

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**34th Day**

**Thursday, April 29, 1976.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. H. H. Baker** (Regina Victoria) I am very pleased to introduce a large number of students here this afternoon who come from two schools in my constituency, Regina Victoria. In the west gallery are 32 students from Thomson School, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Forrest and Mr. Sauer. In the Speaker's Gallery we have the St. Augustine School with 70 students, accompanied by Mr. Didyk and Mrs. Vanderinde.

I am very pleased to greet them here this afternoon. Thomson School was my home district school for my daughter at one time, and St. Augustine School has been very close to where I have lived for a good number of years. They are here to share the proceedings with us this afternoon. I wish them a pleasant and fruitful stay, and again, welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. E. B. Shillington** (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the Hon. Member for Regina Victoria in welcoming both groups of students to the Legislative Assembly and in particular the students from Thomson School. It is right on the eastern boundary of my constituency. I hope they have an interesting and useful day.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. E. L. Cowley** (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly a group of 42 Grade Six students from Delisle Elementary School. They are here this afternoon to watch the proceedings in the Legislative Assembly.

I want to wish them a pleasant stay in the Legislature. I hope they enjoy the proceedings and I would like to point out to the House that Delisle, of course, is not only in the Biggar constituency, but in the heart of the potash belt as well.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Nurses Strike — Hospitals Affected**

**Mr. D. G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like

to direct a question to the Minister of Health. I might welcome him back first. I know I can't catch him up on what has been happening in the mess we are in but I will ask a question.

Have you been informed that, the word has been used that there are only six hospitals that have been affected by the Nurses' strike, would the Minister inform us if indeed that is true? Would he inform us if the six hospitals are the largest hospitals, the ones in Regina and the ones in Saskatoon; and would he inform us in a rough way, not just exactly that is, but roughly, what percentage of the beds in the province this would affect — 60 per cent, 70 per cent, 80 per cent? I won't hold him to an exact percentage, but I am sure he would know close enough to be reasonably accurate. Where is the strike in effect now and what percentage of the beds of the province would be involved in the strike?

**Hon. W. A. Robbins** (Minister of Health): — The strike is effective in the six large hospitals of Saskatoon and Regina. I can't give you the exact figure or even a reasonably accurate figure in terms of percentage of beds, but six hospitals out of 134 in the province. Obviously the ones in Saskatoon and Regina are the larger hospitals, some of them would have up to 300 or 400 beds. I will get that information for you.

**Mr. Steuart:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The six hospitals that are affected, would the Minister agree, are those hospitals where the most serious operations are done and those hospitals with the largest waiting lists? Would the Minister agree that the waiting lists in those hospitals, in normal times, would amount to well over 5,000 or 6,000 people? Would he also agree that whether it is 5,000 or 6,000 or 4,000 or 5,000, it is the hospitals affected with by far the largest waiting lists? Would he also inform the House if he is prepared now that he is back to sit down with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and make available to them the sums necessary to settle this strike that is growing in importance and in disaster every day, before irreparable harm is done to our hospital plan and to the health of the people?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — I heard a radio report today at noon, Dr. Baergen of the Saskatchewan Medical Association, who said that all of the emergencies were being looked after throughout the province and that any claims that people were dying, or suffering very severe problems in relation to that situation, are not true.

I just came back from Ottawa, as you are aware, attending the Health Ministers' Conference. I can't tell you exactly the size of the waiting lists in Saskatoon and Regina, but I know that one in Regina taken sometime ago showed some 2,500 persons and when a complete check was made on it they found that was reduced somewhere in the range of 1,500 because a lot of those people would not go to hospital even though they had the opportunity to go at that particular time.

I don't think we should be interfering with the process of negotiations. Negotiations should occur in good faith. We have available to both sides the conciliator from the Department of Labour and we would hope that they will soon get back together again and come to a satisfactory settlement.

**Mr. Steuart:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would agree that in spite of the bland assurance given by Dr. Baergen if in fact he did give it, I wonder if the Minister would agree that those people suffering from cancer, for example, have been sent home, those people suffering from cancer who have been told that they cannot go in and have an operation unless it is an absolute emergency, would he not agree that this goes beyond any bland assurance by Dr. Baergen representing I am sure, not medical opinion, because I have had all kinds of doctors phone me and I'm sure you have had the same number, if you would admit it, expressing their deep concern about people who are not being admitted and the serious health problem they are facing, it could mean their lives. I ask again, would the Minister be prepared, what will it take to get the Minister, on behalf of the Government, now that he is back home facing his responsibilities, what will it take, what kind of a disaster will it take for him to sit down with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and make the funds available that you're not making available now? Quit hiding behind this, because there is a crisis here, what is it going to take to get you to face your responsibilities and put the money on the table so they can settle this strike?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, we have told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition before that there is more than \$27 million available to the Hospital Services Plan this year than was available last year and that is not a severe cut back. It is an attempt to slow the escalation, admittedly. The assumption that people are going to be dying off in droves, etc., are obviously going to have to be dependent upon doctors' advice and this advice will get him to the Saskatchewan Medical Association. We are not saying that it is not a difficult situation, it obviously is. But it is obviously a highly emotional situation in cases like this and that is understandable too. I suggest to you that every province in Canada is faced with the same difficulties in terms of the escalation of health costs and that is one of the reasons we were in Ottawa at the Health Conference which was recently held. And if you think the situation is much different here than it is in other places, you are wrong.

**Mr. J. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle):** — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Will the Government of Saskatchewan now reconsider and re-institute the \$72 medical care premium to guarantee that the people of Saskatchewan have much shortened waiting lists for surgery of all kinds including elective, to guarantee that the anesthetists of this province have adequate salaries and are no longer leaving the province?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Robbins:** — I can't guarantee what the Government might do in

relation to health premiums. That's something we'll have to look at in the future. I might point out that the total revenue flow for health revenue premiums was some \$15 million a year, the increase and the requests through the Department this year are in excess of \$100 million a year.

### **Social Services Willing to Pay More for Nurses**

**Mr. R. L. Collver** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — A supplementary question to the Attorney General, or to the Minister of Social Services, or to the Minister of Health, whichever one wants to deal with it.

In the light of the cool light of day today and having had an opportunity I am sure to read the advertisement placed in the Regina Leader-Post, April 24, in which the Department of Social Services advertises for, and I quote:

Candidates will have professional nursing experience and be eligible for registration as general or psychiatric nurses.

And in which advertisement clearly outlines that the Department of Social Services is prepared to pay registered nurses considerably more for the Department of Social Services, with the same level of experience, than working in the acute bed hospitals. Is the Minister of Social Services, or the Attorney General, or the Minister of Health, prepared to answer my question of yesterday?

**Hon. W. E. Smishek** (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, Yes, I have looked into the newspaper advertisement. The Hon. Member will likely have noticed that it is a Nurse II position paid at an annual salary range of \$12,120 to \$14,100, the top rate is achieved after five years of service. There is also a Nurse I position in those institutions and the monthly rate is \$938 to \$1,089. We are really not comparing completely the same jobs, partly they are. We recognize that in case of general duty nurses, they do some supervision of the lay employees. But the Hon. Member will have also noticed that it's in a chronic care facility and nursing home ranging from Level I to Level IV care. Based on the collective bargaining structure, in these institutions there are two levels of nurses. The Hon. Member is probably also aware that in the case of hospitals there are general duty nurses, as well as nurses who have supervisory responsibilities and their rates are higher. So I don't think that you can compare these as identical jobs. In the case of Nurse I position of \$938, that would compare to a general duty nurse where the offer now is \$966 on a basic starting rate.

**Mr. Collver:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that none of the quotes are mentioned that he just mentioned in his answer, none of the stipulations for this particular job are mentioned in this advertisement. Would the Minister not agree that it was particularly inappropriate for the Government of Saskatchewan to advertise for this kind of position which the nurses could feel that they

could have applied for without the qualifications mentioned by the Minister just at the time when negotiations are very heated?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I have got a copy of the advertisement that he gave me, it is dated Saturday, April 24, the day that the nurses strike occurred. I am sure the newspaper advertisement was arranged for and placed probably several days before being printed. I don't see anything wrong with it. Certainly the information, I am sure, is available to the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses, they know as a bargaining agent what the rates are in the case of Government institutions and nursing homes. I am sure that information is available to them, that the information is public. Department of Labour collects all the collective bargaining agreements and makes them available to people.

I think perhaps the Hon. Member is trying to make something out of a situation that doesn't exist. These are practical rates.

**Mr. Collver:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The point made by the Minister in his answer is exactly what I was leading to yesterday. That the collective bargaining structure within the Department of Social Services and in the Level I to IV homes is considerably different than the collective bargaining structure in the acute bed hospitals. The question is again: is it the Government of Saskatchewan's intention to inform the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses that if they were Members of this other union they would get a better collective bargaining agreement?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is obviously completely missing the point. In a case of Nurse I working in either a psychic centre or one of the chronic care institutions, the starting rate is \$938 and it goes up to \$1,089 after five years. The offers that have been made to the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses for similar positions, the offer made by the Hospital Association, is higher than what the settlement with the SGEA has been.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Next question.

### **C. P. Transport Prohibited From Using Highways**

**Mr. J. G. Lane** (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Transportation. News reports indicate today that the Highway Traffic Board will be prohibiting CP Transport from using the highways of the Province of Saskatchewan. Is it the Government's intention, and will the Government cancel all functions to be held in the Hotel Saskatchewan, or any CP facility? will the Government also cancel any contracts that any Government department or agency may have with CP Express, as opposed to CP Transport?

**Hon. G. MacMurchy** (Minister in Charge of Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, I have planned to make a report to the Assembly under Ministerial Statements regarding the situation

with CP. In fact, I provided a copy of my statement to the Hon. Member who raised the question and to Members on the Conservative side so they could comment on the statement.

To his first question, no, we do not have those plans.

**Mr. Lane:** — Would the Minister not admit that it would be a fairly consistent policy to undertake for the Government opposite to not only take action with CP Transport, but to take action with CP itself for the disdain in which it holds the people of Saskatchewan with its actions. My supplementary, will the Government opposite also consider stopping the use of CP Telecommunications if possible and also CP Telex outlets and facilities and CP Broadband Data Communications Network?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the Hon. Member's questions.

**Mr. Lane:** — Further supplementary. Can the Minister explain why an MLA phoning your office with regard to CP Transport is required to go only to your Executive Assistant and the Highway Traffic Board is under instructions not to talk to Opposition MLAs during this particular CP situation. Can you tell us why, we in the Opposition, are being stonewalled from discussing the matter with the Highway Traffic Board?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not given any instructions to that effect whatsoever.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Final supplementary.

**Mr. Lane:** — Would the Minister then advise me why the Highway Traffic Board has told me that if I have questions on CP that they must go to either yourself or to Mr. Cam Cooper?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — I will take notice of that questions.

### **Adult Education Employees Being Fired**

**Mr. G. Penner** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I was going to direct to the Minister of Education, in his absence I shall direct it to the Attorney General, as Deputy Premier, or possibly to the former Minister of Education. Could you tell me why it is that the Department of Continuing Education has announced that some 60 odd employees at Kelsey, Wascana and Moose Jaw, involved in adult education, are being fired effective June 30?

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Deputy Premier): — I will take notice.

**Mr. Penner:** — I wonder if the Attorney General, in taking notice of that, would also indicate then, or if I could ask him whether or not the reason for that is a very arbitrary decision taken by Cabinet that the preliminary budget for Continuing Education was to be cut by eight per cent and

without so much as a by your leave, 60 some odd people had their positions cut?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice.

### **Critical Situation Exists in Ambulance Service in Rural Saskatchewan**

**Mr. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Health. Has the Minister been informed of the critical situation that currently exists in the ambulance services to rural Saskatchewan? I am referring here, Mr. Minister, to the cost involved in bringing an ambulance to a rural hospital in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, we are getting a fair bit of correspondence from people indicating that the charges for ambulance services are skyrocketing. We have a study going on on this particular subject with the hope that we can get some kind of standardization in ambulance services, and some assistance perhaps to some ambulance operators who are having grave difficulties. We are finding rates that are climbing from \$25 and \$35 levels up to \$110 level.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister saying they are currently studying it. In your current studies, Mr. Minister, are you considering help to local communities to establish their own ambulance services?

**Mr. Robbins:** — I'm sure that's one of the things that is being looked at.

### **Five Per Cent Cut Back in Patient Days**

**Mr. E. F. A. Merchant** (Regina Wascana): — May I direct a question to the Minister of Health to clarify a question that I asked of the Minister of Finance yesterday, and well, I didn't think the question required clarification, but perhaps the answer does. I wonder if the Minister of Health would inform the House whether it is correct that as of July 1, 1976, all of the hospitals in the province and principally the large hospitals, have been told that they must make a further five per cent cut back in the number of patient days, that there is a further cut back in patient days and staff which will not come into effect until the 1st of July of this year?

**Mr. Robbins:** — I'll take that as notice.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, did I hear one of the Treasury Benches say that that hasn't been announced?

**An Hon. Member:** — That's what you heard, yes.

**Mr. Merchant:** — That's what I heard. Might I, as a supplementary, ask the Minister if it's not true that the hospitals have been

informed and this House hasn't been informed? That they have been told that there will be a further five per cent cut back as of the 1st of July of this year and at the University Hospital, for instance, it will mean a further firing of 40 people and they've already fired 90 to date?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Discussions are being carried on by SHSP and the hospitals.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether the discussions have indicated that there is to be a cut back of five per cent as of the 1st of July and I wonder if the Minister would say whether the Government has told SHSP and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association that they must bring in this cut back by the 1st of July?

**Mr. Robbins:** — We've given instructions to hospitals that we have to get control of escalating health costs, the same as all other provinces have done and that's the meat of the problem.

### **Time Limit on Rental Co-operatives**

**Mr. L. W. Birkbeck** (Moosomin): — Question for the Minister responsible for Co-operation and Co-operative Development, or the Minister responsible for Sask Housing Corporation. With regards to your continuing rental co-operatives, my question would be: is there any time limit which a member of a said co-op formed under this program, is required to stay in the home or to live in the home that he builds?

**Hon. E. G. Shillington** (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development): — I'll have to take notice of the question.

### **Proposed Uranium Refinery**

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. The Minister will recall on Friday last I asked a question about his attendance at a seminar in Saskatoon on the weekend of which one of the matters to be discussed was the proposed uranium refinery in Saskatoon. The Minister, at the time, indicated that he was not going to that seminar. I understand later that he received instructions that he was going. I assume he went, and my question to the Minister is: assuming that he was there representing the Government of Saskatchewan, what position did he take on behalf of the Government in connection with this proposed uranium refinery? That is, is the Government in favor of it being located in Saskatoon, or is it not?

**Mr. Robbins:** — I was engaged in a debate with a person from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and myself on one side and two persons from the environmental society on the other side, in relation to the energy problem. The questions came up with respect to uranium. I could not answer the questions with



respect to whether or not any decision had been made because I have never been in Cabinet at any time that that matter has been discussed.

**Mr. Malone:** — Has the Cabinet discussed the matter and if so, are you aware of the decision that they came to?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Not to my knowledge.

**Mr. Malone:** — Is the Government intending on taking the matter up with interested parties such as the city council of Saskatoon, environmental agencies in Saskatoon, the people of Saskatoon, and so on, and coming to some decision as to whether the Government will support this uranium refinery being established in Saskatoon?

**Mr. Robbins:** — I presume if they proceed on that line, they will, yes.

### **War on Drug Pushers**

**Mr. R. A. Larter** (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General.

The parents of Estevan, and I believe all the cities in Saskatchewan, are very concerned with the drugs that are readily available around high schools, and even junior highs and in some cases even the public schools. Is the Attorney General, or will the Attorney General declare an all out war on these drug pushers, as most of the students know the pushers, as you know?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, I believe, is somewhat (I'm trying to pick the correct word and I can't), but a little bit off base, if I can put it in that sense, in directing the question to me, because the question of enforcement of The Food and Drug Act and The Narcotics Control Act are exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice, Canada, under the direction of the RCMP. We don't handle the prosecutions. We don't handle the policies with respect to the prosecutions.

I believe, as Attorney General, that use of drugs is bad. The police forces have, as far as I'm concerned, a standing feeling from our Department that wherever we can help we will, although we don't count very much in this area, they are to enforce the law as fully as they can.

**Mr. Larter:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney General urge or give direction to the federal authorities on this matter? It is a real concern to parents in our cities and I think your direction would carry some weight.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for having that much confidence in me and if my counterparts federally will listen to me, I can assure the Hon. Member that this has been on the agenda of Attorney General's conferences in the

past and we have all expressed, including myself, our concern about the problem. I think, by and large, the RCMP are doing a very good job and I think, by and large, while I don't agree with the constitutional basis of the federal power, that's another matter, I believe the Federal Government is doing as good a job as can be under the circumstances.

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General made any representations to the Minister of Justice or the Federal Government in connection with prosecutions under the Narcotic Control Act and the Food and Drug Act and if so, are those representations to the effect that these prosecutions should be under the Attorneys General of the provinces, rather than under the Department of Justice?

**Mr. Romanow:** — The answer is yes, we have made those representations as stated by the Hon. Member for Lakeview.

### **Re-instituting Medicare Premiums**

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek). In light of the surprising indication from the Minister of Health, that the Department is reviewing or considering the matter of medicare premiums being re-instituted, is the Government intending to re-institute the medicare premiums and if so, when is the Government going to re-institute medicare premiums?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, our budget has been announced and certainly in the next year or for the year 1976 there are no intentions of having any medical or hospital premiums.

**Mr. Lane:** — Further supplementary.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Final!

**Mr. Lane:** — In the year 1977, is it the Government's intention to admit that it made a bad mistake in the field of health and re-institute . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next supplementary.

**Mr. Malone:** — Has the Government considered reintroducing medicare premiums for the year 1977, '78 and so on?

**Mr. Smishek:** — No, Mr. Speaker.

## **STATEMENTS**

### **C. P. Transport**

**Hon. G. MacMurchy** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, all Members are aware that Canadian Pacific is seeking to abandon most of its rural truck routes in this province. Effective 6:00 a.m., April 28, CP transport

April 29, 1976

has placed an embargo on all shipments in Saskatchewan.

I wish to advise the Assembly that the Highway Traffic Board has decided that it will suspend Canadian Pacific's running rights on all provincial highways.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Effective 12:01 a.m. May 1. In effect, CP's operating authority for 1976-77 has been withdrawn, because the company's abandonment of intra-province routes contravenes its licences and in the board's view, makes it impossible for CP transport to properly fulfil its extra provincial operating authorities.

A hearing at which CP may show cause why its 1976-77 authorities should not be cancelled is scheduled for May 17.

The May 1st date allows CP transport to empty its trucks and park them.

Any breach of the board's decision after May 1 will result in CP transport being charged and where necessary trucks may be seized and impounded.

Mr. Speaker, it is reported that Canadian Pacific may challenge the province's rights to suspend their running rights. We believe the company has no valid grounds on which to base such a challenge. The Federal Government has delegated the right to regulate intra-provincial trucking to the provinces. We believe our authority is sound and will be undermined only if Ottawa yields to pressure to revoke it.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Hon. Otto Lang asking for a commitment that his government will support our efforts. I have written him as follows and I've telexed the letter, so that he will have it by this time.

I'm writing to seek a commitment from you that the Federal Government will support Saskatchewan in its effort to secure service guarantees to our communities. As you know, Canadian Pacific has been seeking provincial consent for it to abandon truck service to most rural communities. We've resisted this abandonment and have asked CP transport to apply for renewed running authorities to maintain service until hearings are held and guarantees of continued recognition of the service obligations are received.

In response CP have placed an embargo on shipments on April 28. Our Highway Traffic Board has subsequently advised that it will suspend CP's rights to operate on provincial highways effective May 1.

I would request the commitment that the federal authorities not yield to pressure to revoke the province's right to regulate intra-provincial trucking, as delegated under the National Transportation Act.

I would also request a commitment that your government will support our effort to ensure that Canadian Pacific is not allowed to avoid its service obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I've also sent a telex message today to the Canadian Transport Commission advising of the situation here. Because of CP Transport's embargo, 25 communities to which they are obliged to provide service are now without service. I have asked the Canadian Transport Commission to require Canadian Pacific to restore service by rail to these centres.

Mr. Speaker, in the interim preparations have been made to offer emergency service. Local truckers may receive trip permits from the Highway Traffic Board to move freight on routes which are abandoned. We will do all in our power to ensure traffic continues to move and a minimum service is maintained.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister for supplying a copy of the statement. I might add that when I asked the questions before Orders of the Day, in the oral question period, it was based on news reports this morning and not on your statement.

Some matters come to mind. First of all, we believe that the actions of the CP Transport in this regard show a complete disregard for the people of this province. There is no doubt that this is at least a two step operation by the Canadian Pacific to withdraw transportation services from the Province of Saskatchewan. Obviously, we feel too, that the Provincial Government is not blameless. They have been sitting on this matter since last, I believe, September, and failed to advise the local communities of the situation that existed so that alternate means of transportation could be obtained.

I'm a little surprised, quite frankly, at the political position that the Minister has taken in his statement. On the one hand he says, point blank, that the Government has the power. I question that the Government has the power and I agree with your actions . . . 'has the power to stop the CP Transport from, or suspending its running rights on all provincial highways'. Then on the other hand it says, we want Ottawa to back us. Now, either you are right or you are not right, Mr. Premier, and you can't have it both ways. If you are right in your position, then frankly I don't care and you shouldn't care what Ottawa does, and should enforce the rights on behalf of the people of this province and you don't have to go crying to Ottawa and I think frankly that that was unnecessary.

I note too, that the Minister says in his letter to the Minister of Transport for Canada, that CP must not be allowed to avoid its service obligations. I think that the other side of the coin is that in other areas to put pressure on CP, that the Government of Saskatchewan, as I asked in the question period today, should stop using the facilities of the Hotel Saskatchewan in the Province of Saskatchewan. It should stop using CP Express; it should stop using DEKA Transport, a subsidiary of CP; it should stop using the Broadband Data Communication facilities of CP because the Government has a great deal of economic clout in that regard. The Government should also immediately oppose the application by CP Air for service to the city of Regina, because that will be a lucrative run for CP and the Government opposite has admitted it, previously the Government had supported it. If the CP is

not going to do its duties to the people of Saskatchewan, I say it's incumbent upon the Government opposite to make sure that the CP makes no more money off the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Speaker, again I should like to thank the Minister for supplying this statement in advance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think there is some fault laying with the benches opposite in giving in to the current critical situation that we are in today. I'm quite sure that the Government had time to enter into negotiations and in fact get some specific commitments before the deadline of April 30.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that enough time was provided that this perhaps could have turned out to be a blessing in some parts of Saskatchewan, in that the Government could have had ample opportunity, through the Highway Traffic Board, to inform areas that the CP was considering withdrawing services, so that we could have had an extension of existing freight lines in Saskatchewan, hiring Saskatchewan people and providing employment to Saskatchewan people. Now I think the Government, although I'm not in any way sympathetic with Canadian Pacific, not in any way, and I want to make that abundantly clear, I think the Government has bungled this situation terribly, by not dealing with the matter when it was first announced by CP and if they had done so we would not be in the critical situation that we are today.

#### **Items Withdrawn From Blue Paper**

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the House, the Members and yourself, for just a brief moment. This may be irregular but, Mr. Speaker, I should like in a moment to move a motion respecting extended hours of sitting but before I do I should like to just make a brief statement in explanation.

As the House will know, and as the press will know, the Government introduced a number of Bills a few days ago which I think it is safe to say that the Opposition parties, both the Liberals and the Conservatives, at the time they were introduced, objected to them. In our judgment at the time, we felt and in fact we still do feel, that these Bills are important for passage, many of them are, and we would hope that sooner or later, indeed, the House will see fit to pass them. But I think that some of the points made by the Members opposite, the official Opposition in particular, objected to the matter and I think they have some grounds for objection. In fact, I can see that they did have merit to them. I found the opportunity to consider this with my colleagues in Cabinet, if we could accommodate the business of the House to suit the Conservatives and the Liberals, and the Government objectives. What I would like to say is that there will be some Bills that we will not be proceeding with at this particular stage. If the Members would turn to their Blues, I should like to advise the House that we will not be introducing under "Introduction of Bills", Item No. 1, Item No. 2 and Item No. 3. On "Second Readings", page 3, we will not be further proceeding with Item No. 1, Item No. 2, Item No. 3, Item No. 8, Item No. 10 and

Item No. 13 — The Snowmobile Act, 1975.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say publicly, and on the record, that it would be the Government's intention when the House reconvenes in the fall to pass at least The Snowmobile Act, because we will be heading into a winter season at that time and would hope also to pass The Vehicles Act, including the safety seat belt item. This will give lots of time for implementation and I would like to communicate to the public that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with both Bills, but not at this Session. But we will be moving for passage of them at the earliest opportunity and in particular these two in the fall, because of the season. I think this will give the Opposition the time to consider the Bills and to hear their constituents' views on them and will give the Government some time as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I should like to apologize to the Members of the House for creating this inconvenience. I hope that what we can do with this motion of extended hours is, frankly, roll up our sleeves in the next several days tackle and complete the Estimates and the Bills and, in effect, achieve some of the various objectives that all of us here have articulated at some stage or another.

## MOTION

### Extended Sitting Hours

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member Mr. Bowerman (Shellbrook), by leave of the Assembly:

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, May 4, 1976, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:32 o'clock p.m.