

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Wednesday, August 11, 1971.**

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

**STATEMENT**

**Pulp Mill Agreements**

**Mr. D.G. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House to read a statement, it's not an overly long statement but it is in reply to a statement that the Premier made on August 2nd concerning the amendment of certain agreements concerning the pulp mill. At that time he tabled those amended agreements and I needed some time to study them to make my reply and I wonder if I could make this statement now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it agreed that the Hon. Member has leave to make a statement?

**Mr. E.I. Wood** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that Ministers of the Crown make statements on the Orders of the Day. I don't know whether this privilege extends to private Members.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is true that the Ministers of the Crown have the right to make a statement but the Leader of the Opposition has asked for leave and if leave is granted he would have permission of the House, otherwise he would not, so I am asking the House does the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — Mr. Speaker, may I just say something to the point before your decision. I recognize that this is so and I don't intend that we should change that custom except in exceptional circumstances. Now I can make this statement to the press and I'm sure the press will be prepared to take it. As a matter of fact, they have inferred to me that since the original statement was in the House, and it was a complicated statement, that I had the right then to rise and reply to that statement made by the Premier, which I did in a very limited way, because I didn't have the documents, and I think Hon. Members would realize that when you are talking about a complicated, long negotiation about the pulp mill, that it isn't just possible on the spur of the moment when I heard the statement, to get up and make a sensible and a sound reply on behalf of the Opposition. I would sooner make it in the House where the original statement was made.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the rule will be clear and I wouldn't want to set a precedent to establish a different rule, and the Ministers may make statements under Orders of the Day, but the

Leader of the Opposition has asked leave of the House to be able to make a statement. If leave is granted, he would be allowed but otherwise if leave is not granted, he would not be allowed. Is leave granted? The Member may proceed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — On August 2nd, Premier Blakeney made a statement in this House concerning an amending agreement to the general agreements between the province and Parsons and Whittemore Incorporated concerning the proposed Dore Lake pulp mill. He implied, as did the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, who raised the same subject a few days later, that the previous Government had not acted in the best interests of the province and in fact did not have the moral right to make such an agreement on June 14th with the general election coming up on June 23rd.

I categorically deny these charges and state that in executing this amendment we were protecting the best interests of the province and had not only a legal but a moral right and responsibility to do so. To appreciate the need for the amending agreement, it is necessary to look at the whole picture of the negotiations and contracts already concluded concerning this large and complex enterprise. The negotiations had been in progress for over a year prior to June 14th, and were carried on between the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, Parsons and Whittemore, the Canadian National Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Dominion Securities Company Limited, our fiscal agents.

The province had, in fact, finalized the agreements with Parsons and Whittemore on March 15th. We had also entered into an underwriting agreement to raise the money necessary to finance the pulp mill.

On April 16th the Athabasca Forest Industries Act had been passed and was given Royal Assent.

An Agreement had been entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway on April 30th and the petition with respect to the railway bill had been presented to the Senate and passed in May.

We had been notified by the Federal Government that the pulp mill would be eligible for the usual grant providing it could meet their requirements, including the control of pollution. We had been assured by the Defence Department in Ottawa that we should be allowed to harvest pulp wood on the Air Weapons Range subject to a mutually satisfactory cutting plan. Our officials had informed us that a plan was being developed that would meet Federal requirements.

Two outstanding pollution consultants had informed us that we could meet the Federal standards and stay within the cost limits necessary to keep the project viable.

We were confident the railway bill would pass the House of Commons, if not in the spring Session, certainly in the fall Session.

During the negotiations and preliminary draft agreements certain back-out clauses were provided for the protection of both the province and Parsons and Whittemore. For example, early in the negotiations the Government insisted on back-out

August 11, 1971

rights if the feasibility study should prove adverse, or if the cost of pollution control was so high as to make the pulp mill uneconomical.

Since we received assurance on both these points, and others as well, by experts, we agreed to close or remove our back-out rights in these areas.

Before June 11th, the only back-out clauses left were those put in at the insistence of Parsons and Whittemore for their protection. These included the cutting rights on the Air Weapons Range, the amount of the Federal grant and the agreement to construct the rail line.

At the same time as negotiations were being carried on with the Federal Government, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Parsons and Whittemore, we were also arranging to raise the capital money required.

Early in May, on the advice of our fiscal agents, Dominion Securities Company Limited, the Government and Parsons and Whittemore decided to try and raise \$35 million in Canada immediately and the balance in the United States at a later date. The reason behind this decision was that money at that time was cheaper in Canada although the supply was limited. We could not possibly have raised all the money in Canada.

The final date for actually borrowing the \$35 million was June 15th. On that day the money would be handed over to our trustees. This meant that if Parsons and Whittemore still had a back-out clause, we should have had \$35 million on our hands with no solid agreement to proceed with the project. We were convinced this would put us in an extremely bad bargaining position regarding the three points still under negotiations.

After consultation with our advisors, we came to the following conclusions:

(1) We could meet the requirements regarding the cutting on the Air Weapons Range; (2) We could meet all Federal standards, including those on pollution control within the cost framework necessary to keep the enterprise economically sound; (3) We had been assured of Federal support for the railway bill and we were sure it would pass not later than the fall Session.

The Canadian Pacific Railway was so confident that they hired a contractor and began to clear the right-of-way at a cost to them of over \$50,000. In the unlikely event that our railway bill was turned down by Parliament, we could have built it ourselves and entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to operate over our line. Since the capital cost was being put up initially by the pulp mill and the province, and would have been recovered through rebates on freight charges, our financial outlay would have been the same. However, we were positive the Federal Government would have assented to the railway being built by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It was also necessary to agree, before we had the senior financing irrevocably committed, on how any extra financing would be raised as between the province and Parsons and Whittemore, in the event the Federal grant was less than expected or the railway cost exceeded our calculations. This was also included in the amending agreement.

These then are the essential reasons we, the Government, insisted on the amending agreement.

I would remind the House that I do not have the files concerning this very complicated and complex deal. I left those, as is proper, in the hands of the new Government. I point this out because I cannot produce this letter or that agreement to document the case I am making.

It is easy for the present Government to make these charges and to produce some letters or some documents in their efforts to prove their case. I believe they are trying to set up myself or the former Government as a scapegoat in case they have to pay substantial costs to Parsons and Whittemore.

I will say again, that I believe Parsons and Whittemore should be paid any legitimate out of pocket expenses incurred by them in good faith, but not one cent more.

I state with absolute sincerity that I acted at all times with honesty and in the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. I do not question the right of the present Government to withdraw from the pulp mill agreement, but I resent and I refute their implied charges that either myself or the Cabinet of our Government acted improperly or immorally in any of our dealings with Parsons and Whittemore.

We had the legal and moral right to amend the agreements on June 11th, as we did, and had them signed on June 14th. That Parsons and Whittemore have run up fantastic extra costs in the nine days between June 14th and June 23rd, is highly unlikely.

I would also tell the House that Parsons and Whittemore did ask me and press me very hard to let them draw down \$17 million of the \$35 million that had been borrowed for the pulp mill between June 15th and June 23rd. I refused several times and once in front of R. Pearce, Q.C., our lawyer, who I believe is still acting for the Government, and David Dombowsky, Deputy Provincial Treasurer. I am confident that both these gentlemen would bear witness to the fact that I refused to allow Parsons and Whittemore to draw one cent of the funds before the election.

The final request came at a meeting at Prince Albert about June 17th, and I told Mr. Landegger that I would not agree to any draw down of money because of the possibility of a change of government. I informed him in front of witnesses that if a new government was elected and they wished to withdraw, it would be difficult enough without millions of dollars having been paid out.

I am sorry the new Government has withdrawn from the pulp mill but that is their right. I don't think they had the right to impute wrong-doings and bad motives on the part of our Government.

We acted in good faith in what we honestly considered the best interests of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed the first words of the statement read by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). I heard a little more of it than is indicated by my presence in

the House when I happened to be in the office of the Legislative Council where it was coming over the speaker.

I do not want to say that whether or not the Government acted improperly or immorally, I think we will not at this time argue, that they acted unwisely in the extreme we continue to assert.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Let us be very clear that the date of June 15th, which the Leader of the Opposition sets as the closing date for the financial arrangements and the reason for the signature of the agreement on June 14th, was a date wholly within the control of the Government, wholly within the control of the Government. It was they who decided what the closing date for that particular bond issue was to be. No harm of any kind would have accrued to the Government had the closing date been June 30th. The money was borrowed in May, they decided to close it out on June 15th. Had they decided to close it out on June 30th, this would have been (a) after the election; and (b) at the time when you would know what the situation with respect to the railway agreement was.

The Government decided to act without the knowledge of the outcome of the election, without the knowledge of the outcome of Parliament's deliberation.

I do not now comment on why they acted that way except to say that the judgment that made them act so as to put that closing date of June 15th and that amending agreement of June 14th, was a judgment which was, in my judgment, extremely unwise and which could — and I emphasize 'could' — be exceedingly costly to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Bertha Army Worms

**Mr. K. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day, I have a small question to ask. In view of the fact — and I ask the Premier because I notice the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is not in the House — that a publication put out by the Department of Agriculture details fairly precisely how to dispose of and combat Bertha army worms, and in view of the fact that the Department Pest Control Branch, I believe Mr. Cliff Barrett, was warned at least a month ago and certainly before July 15th of the danger of an infestation of Bertha army worms, we wonder why the Government delayed so long in taking action to combat and prepare to combat this infestation?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, since the Member is quoting from material which he has not made available to the House, I invite him to refer us to the appropriate quotes and material he is referring to and doubtless some Member on the Treasury benches will have an opportunity to look into it and reply.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — To answer his question, the name of the publication is "Insect Control on Field Crops in Saskatchewan", I suggest that he look precisely under the heading "Bertha Army Worms", the heading is "Bertha Army Worms", and the statement is by two gentlemen, one Dr. Greenshields, that the Department was informed in more than ample time, that is Dr. Greenshields; and secondly, Mr. Taylor tells me personally by telephone yesterday that he warned and told Mr. Cliff Barrett at least by July 15th of the infestation of Bertha army worms in the sense that there was a higher than average flight of Bertha army worm moths as demonstrated by their light traps which they maintained in the province. And I wondered if that is now sufficient for the Hon. Premier to answer the question.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not at all. I don't know who Mr. Taylor is, I'm sorry, perhaps I should but I don't know, and if anyone else knows who Mr. Taylor is they can perhaps enlighten me.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Well, if the Premier had been in the House yesterday, I . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don't think the Member for Regina Albert Park can be making statements that way. He can ask a question, the Government says they haven't the knowledge of it, then I think the Member should take it up with the Minister directly and not take up the time of this House.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — All right, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do then have another question, a supplementary question that I should like to put. In view of the fact that this disaster is no different, Mr. Speaker, than the Regina flood, we want to know how much compensation this Government is going to pay and when they are going to announce the amount and the terms under which they will pay compensation for their neglect?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I realize the previous Government possibly created a precedent by paying compensation to the Regina flood victims because of their neglect . . . we are not by any means prepared to admit that there was any neglect on the part of our Government. With respect to whether or not any compensation will be paid, Members will be interested to know that the Minister of Agriculture is touring the infested areas, he has given me a report this morning indicating the results of his travels in Shellbrook and the Leask and Paynton area, in Maidstone and Lloydminster area, in the North Battleford area, and in the Prince Albert area. He has not yet been in the east part of the province from where he has merely received reports by telephone. When we have had an opportunity to fully assess the situation, both from reports and from the personal observations of the Minister and his staff, Government policy will be announced.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, when we prove the neglect of this Government will you ask the resignation of the Minister . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I think the Hon. Member is trying to extend the privilege of questions on Orders of the Day and I don't think we can permit that.

### **Bertha Army Worms — Lannate Poisoning**

**Mr. E.F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) and in view of the fact that many farmers are being hospitalized in Northern Saskatchewan as a result of Lannate poisoning, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture said yesterday that Lannate was in the experimental stage — and I have a transcript, if you would like me to quote — and Lannate of course is a deadly poison which may be fatal to any vertebrate which should ingest it, and in view of the fact that spraying is being done by aircraft and therefore relatively uncontrollable with drift, I should like to know what steps are being taken to protect the general public, including the farmers, and I'd like to know what steps are being taken or checks are being made on livestock, and I should like to know what harmful effects this is having on the birds and wildlife and general ecology of the province?

**Hon. W.E. Smishek** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Hon. Member did ask the question because I expected that that question would likely come up this morning.

I want to inform the House that our Department, as soon as we were informed that Lannate was going to be used, we checked with the Department of Agriculture as to their information on what the content of the chemical is; we checked with the Federal authorities; we received reports from the Federal Government as well and the best information that they had. Up until now there have been six persons who have been hospitalized; there have been seven others who have been admitted for out-patient treatment in the hospitals. Our officials in the Public Health Department are working with all the agricultural people in the regions passing on the information. We have contacted all the doctors in the province giving them a report as to what might be the effects of this chemical in case people come in contact with it, and all the entire medical profession has been alerted as to the best possible treatment and the Department is certainly and completely on top of the problem. No doubt the Hon. Member might have read the report in the paper last night which the Occupational Health Branch of the Department had issued as to the hazards. Now it is true that there is a danger to wildlife. Also, farmers are being asked wherever the spraying area is to make sure the cattle are kept away from the nearest areas. In the case of wildlife, we hope that there is going to be a minimum amount of damage to wildlife and as the Hon. Member knows that in the fields that are being sprayed there really isn't very much wildlife.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer** (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have been looking at the situation and there is no residual effect known at this time

to be present in the poison Lannate or the spray Lannate. Resource people tell me that there is no residual effect. However, if birds were to be right directly in or under the spray, there could be some damage as the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) has said, to livestock and people. It's mainly by inhalation as I understand it and there's very little danger of poison through ingestion. There are further studies being made as to what effect, immediate effect, there will be on birds if they eat the poisoned worms, but the experts say, who have experience with it, that there is very little evidence at this time. But I want to say at this time I see very little difference that if there is residual effect from this that this poison should not be treated any differently from DDT. It is no different, in my opinion, for the agricultural society to pollute any area of Saskatchewan, than it is for an industry and if danger is discovered, I think we are going to have to continue to look for new methods of combatting this so-called Bertha army worm. I also understand that there is some serious question as to whether this actually is a Bertha army worm or a type of beet worm from the United States.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Dirty Yankees!

**Mr. Kramer:** — No, seriously, there is a question these are not a true Bertha army worm that are up in our country; they are tri-colored, four-colored insect and they are not the true Bertha army worm.

### THIRD READINGS

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved third reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act respecting the Protection of Farm Property** be now read the third time.

#### YEAS — 36

##### Messieurs

Blakeney	Michayluk	Cody
Brockelbank	Meakes	Gross
Byers	Whelan	Feduniak
Wood	Brown	Mostoway
Smishek	Kwasnica	Comer
Romanow	Carlson	Rolfes
Snyder	Tchorzewski	Lange
Kowalchuk	Richards	Hanson
Baker	Owens	Oliver
Thibault	Taylor	Feschuk
Robbins	Faris	Kaeding
Pepper	Cowley	Flasch

#### NAYS — 12

##### Messieurs

Steuart	McIsaac	McPherson
Coupland	Loken	Lane
Gardner	Weatherald	MacDonald
Boldt	MacLeod	(Moose Jaw North)
MacDonald (Milestone)		

## MOTIONS

### Committee on Family Farm Protection Act

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the motion which is on the Order Paper has been there for sometime. Members will be familiar with its text. Members will also be familiar with the content of it since it has been a part of the debate with respect to The Family Farm Protection Act. The resolution essentially proposes that a Special Committee consisting of eight Members enquire into two particular areas. Firstly, the operation of The Family Farm Protection Act; and secondly, into the extension of the Crop Insurance Program. I think that the possibilities of problems with respect to The Family Farm Protection Act have been adequately aired in the House and I don't need to go over that ground. With respect to the desirability of extending the Crop Insurance Program, I think all Hon. Members will agree the proposed Federal action in discontinuing the Prairie Farm Assistance Act brings to a head the need to review our Crop Insurance Program. I believe that the present difficulties with respect to the Bertha army worm and the real concerns as to whether the existing Crop Insurance Program will cover much of the loss likely to be sustained heightens the concern which all of us feel with respect to whether or not our Crop Insurance Program is adequate. It is not a perfectly simple thing to know what type of a crop insurance program is desirable for Saskatchewan. It is easy to devise one for one area which doesn't fit another area. I think it is a good topic which a Legislative Committee should consider; they can hear representations from various areas particularly with respect to the different crops which need to be covered and the problems of protection by insurance against the various hazards.

In short, I think the resolution to set up the Committee will be useful and I think the Committee can do exceedingly useful work.

My colleague, the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) proposes to move an amendment to the resolution wherein instead of the words "consisting of eight Members to be named at a later date," the eight Members will be named, Messer, Kowalchuk, Engel, Gardner, Kaeding, Lange, Owens, Weatherald and Whelan, which names have been arrived at by the usual channels. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I will move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood):

That a Special Committee consisting of eight members, to be named at a later date, be appointed and directed to hear representations respecting the effectiveness of The Family Farm Protection Act and to make recommendations thereon;

And, to inquire into the needs of Saskatchewan farmers with respect to the extension of the Crop Insurance Program in view of the proposed discontinuation of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and to make recommendations thereon;

And that such Committee will have power to sit during the intersessional period and during any Legislative Session, except when the Assembly is sitting;

And that such Committee will have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public, and for this purpose to hold meetings away from the seat of Government in order that the fullest representations may be received without unduly inconveniencing those desiring to be heard;

And that this Special Committee be further instructed to submit its final report to the Assembly with all convenient speed.

Seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood, I so move.

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move an amendment, seconded by my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Byers:

That the words "eight members, to be named at a later date," be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Messrs. Kowalchuk, Engel, Gardner, Kaeding, Lange, Owens, Weatherald and Whelan.

**Mr. K. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to speak very briefly to the fact that the other day I mentioned to the House that I thought the formula "one-half plus one to the Government" was an appropriate formula for these important committees. I should regard this as an important committee and in any event, five Government Members and three Opposition Members would, in my judgment, have been appropriate. I should like to record my disappointment that it is set at six and two. I don't think that is fair and it isn't in line with what occurred apparently the last time an important committee was appointed when the other Government was in power. Having said that, however, I believe there was some agreement on this point and I won't press it further. But I am disappointed in the makeup of the committee.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Personnel of Committee on Review of Liquor Regulations**

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, earlier this Session we passed a motion with respect to setting up a Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations and I should ask leave of the Assembly to introduce a motion naming the personnel of the Committee, and with your indulgence I shall read the motion and then ask for leave.

That the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan, appointed on August 9, 1971, be composed of the following Members: Messrs. Brockelbank, Brown, Faris, Feduniak, Feschuk, Gardner, Lange, Kwasnica, MacDonald (Milestone), McIsaac, McPherson and Whelan.

Seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, I so move.

Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like also leave of the Assembly to move another motion and I shall read the motion and ask for leave if I may:

That when this Assembly do adjourn at the end of the sitting of the day on which this motion is adopted it shall stand adjourned to a date set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government and that Mr. Speaker shall give each Member seven clear days notice by wire and registered mail of such date.

If I have leave I'll speak to it.

Mr. Speaker, I have already advised the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) of the contents of this. This has the effect of adjourning the Assembly so that when we adjourn on the day we adopt this motion and if we adopt it now it will be when we adjourn today. We stand adjourned until Mr. Speaker calls the House together on seven days' notice. We, the Government, are not sure whether or not it will be necessary to convene a brief session in November. There is some tax legislation which is possible. The Federal Government is making certain tax moves which may require compensating tax legislation. Members may be aware that our five-year tax agreement with the Federal Government expires on March 31st next year. It may not be possible. They also will be aware that the Federal Government proposes to withdraw from the Estate Tax field effective January 1st next. There are still discussions as to how this is going to be dealt with the various provinces. This may necessitate being called together for a day or two. I should not anticipate a long session, but we all know that that depends less on the nature of the business offered, and more on the particular state in which the Liberal leadership contest ends.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But leaving that aside I hope that I have explained the motion.

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READING

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — **An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us is an Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970. I may say that prior to 1963 The City Act provided a council with the authority to pass a by-law selecting certain garages and filling stations, through a plan of rotation, that could stay open during a period when all garages and filling stations were otherwise required to close.

In the fall of 1962, the Government received a report from a committee representative of various interested groups which had been created to deal with desirable changes in the city,

town and village acts, particularly those associated with the closing of shops.

One of the recommendations contained in that report suggested a revision of garage and service station regulations. The recommendation did not indicate what result the revision would accomplish. And as the employees were protected by applicable labor laws, the Department proposed that the legislation exempt garages, filling stations and gas pumps, from the closing of shop restriction and allow the operators of such businesses the privilege of establishing their own hours. Apparently the absence of this provision, from the statute, has not caused any undue hardship until recently when a problem developed in the City of Moose Jaw.

The Moose Jaw Service Station Association has forwarded a brief to the Government requesting that a provision allowing designated garages and filling stations to remain open under a plan of rotation, be reinserted in The Urban Municipality Act. The problem in the City of Moose Jaw is unique because of the filling stations located adjacent to Highway No. 1. Some of these filling stations are situated outside the city limits and are not controlled by a city by-law.

The Moose Jaw Service Station Association agrees that it would create hardship on those stations along No. 1 Highway, within the city limits, if they were required to close while those outside were able to remain open. And the Association also agrees this proposed rotation system should not include those filling stations.

The amendment proposed by this Bill will permit an Urban Municipal Council to pass a by-law requiring designated garage, filling stations and gas pumps to close when other shops are closed and select, through a plan of rotation, certain of these designated garages, filling stations and gas pumps for gasoline, lubricating oil and grease to be sold during that period. Tires or other articles required for immediate use by reasons of an emergency are exempt from sales under the present shop closing provision of the Act, Section 184.

This, Mr. Speaker, is permissive legislation and provides local governments with the authority to regulate closing of these shops according to local governments. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in the Bill that is before the House, it does not make provision for the designation of certain filling stations which would not fulfil the situation as far as the City of Moose Jaw is concerned at the present time. There has been an amendment, at least given to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), a House amendment, which I will be prepared to move in committee, which will take care of the situation.

**Mr. D. MacDonald** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment very briefly.

The City of Moose Jaw, until a year or so ago, did have a by-law regulating a rotation plan. This was taken to the courts and since that time the rotation system has not been in effect. The only single problem — and I hope this by-law will allow for it — for the designating of two types, or two zones, of filling stations within the city.

To be workable, the city in its by-law, must be able to establish zones requiring different hours of opening in each

zone. And as long as the legal people feel this by-law will permit this, then I certainly find it in order and I think I speak for the Opposition in supporting this Bill.

**Hon. G.T. Snyder** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, just a very few words in support of this Bill.

I, for another reason, didn't want to miss the opportunity to find myself in agreement with the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) on this occasion. I think the import of the Bill is such that it, indeed, deserves the support of all Members of the House.

I had the opportunity of speaking with the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy) during the last session of the Legislature before the change of Government. I believe at that time the Government was receptive to the idea except for the fact that insufficient time was available.

I want to commend the Minister for making the extra effort to bring this Bill before the Legislature and make it possible during this short sitting. And, perhaps, Members opposite have performed a bit of a service by prolonging the Session in order that it was possible to have some of this archaic situation remedied in the City of Moose Jaw with respect to the opening and closing hours of service stations.

I think the Bill goes a long way towards correcting an archaic situation and I would recommend it to all Members of the House.

**Mr. Wood:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the former Minister declined to bring this in earlier because he felt there should be more discussion with the organizations which have been contacted in the first place, when this shop-closing legislation was developed in 1962 and made law in 1963.

I would say that I feel the same is true now that it is very desirable that the organizations involved be consulted in regard to this Bill. My Deputy is, as of today, sending a letter to, I think, about ten organizations which were contacted in the first place, bringing to their attention the amendment being made and asking their comments, with the statement that we will be quite prepared to consider this at a later session if they find it is not desirable in any way. Because it is a rather a small pebble into a pond, it may spread and carry a lot of other implications with it. So we are having consultation with these people in this regard.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

### ROYAL ASSENT

At 5:25 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

### ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE — NOT PROROGATION

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, before I move this House now adjourn, I should remind Hon. Members that once the House does adjourn,

then we shall stand adjourned until the call of the Chair, so it has the effect of prorogation. If there is any other item of business, I will defer, but I know of none other than the Private Members' Motions, which I understand the arrangement is that they will stay on the Order Paper until we next convene.

With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

At 5:27 o'clock p.m. the Assembly adjourned on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney to the call of the Chair, pursuant to Order made this day.