance Damage

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to announce that our Department has requested the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office which co-operates in wildlife crop insurance damage to re-instate the \$25 premium to those farmers who have purchased or will be purchasing wildlife crop insurance. I was rather surprised and shocked to learn when entering the Department that the former Government had reduced this to \$20 per acre. As of now, however, it will be restored to \$25.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the Minister to keep just to the statement and not to raise a debate. We can't permit debates on statements.

QUESTIONS

Bill to Facilitate Seating of Elected Members

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Premier. I believe it has been announced that Mr. Allan Guy was officially declared elected by the judge in the re-count in regard to Athabasca; and Mr. Gross similarly has been declared the winner after re-count in Gravelbourg. In view of the situation on this side of the House I would ask if the Premier would be prepared, and I recognize it can't be done today, on say Monday to bring in a Bill to accommodate both of these Members to allow them to sit in the House for the remainder of this Session. Now, very briefly, I recognize what the Premier said when they brought in the Bill to allow me to sit, and again just let me reiterate that we don't agree with their interpretation of the Act but if we were to argue it the Session would be over. He said he doesn't like the precedent of the Legislative Assembly seating Members when that responsibility and privilege belongs to the people, and with this I concur. However, it is highly unlikely that we shall get the same set of circumstances that we now face this year in 1971. We may have an Opposition as small as we are or even smaller, but it is highly unlikely that we should get the same situation. We have such a small Opposition, such a stunning set back with the death of our Leader

and, frankly, we need all the help we can get on this side. So I would ask the Government to give consideration to passing the Bill to seat these two Members so they can represent their constituencies in this House for the remaining part of the Session.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware other than by word of mouth of the situation in Athabasca. I understood that the Gravelbourg re-count was finished yesterday but I don't know what the Athabasca situation is. I reiterate my earlier remarks about our misgivings about seating people while the process of re-count is still going. In the instance of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) it had, for all practical purposes, ceased because his opponent had publicly indicated that he wasn't going to appeal. However, I will consider what the Leader of the Opposition has said and we shall make our decision and announce it in due course.

Highway Program

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) isn't here so I should like to direct my question to the Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney). In lieu of the statement made by the Minister of Highways that the Liberal Government's highway budget of 1971-72 would be carried out with the exception of a few changes, would the Government tell us what the changes are in that program?

Mr. Blakeney: — I will take that question as notice and I will relay it to the Minister. Doubtless he will answer as soon as he has an opportunity to consider it.

Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). On Wednesday of this week the Minister announced that the Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital at Weyburn would soon be accepting and receiving patients from the southeastern part of Saskatchewan. I should appreciate if he would please tell the House how many new patients — that is, those not presently being cared for in the Saskatchewan Hospital complex — will be accommodated during the year 1971-72 and if this care will be cost-shared with Ottawa?

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, let me answer the last point first. It is my understanding that the program will be cost-shareable with the Government of Canada. In the case of any additional patients that might be admitted over and above those that are in the present mental hospital, as far as I know, initially it will be those patients that are in the mental hospital but I understand it is going to be extended. I shall give the Member for Regina Whitmore Park a more detailed answer after I have consulted some of my officials.

Are Property Owners to Pay Full School Mill Rate

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr.

July 30, 1971

MacMurchy) or perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood). In view of the fact that property owners are nearing the time when municipal taxes may be paid this question is of some urgency; would the Minister inform us whether property owners and particularly farmers will be required to pay the full school mill rate or only the rate of 25 mills as promised by your party in the election campaign?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — May I advise Hon. Members that our program was a four-year program, not a four-day program or a four-week program. I think Members have been amused by the comments of Members opposite to the effect that because something wasn't done in the first four weeks that there has been a 'reneging', if I may use the word of the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), on some particular promise. That particular plank is under consideration. It will certainly obviously not apply for the year 1971, when, of course, many people have paid their taxes. I have, as have many people who live in cities, and there is, I think, no suggestion that it will apply for year 1971. I am confident that it will apply before the four-year term is over.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Compensation to Flood Victims

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: — The practice has been to allow about three questions, we have had four, but on this occasion I shall allow an extra one because it's a new Member asking it.

Mr. Lane: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I am wondering if the Cabinet has arrived at any policy on paying compensation to the flood victims of the Qu'Appelle Valley river system, and if so, what is that policy?

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm advised that since no compensation was paid by previous governments that the people there have not been applying for any.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If, in fact, there have been applications which we haven't dealt with we are not aware of them. We are aware of money being paid with respect to the particular Lumsden flood, the big flood, but we weren't aware of any applications which have come since then. If they have, we are certainly not aware of it.

Mr. Lane: — Yes, there is an application I believe, Mr. Premier, from a Mr. Wong, for example, at Lumsden. I believe there are some from people up at Craven and if the Premier has not seen them I shall make sure that he sees the applications, which were made some months ago, I might advise.

Mr. Blakeney: — They will have been dealt with by the previous Government then.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to help the Premier out. We were considering this very closely, we were thinking of doubling them as a matter of fact.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-in-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. B. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in resuming this debate, I said last night at the end of my remarks that today I would review some of the promises made by the NDP; some of the unbelievable promises they made all over this province, the official ones the party made and then the ones all the candidates who got elected made to the folks back home and the ones of those who didn't get elected made to the folks back home. I have got a partial list here, we are still doing research because everyday we run into more. I promise the Government that we will continue this research and we will bring them to the attention of the Government which I am sure they would like us to do and to the public.

I also intend to discuss, and I hope and I am sure when the Premier rises in his place to enter this debate that he will inform the House and the public just how the Government intends to pay for these promises, or rather how they intend to have the poor old taxpayer pay for them, and maybe, approximately, when they intend to put them in. In four years, well I'm sure they have such a terrific plan with their New Deal for People that they put out eight or nine months before the election so they had a great deal of time to plan, and if you could give us some timetable, it would be helpful for us and the people, I am sure.

Just let's go over a few of them. Now the Land Bank, No. 1, that means they're going to buy some land that's going to cost them a lot of money. No. 2, forgivable loans for farmers. No. 3, re-open small hospitals. No. 4, they are going to eliminate the teacher-pupil ratio. Every time they eliminate or every time they raise it one, it is \$3 million or \$3.5 million of the taxpayers' money. No. 5, they are going to build more houses, vastly more houses. No. 6, they are going to provide funds to pave streets, to build sidewalks, to build parks, to build recreation centres. They have no idea how much this will cost — a great many towns will be interested I am sure. No. 7, they are going to grant money to small industries and small businesses. No. 8, they are going to build community colleges and parks and universities all over the province and offer higher education available in all parts of the province. No. 9, they are going to sharply increase the labor budget. No. 10, they are going to establish industrial research. No. 11, they are going to launch massive housing and urban renewal programs. No. 12, they are going to modernize small towns and build sport centres.

July 30, 1971

No. 13, they are going to abolish utilization fees. No. 14, they are going to give old-age pensioners, both rich and poor, so-called free medical and hospital coverage. No. 15, they are going to provide eye glasses, wheel chairs and hearing aids at very low cost. No. 16, they are going to establish a central aid program.

An Hon. Member: — Any more, Dave?

Mr. Steuart: — More! I haven't even got warmed up yet. No. 17, they are going to include Mercy Care Homes under hospitalization. No. 18, they are going to reduce medicare and hospital premiums. No. 19, they are going to include chiropractic services under medicare. No. 20, they are going to establish a school of social aid work at the university. No. 21, they are going to build more senior citizens' homes. No. 23, they are going to provide a drug program. No. 24, they are going to remove sales taxes on meals, including hot dogs and hamburgers, children's clothes, soaps, cleaners, books, grain storage facilities. No. 25, they are going to reduce or eliminate other fees and charges unspecified. No. 26 they are going to reduce automobile insurance. No. 27, they are going to introduce half-fare bus fares to everyone over 65. No. 28, they are going to spend more money fighting pollution. No. 28, they are going to start a new planning agency in the Government, and I'll bet they'll have three or four new planning agencies. No. 30, they are going to reduce property taxes for education to 25 mills. No. 31, they are going to hire more students. No. 32, they are going to make more bursaries available. No. 33, they are going to give more grants for auxiliary education associations. No. 34, they are going to build vastly more student housing. No. 35, they are going to establish a consumer affairs agency. No. 36, they are going to give more money towards the Indian and Metis organization.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Sounds like a good program!

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, it is beautiful! It is wonderful It is unbelievable! It is the greatest thing since the invention of mother love and warm water.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I tell you I haven't even got warmed up yet. I am delighted to live in this Province, that is until I get the bills. No. 37, they are going to hire an ombudsman, or two or three. And they will need one, believe me. I thought they elected 45 ombudsmen over there but maybe they didn't. I thought that was the job of the elected people to represent the people, but they don't believe that. They are going to hire some more.

No. 38, they are going to enlarge Government Information Services, and Oh, brother, can I believe that! We will give you the names and addresses of some of the fellows that we let out when we first became the Government. And they are going to provide a hotline. Get this: they are going to provide a hotline for the public. I am going to need one of these. I wonder if they can tell us where it is going to go — the hotline to the Premier's office, the Attorney General's office? No. 39, they are going to set up a new Department of Northern Affairs. They

have already done that and they have already established a commissar from the North. I understand that they might put the offices in Prince Albert. Please, do me a favor. Put them in Prince Albert East, if there is one left. No. 40, they are going to build a power dam at Nipawin. Where is the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer)? Last time we put a price tag on that it was \$98 million. It has probably gone up to \$150 million. We don't need the power right now, but we are going to build it anyway. No. 42, they are going to create — well, these are now getting kind of technical. I am just using these to explain because they have regional programs that no one should miss. For example, they are going to create new jobs in Moose Jaw. I don't know why Moose Jaw, but they are going to create new jobs in Moose Jaw. No. 43, they are going to build a \$1.5 million provincial building in Moose Jaw. No. 44, they are going to give Regina a share of the gasoline tax. I wonder if the Premier, the Treasurer, when he gets up to speak will say what year they are going to give Regina this. I am not sure it was Henry or who that promised this one — are they going to give it to all the other villages and towns and municipalities?

No 45, they are going to build a youth hostel. No. 46, they are going to build a technical vocational school in Regina. No. 47, Lumsden was not forgotten but it might be now. They are going to build a nursing home in Lumsden. No. 48, it says right in here, and the Premier didn't even know about it, it says, we are going to pay more flood compensation. He hasn't read the entire program yet. No. 49, this is the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) — he is going to take over the potash industry. That ought to knock off \$1,000 million, but maybe it will take a week or two to do that. No. 50, they are going to take over the pulp mill in Prince Albert. Now we have totalled it up and it comes to more than 100 promises.

I am not going to bore the House with any more, but that is just a slight sample of some of the promises that you people made. There are many more. As I say, there are over 100 and we will keep you posted. For example, and I just want to deal with one more — Art Thibault, poor old Art. Where is Art? Art promised purple gas for small businessmen. How small, Art? Five foot five? If I thought that I would qualify, I would try and get back in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Well, anyway, Art is going to give small businessmen purple gas. I don't know whether they are going to drink it, eat it, or what they are going to do with it, but they are going to get purple gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do they intend to pay for this fantastic program? I don't care whether the Premier says they are going to do it in one year or four years, I suggest that it will take him four years to pay for this program. Now how do they say that they are going to pay for it? Oh, they are going to reduce premiums, going to reduce taxes. They are going to soak the rich! They are going to raise the corporation tax. They are going to get more money for royalties. That is great! Good! Wonderful! Everyone likes to soak the rich, except for the rich, I don't think they like it very well.

But I want to give you one word of caution. Before you can soak those big industries, you have to get them in. You

can't soak them before you get them, then you can really sock it to them. There is another little detail they are forgetting. Before they sock it to those industries, they should get them in here, and they need to get them in here for jobs. You know, there is a tremendous number of jobless people. Not quite as many as you people thought there were, but they are growing every day in the last five weeks, I am sure. And they are watching and they are waiting, rather impatiently, and they are losing hope because in five weeks they haven't announced anything for them. Oh, you got plans and you got studies! You are going to think about it. You are going to increase the public works. Well, we went through that routine too, and we are going to watch yours with great interest. You can dig up some of those old plans and put dates on them.

Let me tell you of our experience. All of those people that you will hire in those public works, will be employed and I am glad to see it — but it won't solve the unemployment problem. The only thing that would really give these people jobs is if you can get someone to invest a buck to start a factory or an industry or start one yourself. I think even after five weeks — and I agree with the Premier — we don't expect that they will do their program in four weeks, four months. In fact, in reading the unbelievable program we don't even think they will do it in four years or 40 years — and they aren't going to have any more than four years. But the unemployed people are waiting. They want to know, Mr. Premier, what your plans are. And vague promises of study groups and tourist industry up in the North, I am afraid they aren't quite good enough.

Let's take one example. The Premier announced briefly, and I am sure that he is going to have a great deal to say about it later on in this House, that the deal — the Canada deal we had made with the Choiceland Iron Mine — was out. The Members on both sides of the House, people all over Saskatchewan, I am sure were shocked and dismayed when the Premier made this announcement. All Members will recall that this project began formally a little over two months ago with the signing of an agreement in Regina.

The partners involved were the Government of Saskatchewan, IPSCO, the local steel mill, Denison Mines, the Choiceland Iron Mines Limited. I said at the time of the signing of the agreement when I was involved in negotiations, that this is one of the most important industrial projects we had ever attempted to get into this Province. Indeed, when one thinks of the tremendous secondary industry potential that this development would create, it would probably have been the single most important industrial project ever to come to the Prairie Provinces.

At the time of the signing of the agreement we acknowledged the fact that there were some risks involved in this enterprise. But then there are risks involved in every new industry. It was our feeling at the time that the advantages far outweighed the disadvantages.

Let me, for just one moment, enumerate some of these advantages: employment — our Socialist friends opposite made a big issue during the recent election campaign about the Saskatchewan unemployment figure. I remind you that during the last six months of our Government, the unemployment rate in this Province was the lowest anywhere in Canada. But despite that fact we had at no time maintained that we were satisfied with our unemployment rate. We have always maintained that we should

like to see it lower until it was wiped out. We were, and still are, more concerned about the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan, and especially in the northern part of the province. That is why we decided to go ahead with both the pulp mill at Dore Lake and the iron mine at Choceland, despite the risks involved.

There are thousands and thousands of people unemployed in both of these areas. We are convinced that the unemployment opportunities must be developed in these areas and developed now, not 50 years from now.

The new mine at Choceland would have provided over 1,000 jobs in the construction period and another 1,000 full-time jobs when completed, in the mine and the pelleting plant. The secondary services that would have accompanied the new industry would have meant, maybe, as high as 3,000 or 4,000 additional jobs in that area. The new mine would have created additional employment in other parts of the province as well.

Jack Turvey, president of IPSCO, has figured that such a project would have meant an additional 3,000 or 4,000 here at the steel mill. This steel mill could have well become the steel centre of Western Canada.

In short, Mr. Speaker, over the next decade the Choceland Mine and the Iron Pelleting Plant directly and indirectly could have created as many as 10,000 additional jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bowerman: — 80,000!

Mr. Steuart: — No, not 80,000 but 10,000. And at least we promised 80,000 and we got some. I will say this for you fellows — I don't know how many you promised but it won't be 80,000 at the rate that you are going. It won't be 8,000 and in fact I don't think that it will even be 80. The additional jobs would have been a big step forward in the diversification of this Province. Even our Socialist friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, have admitted that diversification is an absolute necessity in the Province of Saskatchewan.

When are you going to announce, Mr. Agriculture Minister (Mr. Messer)? You can find the press today if you want to make that announcement. You have been in five weeks and you haven't announced one job-producing industry, business or anything else.

For too long this Province has been dependent on wheat with the result that when there is a drought or the price of wheat goes down or we can't sell our wheat, the whole economy stagnates.

The new mine, while having diversified our economy, would have given us a wider tax base in this province. Everyone knows we need that especially if you Socialists hope to carry out even one-tenth of the promises that you made to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, for years now the NDP Socialists have been preaching anti-Americanism in this province. In fact, up and down this whole land, if there ever has been a dividing force between us and our neighbor to the south, it has been the NDP throughout the length and breadth of this nation.

July 30, 1971

They opposed the Prince Albert pulp mill because it was partly financed by American capital. They have opposed the Dore Lake pulp mill because it was financed partially by American capital. For years they have harped about the need for developing our resources with Canadian capital, yet when we made arrangements with Canadian capital to develop our mine at Choiceland, a mine that has been known for years, that people have worked on for years, including your Government when you were the former Government. When we make those arrangements, your first opportunity, you turn thumbs down.

Now I said at the beginning of my remarks that I found it incredible that the new Government would even think of turning down this complex. There they sit, calling themselves the friend of the underdog, the friend of the unemployed, tossing out the window the opportunity of getting into this Province, even though when the new Premier said in his press statement that he wanted a more economical approach to the project, implying that the initial agreement and studies were not economically sound. He based his assessment on the final feasibility study of the General Engineering Company.

Well, what about that study? This same company had been hired several years ago. We hired them again. We said make a study of this. If it is feasible we want to go ahead with it. We knew that we should get a partial answer. We gave ourselves, at that time, if it was totally unfeasible, a chance to back out. And the Government took that chance and we put that clause in there. At the same time, I think and I am convinced, the Premier and the new Government should have asked for more time. I am convinced that they would have got more time. From Denison, they certainly would have got more time from Mr. Kirby, they would have got more time from the Choiceland Mine.

What do some of the people say about the study? In a press statement dated July 19th, the Leader-Post under the name of Steve Roman, president of Denison Mines had this to say:

Stephen Roman, Chairman of Denison Mines Limited said today that Premier Allan Blakeney made a big mistake in cancelling an agreement for the development of the Choiceland iron deposit in Saskatchewan.

Roman went on to say:

It was a good deal for all concerned, and would have provided a new and vital industrial base for Saskatchewan. If the Premier wants to listen, Mr. Roman said, we can prove the project is economically sound and our figures are accurate, and also prove the information on which the agreement was cancelled was wrong.

Mr. Roman is a Canadian citizen. He is the man who built the Elliott Lake mines. He is one of the most successful mining men anywhere in the world, one of the leading businessmen in this country. And yet, would Mr. Blakeney get in touch with him and say, "come on and sit down with me?" He did not. I talked to Steve Roman in Toronto this morning and asked him if he has had any word from the Government of Saskatchewan. Has Mr. Blakeney or anyone else phoned you and asked you to come down and talk this thing over? And he said, "No, they haven't. All I heard was the cancellation." I said, "Would you talk it over with him?" He said,

Of course I would. I still think it is a good deal. I still think that it would work out for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. I would like a chance to present my side of the picture. I think the report was ill-conceived and hastily done.

Now, let me point out this: that they may be dealing, they may be carrying on negotiations with Mr. Daly. That's fine! Mr. Daly is a fine man. He is the president of Choiceland mines. But Mr. Daly has been trying to develop this mine for years. It wasn't until he got someone of the stature of Mr. Roman, someone with the know-how, someone with the worldwide organization behind him, Mr. Roman, that has made the Choiceland Iron mine and pelleting plant anything close to being a viable project. Yet our Premier cancels it out of hand, never phoned him up, never said, "I'll come down and see you or you come out and see me." I am convinced that Mr. Roman, Mr. Daly and Mr. Turvey, recognizing that there was a new Government, and that the Government had the right and took it — and I don't blame them — to stop and look over every deal that our Government made before they went ahead. We allowed that escape clause. We put that in there for that reason, for ourselves or any other government. Then you could have told them, "come on out and talk this over and see if we can make a better deal." Maybe you could have made a better deal. Maybe you can make a better deal yet, I hope you can. But let me tell you this, you don't get people of the stature of Steve Roman with the money behind him to come into this Province and offer to work with us every day. It's a fact that we, and you before us, tried to get that Choiceland iron mine developed and we failed. And the first time we got someone, whom I think had the know-how and the money behind him to maybe make it successful, Mr. Blakeney just threw it out the window a few days after he became the Premier.

Mr. Roman goes on to say:

We thought it was an economically sound agreement when we went into it and we still feel the same way. We think we know more about underground mining than the Company that did the feasibility report. The project calls for a lot of work and lots of original ideas.

Denison was anxious to get in on a project which could have completely changed the economy of this Province.

Interprovincial Steel and Pipe have said it cannot expand without access to ore products. Choiceland can provide that. It was planned to sell the iron ore to all the Prairie Provinces and outside the country as well. Mr. Roman quoted further:

A steel firm is essential to the rest and will be involved either in Regina or Edmonton.

He decline to elaborate on his reference to Edmonton. But I can tell this House that I am absolutely confident that if this Government — and I hope this thing isn't finished, I hope they haven't completely lost their chance — if this Government does not take this opportunity or if they can't replace it with another opportunity and a steel complex of this size gets developed either in Manitoba or more likely in Alberta, then I'll tell you we have lost our opportunity to have a steel plant for at least the next 50 years.

There is only room for one large steel complex in the Prairie Provinces and I think we had that opportunity within our grasp. I hope, I sincerely hope, that what the Premier has done up to this point was merely a ploy in his negotiations, but I can tell him that he had better get those interested parties back at the table and I can also tell him that he cannot develop that complex with a Choiceland iron mine. Maybe he can find some new partners that have got the kind of money and know-how that Mr. Roman has in Denison Mines, I hope he can. I am a citizen of this Province and I want to see it succeed. If they can, this party will be the first to congratulate you and support you. But I think it was absolutely disgraceful that you didn't at least explore the ideas and invite Mr. Roman out here to say, "Look, we've got this study, we don't think it is economically sound, although it did show a small profit was possible. What do you think about it, after all you have been in the mining business for years, you made a fantastic success of your business life and the companies you have been involved in. What is your answer to it?" Maybe, Mr. Premier, you wouldn't have been satisfied, maybe he couldn't have given you answers that would have satisfied you, but at least you could have looked this Opposition in the eye, and the people of this Province and the unemployment problem in the eye, and said, "Look, I have left no stone unturned, I have gone into every possible detail and I have found that I am not prepared to risk the \$10 million to try and develop this complex."

It is a queer thing, though, they'll stand up here in the House and they'll boast and they'll promise to spend millions and millions and millions. Oh, they are prepared to take over some of them, the potash industry, \$800 million or \$900 million. They are prepared, some of them, to go up and grab the pulp mill in Prince Albert. I don't know how much that will cost. They are prepared, some of them, to throw out the Dore Lake agreement. Let me tell you, if you do it might cost you some money.

They are prepared to build government buildings in Moose Jaw at \$1.5 million. What does a government building do? All a government building does is that it encourages the civil servants to fill it up with more civil servants. I forgot whose law they call it, but you could name it after Allan Blakeney if you want, and that costs the taxpayers more and more and more. They call that social capital. Well, there is lots of social capital to be spent and we agree with it. But, Mr. Premier, you had better balance it with business and enterprise capital because it takes that in the final analysis. Until such time as your Members change the whole system, until you wipe out the Capitalistic system, until you bring in this Utopia of Socialism, in the meantime while we are still struggling under the so-called Free Enterprise system, I suggest you play the game by the rules of the road, then when you have got this Utopia across the country, then you can play the game any way you want.

Mr. Daly, what were his comments? Mr. Daly, president of the Choiceland Iron Mine Limited, on Monday blamed a badly researched feasibility study for the cancellation of the proposed development of an iron mine at Choiceland. Today he told the Leader-Post in a telephone interview that the feasibility study obviously suffered from lack of time and research in its preparation. The report was prepared without consultation, either with Denison, the major principal, or with Choiceland. He said the optimistic revised figures could indicate the project was substantially better than the feasibility report study showed.

An Hon. Member: — . . . table it!

Mr. Steuart: — I should like you to table that. If you have tabled it, I am sorry, I will take a look at it today.

I won't be surprised. I am not suggesting for a minute that the feasibility study based on a feasibility study, maybe your decision was a right one. I am not saying it wasn't. But what I am saying is: what have you done? I hope you have some report — you haven't reported it publicly. Why didn't you bring these two people in who are experienced in the mining field and say, what do you think of this report? You obviously haven't and now you have cancelled it. I would have done that, we would have done that. If they didn't have any answers and the report was that bad, then we would have washed it out. Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, to the press, to the public of this Province, we put that clause in. We said, "if we get a feasibility report and we hire the company and that feasibility report shows it is not a viable project, then we'll wash it out, we'll back out of it."

Well, okay, you got the feasibility report, but for God's sake, with the unemployment we have got, and the lack of industrial base I should think it would have been just common sense to have said, 'let's first, before we do that, call in the two people who have some experience in mining and say, what do you think of that report?' Then if they weren't satisfied with it and they put an honest doubt in your mind, say, 'how about giving me 30 days or 60 days leeway to look at a new report.' Sure, they would have done it. Maybe when you stand up you have got a good answer, I hope you have, because the people of this Province need to have that answer, especially those people looking for work.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of two of the most prominent mine experts in the country, both say the original Choiceland project is economically sound and a good deal for this Province. On the other hand, we have little Allan — shortly he'll be an expert on everything — but right now, or at that time he was still just a city labor lawyer and I am afraid he wouldn't know a handful of iron pellets from a load of hay, and he said, "this isn't a good study, we are going to throw the whole thing out."

Mr. Romanow: — . . . a corporation lawyer!

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, I am sorry, he is a corporation lawyer — a Crown corporation lawyer he is now, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the time this was thrown out that there was more behind it than appeared just in the press. I still say that our good friends, the Wafflers, were calling the tune, they don't want any of this Capitalistic money, not even Canadian money. I think that was the first instalment little Allan paid and I think that if he throws out the Dore Lake pulp mill, we'll see the second instalment. I can hardly wait until they have their commune meeting out on the weekend and hear the breathless results and follow it up next week when you make the announcement on the Dore Lake project.

Mr. Speaker, this was a black day for the unemployed when you threw that mine out without coming out — I hope you can do

July 30, 1971

that today — and say that you have an alternative and not some "pie in the sky" thing about some development of the tourist industry up North, up in the Meadow Lake area that employed some 60 part-time people last year. Or some studies by some of your Socialist friends you have imported, to tell us we'll have study reports down the road somewhere and we'll find some jobs for these unemployed. They need them now, they need them now.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about the Dore Lake pulp mill. This was a second industrial complex that we had negotiated but up to the point where we had signed the deal and now it stands in jeopardy.

I should like just to take a minute or two to talk a bit about a philosophy. Now the Members opposite are very fond of talking in a philosophical strain, a civilization will be judged on how it treats the poor, the old, the sick, and the blind. Well, let me tell you a civilization will be judged on how it treats its unemployment. And the unemployed can't cash those phony cheques that come out of your mouths, they have got to have jobs, and until you change the system, somebody has got to invest a buck before somebody can go to work. As far as our Government was concerned, and as far as our Caucus is concerned, and as far as our philosophy is concerned, let me make it crystal clear — we don't and we never have worshipped at the altar of Free Enterprise nor do we worship at the altar of Government Enterprise.

I have said this before and I'll say it now, lots of time I think the only thing that makes free enterprise smell anywhere acceptable is if government enterprise smells worse. Then when you get a combination of both, sometimes those Crown corporations are the real problem. I say the job of government today is to look at each situation and if that situation can best be developed by private people with enough government control to see that the ordinary man gets a fair share, then develop it that way. If it calls for government development through Crown corporations or any other government industry, then develop it that way. But please don't come in here as a Government and tell the people you have got the answers for jobs and the revenue and the resource development and to start calling people that come in here to invest their money pirates, robber barons, and say we'll throw them out without any compensation. All that Parsons and Whittemore ever did was come in here and make a deal with us. If we made a stupid deal, well, we made a stupid deal and the people threw us out of power. It wasn't their fault. Somebody got up and said, look at the way they . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Clap, sure, sure! They haven't seen the deals you made yet! I'll go back to some of those deals you made in 1944. You should really be put in jail for them. Don't talk about stupid deals, you haven't proven yet that you could run a single peanut stand, never mind a pulp mill or anything else.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Let me tell you something. One of your Members gets up there and says, look at the way Parsons and Whittemore treated the chemical plant up in Saskatoon. Let me tell you how Parsons

and Whittemore treated the Co-op Chemical Plant. Don't let anybody tell you I don't know what I am talking about, I was involved for a year in that deal. I'll tell you about Parsons and Whittemore, Mr. Member from Saskatoon, Mr. man who wants to run all the Capitalists out and take their money from them and give them no compensation, calls people who come in here to develop our Province robber barons and worse. Parsons and Whittemore made a deal with the Co-op chemical Company to have them supply caustic soda, and fluorine to the new pulp mill in Prince Albert. They didn't grab their little co-operative hands and make them sign the deal, the Co-op was anxious to sign it, they were already in the industrial chemical business and they wanted to expand so they signed the deal of their own free will with Parsons and Whittemore. What did they do then? They bought some equipment and the equipment didn't work very well, and they were accused — among other things — of dumping mercury into the Saskatchewan River.

I am not going to say whether they were dumping it or not, although some of the Members from Saskatoon who support the Co-op movement were quick enough to say that they were dumping that mercury and they got a law suit. They were alleged to be dumping some in, but I know something, it is not alleged, they had lots of problems. They signed a deal with an American co-operative that went broke to buy some of their chemicals and it went out of business and they found themselves in extreme difficulties losing money. In fact, it was almost a fact that the entire Federated Co-op across this country was in jeopardy. Because we, the Government, had lent them some money — you had lent them some money when you were in Government — we sat down with Parsons and Whittemore and the Co-op people. We re-arranged that whole contract, Parsons and Whittemore didn't have to do that, they could have said, "stick to the contract", because they could have got that chemical at that time from the Dow Chemical Plant at the same price. So they re-wrote the contract and when we finished, it was a much better contract to the Co-op Chemical Company. They gave them an increase in price that netted the Co-op Chemical Company of Saskatoon about \$150,000 gross more a year and cost the Prince Albert pulp mill \$150,000 more a year. That is exactly the beginning and end of what Parsons and Whittemore, through the Prince Albert pulp mill, did to the Co-op Chemical and the Federated Co-op in this Province. If that's a sin, if that's what is going to black-ball them out of this Province, then I think we should have more sins and more people like that in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I am saying this, if the Socialist Government wants to throw out the Dore Lake pulp mill, that's their business. That's their business. If they can come in and show that we made a bad deal, that's their business. If they can make a better deal, good for them. We never pretended we were the greatest geniuses in the world, all we ever said is, we are going to try and do something to find these people jobs.

Let me show you the other side of the coin. Up there in LaLoche, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, Meadow Lake, there are a great many people up there. Most of them are Indian and Metis and they have been living for generations on social aid. We white men went up there and we changed their way of life. Oh, we really changed their way of life. They had fishing and

July 30, 1971

hunting and a reasonably balanced way of life, we gave them social aid, unlimited social aid by their standards, not by ours. Oh, and the liquor, the only free enterprisers that you find up there are the bootleggers and they come up on social aid day. I say to the social aid workers and all those brilliant people coming out of our universities, it is about time we thought of a better way, but in the meantime those people have been doomed by you, and by us, to a life of social aid, a life of degradation that is hardly comparable anywhere else in this Province. How are you going to help them? But in the meantime while you are waiting for your Utopia, you help people usually by offering them jobs, so they can hold up their heads and stick out their chests and say, look I'm a real citizen. I pay my way.

I don't have to be told by anybody that the Indian and Metis of this Province, who are just as good as we are, sometimes a little bit better and most of them like most of us, would sooner have a chance at a decent job at decent wages. Okay, we want to help them, they are there, they are not going to move out of there. Now how do we do it? Somebody said the tourist industry. For God's sake, use your brains! The tourist industry employed 60 part-time people up there the year before last. Sure they have some tourist industry but it is not going to supply the thousands of jobs necessary to give some of those people some hope now, not 50 years from now. So we said a pulp mill can make it, a pulp mill because there is a lot of wood up there, a tremendous area of forest.

Now let's look at the problems. The problem was to get somebody to come up there who knew how to run a pulp mill because there is no use starting pulp mills if you can't sell the pulp, and market conditions are tough enough anyway. The pulp mill market goes up and down like a roller coaster. Right now it is down a little, it will come back. You have to have somebody with know-how and a world-wide organization, so we went to every Canadian pulp mill in Canada. We said, come in. Somebody said, did you offer them the same deal you gave Parsons and Whittemore. We said, "No!" Of course we didn't, we offered them any reasonable proposition, let them negotiate with us. We didn't offer them the same deal because we negotiated with Parsons and Whittemore for about a year, but we would have offered it to them, exactly similar terms and conditions because we wanted Canadian capital first. Make no mistake, they wouldn't come in here, they wouldn't take the chance. Parsons and Whittemore said they would do it. It is a big risk and we were risking a lot of the taxpayers' money. I don't pretend we weren't. There are problems of pollution, and there are problems of reforestation, but today with technical know-how and science and good-will and intelligence, we could have solved those problems. If we didn't solve them, we wouldn't have a pulp mill. We wouldn't let it go ahead, Ottawa wouldn't let it go ahead. They were prepared to put money into this, we were prepared to take the risk. I don't argue there was a raw risk.

But friends, let's look at the alternative. The alternative I am afraid is, we say to those people in a practical honest way, sorry brother, we haven't got anything for you. Stick on social aid for another 20 or 30 years until we find some nice clean-smelling 100 per cent Canadian industry that might come up there and can your blueberries or I don't know what they might do. I hope, Mr. Premier, that you do make a deal. I hope you do. We'll support you if you do, I know there are problems. If you can make a better deal than we did, I will say this, you are in

a better bargaining position. I'll bet you've got them pretty scared right now. So if you can make a better deal, make it. Again I want to say we never pretended to be the greatest geniuses that ever walked. I am sure there is a better deal to be made. I don't think it could be much better, but maybe it could be. But make a deal if you can. Sure it is easy to laugh, Mr. Minister of Northern Affairs. I am being serious, what is your answer to those people? We . . .

An Hon. Member: — Smoke jumping . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, make them smoke jumpers! We didn't have an answer for them. In honesty we didn't have an answer for those people until we found that pulp mill. You haven't got an answer today and you were there for 20 years. Twenty years and you didn't have an answer! You haven't got one now and that's your responsibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this in closing, I hope that you do make a deal. I don't know whether you will or not. I just want to say this. The people of this Province — sure we're talking back and forth here and Mr. Blakeney got up and said, you really don't expect us to do all our promises in five weeks. No, we don't. But you have been the Government for five weeks and you have called a Special Session, we didn't. I think the people of this Province are waiting, they are happy, I am sure that you are keeping those promises of utilization fees and so on. It is a good start. But they are waiting for something more than that, because that is only one side of the coin. They are waiting for an answer for the young and the unemployed and the people that want to build their careers and their jobs here in Saskatchewan. Okay, that's just good fun. The people of this Province already beat us, you can beat on us for another month or two months in every one of your speeches telling us how stupid we were and how inhuman we were in putting on utilization fees and so on. Bully for you! But I am going to tell you something, people of Saskatchewan are expecting a little more, they elected you, they didn't elect us as the Government. They know they defeated us, they know why they defeated us. I am going to tell you one thing, one reason they didn't defeat us for, one thing that didn't put us down to defeat — if you say you did, you are reading the tea leaves wrong — we didn't go down to defeat because we tried to get industrial development. People liked that part of our program and they are expecting you to do as well or better.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — When you rise in your place, Mr. Premier, and after you are finished tearing the strip off me, as I expect you will, tell them of what stupid deals we made and how and why we got beaten. I hope and I expect that you will give some concrete examples and some positive programs that will give the people, many of whom — most of whom I guess — supported you, who are out of work, under-employed, coming out of our schools, almost today without hope — that you will give them a ray of hope and you will give them something practical.

Mr. Speaker, up to this point you haven't done that. I move, seconded by my seatmate, the Hon. Mr. Boldt — used to be Hon. he is just Mr. Boldt now — that the following words be added to the motion:

but this Assembly regrets that the Government of Saskatchewan has failed to provide practical alternatives for employment for our jobless citizens; that the Government has failed to recognize in any meaningful way the financial plight of our farmers; and that the present Government has failed in its Throne Speech to outline concrete proposals for resource development or to maintain the high priority of the Liberal Government in the field of pollution control.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I first want to take this opportunity — my first formal presentation in this House on the general business of the House — to compliment you on your election to the high office as Speaker.

Mr. Boldt: — Was elected to this office?

Mr. Blakeney: — Ah, yes, you voted for him, Mr. Member for Rosthern. You had an opportunity to vote against him. We in fact even could have nominated the Member for Rosthern as Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But no one other there had sufficient confidence in big Dave, or is it little Dave, to make that selection and we have selected the Member for Wadena. He has served before as Speaker in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — He served well and I am very sure he will serve well again.

I want also to compliment the mover of the motion, the Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) and the seconder, the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson), for very, very creditable performances in their maiden speeches in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I want also to extend my compliments to all of the new Members of the House, first on their election and secondly, in respect of those who have already participated in debates, in their contribution to the debate. I think that this sitting is remarkable in the sense that in our third day of sitting, perhaps 15 or 20 Members have been on their feet making their contribution to the debates in the House.

I want to compliment the Member for Prince Albert West on his election to the office of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and to compliment him on his maiden speech in that role.

I join him in his tribute to his immediate predecessor,

the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher and I know that Mr. Thatcher will indeed be sorely missed on the Opposition benches and in this House.

I want now to deal with one or two of the points made by the Member for Prince Albert West, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). And I want to deal first with Choiceland Iron Mines because, Mr. Speaker, the situation which this Government faced on Choiceland Iron Mines is very different from that painted by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West. The facts are that in order to get an announcement to coincide with their election campaign, they rushed into a deal which provided for the feasibility study which they must have known would be inadequate. They know that the company which they themselves selected, General Engineering Company said that they would need some time to do a proper feasibility study and that it would take about \$90,000. But instead they said, "No, we're not going to spend \$90,000 for a feasibility study on this \$90 million project. We want you to do a hurry-up, rush-up job for \$15,000." And they further signed an agreement which operated like this: GECCO (General Engineering Company) would do this hurry-up, rush-up job and they would present this feasibility study to the Government and to the other parties to the agreement and at that point the Government had ten days to move. The Government had to reject the deal in ten days or, if they did not, the Government was committed to sink a shaft for up to \$10 million in costs — entirely a Government expense with nobody else participating.

Now, under those circumstances the Government of the day had to act on the feasibility study. When you get a study and look at it for two or three days and think it's inadequate, then there is no time at this point to talk about getting in touch with people to rewrite agreements. At that point you have to make a decision and the decision was made that that deal, on that feasibility study, was a bad deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I want to say that I thought the feasibility study indicated a project which was not economically viable. The Member opposite might suggest that I'm only a lawyer and accordingly you don't know anything about these things and he may be right, but I can read a balance sheet. I can read a few figures and all you had to do was read a few figures and you could know that that deal was not viable. And I am encouraged in that belief by the fact that Mr. Steve Roman, whom he quoted, said that the report was a bad report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I have been in touch with Choiceland Iron Mines and they say that the report is defective.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I have been in touch with Interprovincial Steel Corporation and they say that they can show that that report is wrong.

July 30, 1971

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The report in Mr. Roman's words was "ill-conceived and hastily done." All right, we therefore are at the position where we cannot go forward on that report. We start over again. But I want to assure Members opposite that the Choiceland Iron Mines deal is far from dead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I want to tell you that at the same time the decision was made to reject the project on the basis of the GECO report, I asked the Deputy Minister of Industry and the Deputy Minister of Mineral Resources together to organize a task force to get us a proper feasibility study, to see whether or not we could not go forward. I have since been in touch with Choiceland Iron Mines and IPSCO. They are perfectly willing to participate.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll bet they are, they've got no money!

Mr. Blakeney: — Choiceland Iron Mines are the people who own the property and IPSCO has the market. It seemed to me that if either of those people want to involve anyone else, it's their selection. If they want to involve Steve Roman — by all means.

Mr. Steuart: — They tried for years, Al, they've got to get someone with money.

Mr. Blakeney: — I hadn't been aware that IPSCO was in insolvency. I remember I used to hear that stated by Members on the other side of the House year in and year out when I had something to do with IPSCO, when they were telling me then that it was insolvent and they were wrong, and they're wrong now. IPSCO does have money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — All I can say is that this project will go forward if it is at all feasible. We are more than happy to deal with Mr. Steve Roman or Denison or with Mr. Daly or Choiceland or with Mr. Turvey and IPSCO or any combination thereof. And we are right now analyzing this project to see whether or not it can't go forward.

Now, a word or two about the Dore Lake pulp mill. I should have thought Members opposite would be the last people to come into this House and talk about the problem of unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Because I stood in this House approximately where the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) now sits 18 months ago and heard the Government who sat on these benches say that they fully approved of the Trudeau policy of deliberately creating unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, in December of 1969 Mr. Trudeau said that he could contemplate with equanimity six per cent unemployment . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . and in February, 1970, the then Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and his colleagues said they thoroughly agreed with this.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . I wish you would quote when I ever said that! I never agreed with him when he said that and you can't quote it so take . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would refer the Hon. Member to the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Speech of the Session of 1970 and you will find there a specific statement — I can't remember whether it was the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer now — to the effect that they specifically agreed with the idea that fighting inflation was the first priority and that is precisely what Mr. Trudeau said he was doing when he was creating the unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This was exactly what you said. This was part of the general flavor of the debate at that time . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows at that time that the issue was: shall we have inflation and employment, crudely put, or no inflation and unemployment, crudely put. Every economist of that day was talking about the trade-off. I suspect that the Member for Prince Albert West never consulted the economists in his department and he probably wouldn't have understood what they said if he had.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But this was the discussion of the day — you either stood for inflation and employment or unemployment and no inflation. That was the trade-off, and you people elected unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . What are you going to do? You're the Premier now!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I told you what we're going to do . . .

Mr. Steuart: — What?

July 30, 1971

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . we're going to try to find some jobs for Indian and Metis people and I want to tell you this — we are not going to invest \$50 million or \$75 million in a pulp mill to create 60 jobs for Indian and Metis people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You're announcing it, you're announcing you're not going to have that pulp mill.

Mr. Blakeney: — I have announced nothing of the kind. I am just saying that the allegation that pulp mills create employment for Indian and Metis people has been conclusively disproved at Prince Albert . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . conclusively disproved and when Members opposite allege that the pulp mill project will have any significant effect on Indian and Metis employment, they fly in the face of the facts that are right there in Prince Albert.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — There are more unemployed Indian and Metis people in the constituency of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) right now than there were before . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — There are more people on Welfare in Prince Albert today.

Mr. Steuart: — What are you going to do for them?

Mr. Blakeney: — I am sure that we on this side of the House listen with sympathy to these allegations by the Member for Prince Albert West. We knew that he hadn't had much time to prepare; we knew that he was thrust into the role very suddenly and we knew that he certainly didn't have much time to prepare during the election campaign because he was pretty busy in Prince Albert West.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — As a matter of fact we missed his usual sort of flying saucer performance of going hither and yonder in Saskatchewan giving his little exposition in his delicate way of Liberal philosophy. As a matter of fact he stayed pretty close to home. He did get down to Saskatoon on one occasion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And he said to the people in front of him, "That's a hell

of a looking audience.'

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, concerning the people in front of me, what am I to say?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I know that since that time he has been tied up pretty well finding out whether he is the Member for Prince Albert West, and we've attempted to accommodate him here in that way. He is still having a difficult adjustment to make and I think he would do well to take a little time to repeat to himself that, 'I'm not Provincial Treasurer, I'm just barely an MLA.'

I think it is pretty evident that there is some confusion in his mind, and I recall that he was confused before, as a matter of fact. As a matter of fact I remember when he was standing right here at the seat occupied by the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and do you know what he said on that occasion — and this was in April, not so long ago. He said, 'Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what I predict, I predict here today that based on this budget and on our record and our platform, in the next election we will win 45 seats.'

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — He was partly right, 45 seats, but the wrong party.

We've had predictions before from Members opposite and I know that many of us will remember the one repeated ad nauseum in 1964 and in 1967 and the years that followed it, how many times have we heard from Members opposite all this time saying that they were going to wipe out the Socialists; that they were going to exterminate them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — How many times have they consigned us finally to the grave. But if I may quote Mark Twain, Mr. Speaker, the report of our death was greatly exaggerated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We are not dead, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan have decided otherwise. They said on June 23rd, firmly and clearly that they want to wipe out, not the Socialists, but the sad, sorry, miserable record of seven years of Liberal mismanagement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — They want to wipe out the dissension and the discrimination against the poor and the sick and the working people of the province.

July 30, 1971

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And they want to wipe out, in spite of what the Member for Prince Albert says, they want to wipe out the give-a-way of our resources and the disregard for our environment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What are you going to do for the unemployed, Allan?

Mr. Blakeney: — Members opposite had their dreams, they had dreams of wiping us out. People of Saskatchewan have made those dreams their nightmares, and rightly so. We here on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, represent not 42 per cent; not 46 1/2 per cent of the electorate — which is the best that the party opposite has ever attained in living memory — but we on this side of the House represent over 55 per cent of the Saskatchewan voters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And this 55 per cent said, 'Wipe out the last seven years, give us a New Deal.' And that is what they are going to get — a New Deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Members opposite decided that they were going to fight their election not on a program but on some schemes and ploys. They started out with their gerrymander, that diabolical redistribution bill.

Mr. Romanow: — A Daveymander!

Mr. Blakeney: — But I tell you that when the people of Saskatchewan get a New Deal, it's going to be right on the top of the list — a new deal on redistribution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Members opposite have been planning and scheming for years to somehow take over the Progressive Conservative vote and in this election the conservatives ran only a handful of candidates. I can see that the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) was rubbing his hands, he said, "Here we are, we've got a sweet setup, we've got these constituencies all carved up in the Daveymander, we've got tiny pocket boroughs designed to over-represent the fat cats of south Regina, we've got people like the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) sitting for a little pocket borough, and the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) sitting for a tiny pocket borough." He saw this whole idea as one where he couldn't lose. Well he only forgot one thing, Mr. Speaker. He forgot the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan said they are not going to have this anymore. The people remembered and it wasn't only New Democrats that remembered, it was Social Crediters and Conservatives and, yes, many Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — They remembered the seven years, the seven years of what I had called famine and pestilence. They remembered the years of broken promises.

The Member for Prince Albert was busy reciting the promises we had made. Wouldn't it have been better if he had recited the promises that they made in 1964 and 1967?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Wouldn't it have been better if he had given an account of his stewardship, if I may put it that way?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Wouldn't it have been better if he had said, "Yes, we were defeated but we were defeated knowing that we offered the electorate something in our two elections and we delivered." That would have been a use of promises, but I never expect the Liberal Party in my time to reiterate the promises they had made and tick them off as to whether they have fulfilled them or not. We shall be very happy four years hence if you recite our promises made in our program card and see how we get along with them.

Mr. Steuart: — In your program card!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or in our New Deal for People, either one. I want to say that while it is possible that we may not achieve everything, I believe that our record will be creditable and I now, in advance, issue a challenge to Members opposite to compare our record with theirs from 1964 to 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — With all their planning they went too far and they lost any remaining credibility with the public. The New Democratic Party had a platform. People believed in it. The Liberal Party proclaimed that they "could do more." The people of Saskatchewan said, "No, we've had enough, we don't want any more of that."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If the Leader of the Opposition wants to know why we called a Special Session, that's the reason. It is going to take a lot of time to wipe out the damage which has been done.

Mr. Romanow: — We've got to get on with the job right now.

Mr. Blakeney: — We want to start right now and we want to start as fast as we can rebuilding this Province, restoring confidence, implementing our New Deal for People. Because, Mr. Speaker, these seven years of Liberal rule have done sad things for Saskatchewan. They've emptied houses and stores; they've sent

our young people packing; they've created a new class of people — economic exiles. Construction workers in the thousands couldn't get jobs, and if they did their wages were lower than in Alberta and Manitoba, and so they left. Newly qualified teachers and other college graduates couldn't get jobs and so they left. Employees of some chains, such as Ashdown Hardware, who saw in one morning all the stores closed at one time, had their jobs disappear and they left. Employees of branch plants, machinery distribution centres were transferred to Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Brantford, and so they left. Potash workers, refinery workers, railway workers saw their jobs disappearing and so they left. And in 1970 alone, 32,000 people left Saskatchewan — 2,500 each month, 85 each and every day. That's the equivalent of emptying the City of Moose Jaw in one year. And all I want to say is this. The way Members opposite come in here and weep their crocodile tears about what are we doing to create jobs, what were they doing in the last three years? What were they doing?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — What were they doing that allowed 32,000 to leave this Province in one year? Even the City of Saskatoon — and he talks about potash mines — lost population in 1970, 32,000 people exiled in one year, and I want to say that even though these people opposite now profess concern for the unemployed, I want to say that when they were in power no Canadian province, large or small, has ever suffered such a population loss.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — You know on January 1st of this year there were actually 17,000 fewer people in Saskatchewan than there were when the Member for Prince Albert West mounted the Treasury benches.

Mr. Steuart: — And there are 45 less . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Liberals took office in 1964 and since that time more than 100,000 people have left Saskatchewan. And yet the Liberals went to the people and said that they "could do more." The voters said, "No, we've had enough." The Liberals said they "could do more . . ."

Mr. Steuart: — Okay, we covered that! You've said that.

Mr. Blakeney: — The Liberals said they "could do more"; the people of Saskatchewan said, "No, they want a new deal, they want a new deal for the sick and a new deal for the elderly and a new deal for students and a new deal for working people and a new deal for the mentally ill." And we've covered those things in this Throne Speech and I want to say here that this amendment while it might be appropriate for a regular Throne Speech, is surely inappropriate for the Throne Speech for a Special Session where at their request we specifically limited the legislation which was brought in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I want to say that when the regular Throne Speech is brought in in February there will be lots of talk about the items mentioned here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But right now we are providing a new deal for the sick and a new deal for the elderly. We've already done something for the students, more than the Members opposite did in their seven years, in a bursary program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We are going to do something for working people; we are going to do something for the mentally ill and we are going to provide a new deal in resource development. This Government intends to see that the people of Saskatchewan get a new deal, Mr. Speaker. This Session is the first instalment and that, Mr. Speaker, is why this Special Session has been called.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal a little later with the programs which we have to offer. May I, just before I close, deal with this little allegation just tossed off by the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) of grandstanding. Grandstanding! If there is one thing that I should have thought the Liberals would have realized in this election it was that the people in Saskatchewan and, in particular, the people of rural Saskatchewan have rejected their farm policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The people of Saskatchewan have said "No" to Federal farm policies and they've said "No" to Provincial farm policies. The people of Saskatchewan have said that farmers need help. They have said that some farmers — and quite a few farmers — are in trouble and in deep trouble. Now we think that this trouble is temporary but it is nonetheless real on that account. And we are proposing to bring in a bill to help these farmers, to give them some relief, and what are we called from Members opposite? Grandstanding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Members opposite might think it is grandstanding to give some relief to hard-pressed farmers but I can tell you that the farmers of Saskatchewan won't think it is grandstanding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — They will think it was what they elected their Members to do.

Mr. Speaker, I'll have much more to say in this Throne Speech debate when we next pick it up, and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

July 30, 1971

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

MOTIONS

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow:

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Monday, August 2, 1971, meet at 10:00 o'clock each sitting day, and that there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.; and

That on Wednesday, August 4, 1971, and on each Wednesday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(2) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.; and

That on Friday, August 6, 1971, and on each Friday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(3) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Notwithstanding Rule 3(4), on Saturday, August 7, 1971, and on each Saturday until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 5:30 o'clock p.m.; that there shall be a recess of two hours at 12:30 o'clock p.m.; and that the Order of Business shall be the same as on Thursday.

Now I am the first to concede that this is a very rigorous schedule. We did not wish to accelerate the hours of sitting until Members opposite had an opportunity over the weekend to consider the various bits of legislation. We intend to adjourn tonight at 5:30. We do realize that these hours of sitting may put extra pressures on Members opposite and if they do wish to have some relief, if in fact the Session does go on for the whole week, we should certainly wish to consider it and be very happy to consider it. We do, however, wish to accommodate those good number of Members who have suggested that they do want to expedite the business of the Session and accordingly in order that there might be that measure of flexibility, I am moving the motion as it appears No. 2 on the blues.

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly to this motion. The time rules which are set forth in the rule book which has been presented to me contain, I think, a sensible approach, and are set out there because the Members here do require a little time to study the bills as they are presented. We require time to consider these bills and particularly the speeches given by the Minister and others in support of these bills. I think we need an adequate time to prepare our response to these, Mr. Speaker. Now the proposal which had been taken as read really says that we will sit all morning right through to the lunch hour and we will then sit until 5:30 in the afternoon; we will start at 7:00 and go right through until 9:30 at night, starting Monday.

We are particularly concerned, Mr. Speaker, that all the bills that are brought to the House be adequately scrutinized and scanned by the Members here, that we may adequately protect the people whom we have been elected to protect. We are particularly concerned about the farm Bill that is coming up, Mr. Speaker. We haven't even seen the Bill; we are asked to start a sitting on Monday morning that makes us rush through these things; we should like to see all of these things; it is obvious that the press gets a good view of them before we do. There are only 13 of us, Mr. Speaker. It means a lot of double work by us. Instead of spreading the workload among 24 Members as occurred in the last Opposition, we have to spread it among 13. Everybody here has to do practically double duty.

I gave a good deal of time particularly to studying The Labour Standards Act and wish to deal particularly with Bill 2 and matters of this sort. These things take a little time, Mr. Speaker. I got the Bill on Labour Standards only at 2:40 p.m. yesterday. I think, of course, that we could spend a little time during the time the House is in Session away from here but it is appropriate that the 13 of us should spend as much time in the House paying as much attention as possible, and we can't be doing two things at once. It would be all right if we could spend all weekend, morning, noon and night, but I do not think that that is appropriate and it is particularly not appropriate because we aren't going to have the staff necessary to do the job. The only time that we can really prepare speeches is during the additional time allowed us — every morning, Wednesday night and on the weekends.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal does not in any way shorten up the Session. All it does is get the same number of hours compressed into fewer days. That doesn't mean that we aren't going to spend the same number of hours dealing with the subject at hand.

Mr. Speaker, my submission to the House is that we cannot support this, at least I cannot support this, simply because I don't think it gives us adequate time. Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is probably part of the grandstand plan. What has happened is that the Government has set the stage to get all its headlines up to and including Friday and then pressures a motion of this sort onto us which requires that we hustle ourselves into the House, morning, noon and night, all next week, without adequate preparation, to respond to the headlines that have been created this week by the Government.

It is hard to accuse us of delay. Particularly, this farm Bill upsets me because we have been very accommodating; they have asked for motion after motion to be presented, bill after bill to be presented, and without any trouble at all we have given consent to have them brought on. We have been very co-operative and we should like to continue to co-operate but I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the motion and will have to vote against it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word or two on this particular motion, I can appreciate as someone said, 'This is a motion we've seen before in this House.' I think the circumstances generally have been somewhat different than they are on this particular occasion. I can appreciate the Government's desire also

to expedite the Session as much as possible but normally this kind of a motion comes to the House in the latter weeks or the latter days of what has been a normal Legislature with mornings off and time for preparation for the Speech from the Throne and so on. And I think particularly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Bill that was outlined to the press this morning by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), I am disappointed in my colleague and friend, the Member for Hudson Bay or wherever his new seat is now, Kelsey or Tisdale, for making a move of this kind. I'm sure it was an oversight on his part.

But here is a very far-reaching Bill, Mr. Speaker, not only for the farmers whom he is concerned about and I'm sure we all are but I know that they are concerned as we are about small businessmen, implement dealers, who are certainly affected by this Bill. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness and I do ask the Government to reconsider this. They will pass the motion, I'm sure. We shall be sitting here next week whether it is three days or four or five, I don't think it really makes that much difference to them, but I wonder if they would reconsider and instead of beginning at 10:00 o'clock in the morning, at least begin at 2:30 o'clock for Monday and perhaps Tuesday. These arrangements can be made, I know, by passing the motion. We can still make that arrangement and I would very sincerely ask that they do so for the reasons outlined by my colleague who just took his seat, and the feeling of other Members on this side also.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words to the motion. The Members opposite argue that the proposed motion creates a hardship on them and two of the Members who have spoken, the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) indicate that the most important reason for the hardship is the proposed farm Bill. They say that this Bill is likely to have very wide-reaching consequences and they will need time to study it. I agree. I think the Bill is a very important piece of legislation.

It does have some important consequences and we want everybody, including the Opposition, to be well informed on it. But I want to remind the Hon. Member for Regina Albert Park and the Hon. Member for Wilkie that the Bill can't come before the House for its consideration until Tuesday at any rate. As the Hon. Premier has said, Members of the Opposition have the weekend, Saturday and Sunday; they have Monday as the time we permit to them for further consideration of the Bill; it doesn't come on for debate until Tuesday. It may very well be — and I direct this to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) — that the Members opposite after they have considered the Bill in principle may want to bring it on even earlier than the Tuesday rules. And that's the purpose. It may very well be. The Member for Regina Albert Park seems to laugh at it but it may be a Bill of some importance and some concern for protection of the family farm. The point is that the Premier's motion simply asks the Members of the House this. It says: "Give us the flexibility in rules." You have time to examine the Bill. If you want to bring it on early — in fact it is being tabled now — here are the rules that will allow us to consider the Bill at any early convenience, get on with the business of this House and get some relief to the farmers and the various people that the legislation is intended to cover.

May I make one other comment. The Members opposite say that they are going to be unduly hard-pressed. I think that we are prepared to give consideration to the problem. Why don't we pass the rule; see how it works on Monday and if we are finding undue hardship, they can communicate it to us. The Government, I'm sure, will consider their position at that stage. But in order to get the rules expedited and get the business before the House and passed so that we can get on with the matter set out in the Speech from the Throne, we have to have this rule implemented. I would respectfully ask the Members of the Opposition to reconsider this position and to vote for this particular rule.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I think we need another lawyer to explain what the first lawyer meant because the second lawyer just left us all confused.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — If you want us to listen to your yapping Monday morning, we have no time to study that Bill. If we get it today and if you are going to call the House on Monday morning, there might not be any Liberals sitting here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — We might not be here. Sure, that's what you want, that's what you want. You want to railroad this Bill through and you can have it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Railroad, railroad!

Mr. Boldt: — All you want is to railroad something through.

Mr. Romanow: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — You don't even know what a farmer is like. You don't know the first thing about a farm. You wouldn't know a load of hay from a load of beans.

Here we have a Government that has 45 Members and if we are going to sit in this House here, we are going to tell you when this Session is going to close, not you. If you want to sit here on Monday morning, we shall fool around and waste your time. You are not going to get out of here any sooner. All we are asking is that we can come into the House having studied the Bill and give intelligent debate on it. But you want to refuse us this. You want to talk about the Bill and you are not going to give us any time to talk about it. I don't care whether you vote for this motion, you've got the majority you can vote us down. We are going to call for a standing vote.

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) says, 'Pass this motion and then if you find it is a

little drag on you and your 13 Members, can't quite keep up, well just mention it and we shall gloriously give you the morning or afternoon or night off or something.' Well, why not put the onus the other way. We are the 13, you are the 45. You've got the staff. You've had the Attorney General's Department and the lawyers telling you what to do; you've had the legislative lawyers telling you what to do. You are the ones that know — I think you knew what you were going to bring in, I'm sure you planned it a while ago, if you didn't you should have — we have never even seen it yet. So why not leave the rules the way they are then if we find we want to accommodate you at any time, the House is master of its own destiny, you can say, 'Shall we meet tonight, shall we meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock and if we find that we have got our homework done and we are in a position to do it, of course we shall accommodate you because we don't want to drag this Session out one hour longer than necessary. If that Bill is something that is extremely necessary, without the family farm or any other farmer in this Province, of course we will pass it as quickly as we can. But why put the onus on us. Put the onus the other way.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, there is one other reason why I object very strenuously to the motion put forward by the Premier and that is that Bill No. 9 has not only a impact upon the Members of this Legislature, this Bill has an impact on every farmer in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, certainly bills of the kind that have just been put on our desk this afternoon have an impact on every small businessman in rural Saskatchewan, every implement dealer, every garage man, every man who produces implements in the Province of Saskatchewan. Surely, in presenting a Bill of this kind to this House there should be an opportunity for the implement dealers, for the garage men to have an opportunity to study this Bill, to see if it has implications on their business, to see what impact it might have on their future sales, to see what impact it might have upon their central agency or their supplier and if this is not the most important single reason for delaying this kind of motion, then I'm afraid I am sadly mistaken. And that is the main reason that this kind of a Bill doesn't only affect the people in this House, it affects every businessman, every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan. They need the opportunity to study this legislation; they need the opportunity to prepare any presentations that might have to be made. Perhaps we may want to send this to the Law Amendments Committee; perhaps they may want to come and present briefs to it. They are going to need time to consult with their legal people, to consult with their own organizations, to perhaps bring their associations together to study the real impact and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am very violently opposed to this motion.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my words along with the Hon. Member who has just spoken, that the Members opposite have made a great point about the fact that there are only 14 Members on this side who should be concerned about the length of time that this Session lasts. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) just eloquently placed before the Assembly the very, very valid reason why we need to take a little bit of time to give an opportunity to the people of Saskatchewan who are concerned about this legislation. That, Mr. Speaker, I have always understood is one of the prime functions of the Opposition, to hold up legislation at times for the people of the country to study the bill, make presentations, to meet, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure

that you yourself would concur with that from this point of view.

I hope, Mr. Speaker — and I am sure the Government is going to pass this motion — that when we do move into these new hours that once the Ministers have introduced the Bill because we, on this side, should like to listen to the remarks of the Ministers on these Bills and have a chance to study their remarks, that they won't press us for a continuation of debate on the Bill immediately after the Minister introduces it on second reading, and I hope that they will give us an opportunity, if we deem it desirable, to take a little longer on some of these Bills. We are not wishing to be obstructionists. It is obvious that we cannot be obstructionists even if we did want to as we should simply run out of time. But as for the preparation, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government also will keep in mind that we are not capable of working 24 hours a day; we don't have the staff, the people whom we require to assist us on Saturday and Sunday. Most of us come from the country and are hoping, at least, to go back and see our families for a few hours. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that once this legislation is passed it will be used in a very moderate way.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Has the Government Caucus seen this Bill?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, that has nothing to do with this motion.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the motion. We find ourselves in the position of having misunderstood some arrangements which were made. I propose to ask the House to pass this motion and then I want to assure Hon. Members opposite that they are going to have lots of time to consider things, lots of time to consider things. There seems to have been a breakdown of communications so I'm going to ask the House to support this motion and we will proceed from there.

Motion agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS - 41
Messieurs

Blakeney	Robbins	Faris
Brockelbank	Pepper	Dyck
Byers	Michayluk	Cowley
Wood	Meakes	Cody
Smishek	Whelan	Mostoway
Romanow	Brown	Comer
Messer	Kwasnica	Rolfes
Snyder	Carlson	Lange
Bowerman	Engel	Hanson
MacMurchy	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Kowalchuk	Richards	Feschuk
Baker	Owens	Kaeding
Thibault	Larson	Flasch
Matsalla	Taylor	

July 30, 1971

NAYS - 13

Messieurs

Steuart
Coupland
Gardner
Grant
Boldt

MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac
Loken
Weatherald

MacLeod
McPherson
Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)

The Assembly adjourned at 4:27 o'clock p.m.