

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday, December 19, 1973.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT'S STUDY ON REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONS

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General in the absence of the Provincial Secretary. Can the Attorney General tell me at what stage the Government's study in review of real estate commissions is, and has the Government accepted the final figure of 3 1/2 per cent being the limit on real estate commissions?

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I just simply cannot answer that question for the Hon. Member. I am not personally familiar with it. I will take that question as notice and bring it to the attention of my colleague and see where we go from there.

MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS PICTURE IN ANNUAL REPORT

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). Upon reading the annual report of the Department of Highways, I noticed that the Minister's picture was included in that report twelve times. I should like to ask the Minister for what reason did the Department of Highways feel that it was necessary to go to that extra expense of including your picture twelve times in that report.

HON. E. KRAMER: (Minister of Highways) — This has already been drawn to my attention, Mr. Speaker. The Member is mistaken, I think it is 13 times and I didn't like that because it is an unlucky number. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the staff prepared the report, I had very little to do with it and I admire their good taste.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Just a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister tell me whether the Department has hired a full time photographer to follow the Minister around in his travels and if he could tell me as well on what provincial highway was it that he caught that fish?

MR. KRAMER: — That fish? Well, I didn't catch that fish at all. That was about at mile 103, there was a native chap camped there trapping and fishing and he showed us this big trout. The photographer, who happened to be non-professional, took a

picture. I thought it was a good idea to let folks know what kind of good fishing was being opened up by the new highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

POSSIBLE EXPANSION BY SIMPSON TIMBER CO.

MR. H.E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowerman), I wonder if we could ask the Premier, in view of the announced \$30 million development by Simpson Timber Company in the Province of Alberta, has the Government made any decision to allow Simpson Timber to make their \$5 million expansion here in Saskatchewan to provide jobs for people in the North.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — I am simply not able to answer the Hon. Member's question as to precisely the state of negotiations between the Government of Saskatchewan and Simpson Timber Company Ltd., and therefore I am not able to answer the Hon. Member's question, I don't have the information.

MR. COUPLAND: — A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is the Government able to table any new feasibility studies relating to the supply of timber in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan in order to guarantee the company's continuous supply of timber?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, once again I regret that I am unable to say whether there are any, new feasibility studies. I will take that question as notice and I will ask the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources to deal with the matter when he is next in the House.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

THIRD READING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thorson that Bill No. 42 — *an Act respecting the Conservation, Stabilization and Development of Oil and Gas in Saskatchewan* — be now read a third time.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that when last evening we called it 9:30 I had dealt with most of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on this third reading debate and I don't intend to repeat those. Might I just make two points before I take my seat. The first point deals with the need for the acquisition of surface rights and the argument sometimes put forward by Members opposite that that particular action was unnecessary because the method of conservation and control proposed by the Government of Alberta was equally available to us.

May I say again that the proposed method of operations so far as we can judge from the press reports and from the legislation tabled in the Alberta Legislature, the proposed method to be used by the Government of Alberta involves a marketing commission and a marketing commission which will

market petroleum taken from lands which are in a legal sense the property of the Government of Alberta. These lands for the most part will, of course, be under lease but title is held in the name of the Government of Alberta. And again not only from the legislation but also from the press reports it is clear that the Government of Alberta feels that its right to operate the marketing commission in this way depends upon their having legal title, as they do to 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the producing mineral rights in Alberta. We simply do not at the present time have title to 85 per cent or 80 per cent or 75 per cent or 70 per cent or even 65 per cent of the producing petroleum and natural gas rights in this province. Accordingly, unless title to additional mineral lands was acquired the Alberta marketing commission method wouldn't be effective in Saskatchewan. It is simply not possible to control a market effectively if you only control 60 per cent of the product. Accordingly, in order to put ourselves in a position akin to that of Alberta with respect to the ownership of lands, the ownership of mineral rights to lands from which oil and gas is produced, we have acted to acquire title to additional oil and gas rights.

It is really not possible for anyone to argue effectively and logically that we should not have acquired title to those additional mineral lands or oil and gas rights but should have proceeded on the basis of the Alberta marketing commission. At least in my judgement, those are contrary arguments. Accordingly, if people urge upon us the Alberta method of conservation and marketing of our petroleum they should equally support the move which makes that method effective i.e. the acquisition of title to additional mineral lands. It is because we wish to be in a position if the need arises to use the Alberta method that we are taking steps to acquire title to additional mineral lands.

Once again to the people who own the title to those additional mineral lands that we are acquiring we are giving a Royalty Trust Certificate entitling them to the same amount of petroleum from those lands as if they had title. It is not in this case depriving them of any right to barrels of petroleum and natural gas but only depriving them of the bare legal title which at least in the opinion of officials in Alberta is necessary in order to make their marketing commission effective and which would be necessary in order to make our marketing commission effective, should we need to go that route. I have on an earlier occasion indicated why we felt we might need to go that route because it may be that our conservation board will be ineffective from the point of view of giving us effective conservation measures. We know the threat is there based upon the current legal attack on conservation boards or at least on the Potash Conservation Board of Saskatchewan.

Let me make one other point. Members opposite appear to be saying two things with respect to the so-called windfall profits. They appear to be saying that the Government of Saskatchewan should not take the windfall profits from future rises in oil prices for the people of Saskatchewan, that to do so would be confiscation. That is one argument that they make. The other argument that they make is that alternatively we should have acted to do that last September. Members opposite are saying that we should have acted sooner. They said that over and over again and the Leader of the Opposition again repeated that in his Third Reading remarks. I must ask Hon.

Members to articulate just what we should have done sooner. I think the only thing we could have done sooner would have been to apply the additional royalty and the additional mineral tax sooner. That is the very thing which others of their Members are characterizing as confiscation. Now if you ever heard an argument that tried to have it both ways, it's an argument which says that when you take the windfall profits you are confiscating, you should hang your head in shame because of this act of confiscation in this month of December — the Members opposite say, 'hear, hear' — and in any case you should have done it all in September.

That is really the argument they put forward and I think others will appreciate why that argument lacks credibility. If, in fact, they say we should have acted sooner, they should then be expressing their support for the mineral tax, their support for the additional royalty. They should confine their opposition to the other aspects of the Bill but they have not done that. Indeed all we are doing with respect to Imperial Oil is taking their windfall profits. Little else in the Bill affects Imperial Oil and yet they were at pains to point out how this would adversely affect Imperial Oil. And also at pains to point out that we should have done it all in September.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that because of the points which I have made, the fact that there are no leases that have been torn up, contracts that have been varied, no confiscation — unless one is to assert that the level of compensation is so inadequate as to amount to confiscation. If that is their position I wish they would state it. It is not failure to act to recoup windfall profits, but in fact a very responsible Bill doing what Members opposite have in some parts of their speeches urged us to do and not doing the things which they have alleged we have done, with respect to breaking of leases and contracts. It is in fact a Bill which does do all of the things we asserted it would do. It is a Bill which should merit the support of all the people of Saskatchewan, it should in fact merit the support of those Members of the Opposition who are still with us.

I assert that the measure before us should, and I hope, will gain the support of all Members of the House on both sides and I think if Members will follow the consistency of their own arguments they will support this Bill and they will, by supporting this Bill, be indicating that they stand four square on the side of the people of Saskatchewan in the recouping of these profits, four square on the side of the people of Saskatchewan in dealing with people elsewhere in Canada to get a fair return for our resources and still make a contribution to a national energy policy, which we hope will develop into a national development policy which will bring to Saskatchewan and to all of Canada a renewed sense of the unity in this country and a renewed determination to use our resources wherever they may be to provide a more equitable distribution of the economic welfare of this country, whether that economic activity arise from our mines, from our oil wells, or our farms, or our factories. This is the context in which we present this Bill. This is the context in which in my judgement is being accepted by the people of Saskatchewan and I urge all Members of the House to accept it in that light.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add one or two thoughts to this debate in closing. I should like to express my concern over what is in fact a new philosophy over what is coming into the Legislature of Saskatchewan and that is if there is a sudden rise in a price of a product due to world demand that the Government has now identified that and has given it a name and calls it windfall profits. They have given it that name for the very purpose of trying to fix in the public mind that there is something undeserving about it and consequently the Government has every right morally to take that profit. This is a principle which is now firmly embedded in our law and could pass to a number of other products including wheat, and the products of the farm. We know today with the burgeoning populations of the world that the food crisis could make the energy crisis look small by comparison. The food producers of the world and particularly of the western world are now coming into a golden age. They are going to see the demand for their products increased remarkably over the next ten years. True there will be some high and some low but in future the golden age of the producer of food may now be here.

I have heard it expressed by a few Members of the New Democratic Party, although I have looked through some of the speeches and I haven't heard it expressed by party supporters, that just because a man is a farmer and just because the price of wheat should suddenly increase by \$2 or \$33 a bushel because of some demand in China or somewhere else, there is no reason why the farmer should have that profit, that windfall profit due not in any way to his own efforts, but due to an artificial demand created elsewhere, and that should belong generally to the people of Saskatchewan. That view was expressed fairly frequently with respect to products and to farm property during the summer in which I was involved in the Foreign Ownership Bill. In fact some of these suggestions were at least to my conventional mind so outrageous that I don't even presume to attribute them to Members of the New Democratic Party unless they have a wing or a splinter, and I gather that they do have wings and splinters, that are not generally in the mainstream of their Party either.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this Government is establishing the principle that if some foreign situation — and foreign to this Party may mean anything beyond the borders of Saskatchewan — creates a profit over and above what is called ordinary profits or average for the past period, that may well be a justifiable and fertile ground for the Government to hack away with its little hatchet and take away 100 per cent of the benefit.

I am concerned about this principle being adopted and I think the Premier has in his remarks certainly over-simplified the views that I have expressed because my views were simply this: That a graduated scale like the income tax would have been appropriate under Part I to the windfall profits. Certainly if somebody makes a huge profit there is no doubt about it that that kind of income should, as the profits rise, be more and more brought into the public treasury. And that a graduated scale, approaching 100 per cent, might have been fully justifiable. But a scale which starts at 100 per cent surely is not.

We brought these people into Saskatchewan and we did not warn them that they would be limited in their profits and, in fact, they had every right to expect that because of increasing world demand the prices for their products would rise and that has been denied them. The expectations that they have every right to have, have now been dashed. The Government has acted just too vigorously and perhaps I am talking about a question of degree.

I suggest that the abruptness, the 100 per cent finality of the actions of the Government will bring some short term gains, but I think in the long term, these actions will cost us a lot in development capital, not only in the oil industry but in other industries, and should well bring some apprehension to the farmers and every person of any substance at all in Saskatchewan.

Let me say that in the future if we invite people to come to Saskatchewan to invest here, they should come with a clear warning that if because of fructuous events of any kind, they should find themselves faced with unusually high profits that the Government of Saskatchewan stands on principle ready to take 100 per cent of those surplus profits as defined by the Government. Without that warning, Mr. Speaker, we do not treat fairly those people whom we invite to come to Saskatchewan.

Let me close my remarks by dealing with a point that the Premier dealt with rather firmly. He repeated over and over again that not one oil and gas lease had been torn up, not one of them had been ripped to shreds. Well, I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the standard Department of Mineral Resources petroleum and natural gas lease. On the second page as part of the terms it says:

To have and to hold the petroleum subject to the petroleum and natural gas regulations as amended from time to time.

Now, undoubtedly what the Premier is saying is that when they sign this lease, the companies who sign these leases with the Government, gave the Government the right to change the rules. The next paragraph is a yielding paragraph and it deals with five cents a month until the next 1st of April and then \$1 per month thereafter. And then the next clause says:

And also rendering and paying unto the lessor any royalties as are from time to time prescribed by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that the Premier can say that these are not torn up is by a cute definition. His cute definition of whether a lease has been torn up or not is all that saves him and the only way in which he can say that it is not in fact torn up. Because, Mr. Speaker, he says, I presume he says, that not one single lease was torn up. And he said that he challenged any Member to say which one was torn up. I say to the Premier that it depends on your definition. If you say that every person who signed this knew in advance that every one of the rules could be set and changed by one of the parties, but that the deal itself goes on, then, of course, there were none torn up.

The fact of the matter is that every lawyer believes that fundamental terms in a contract ought not to be changed by one of the parties. And the fact of the matter is this: that the Government of Saskatchewan, on one hand is taking the top royalty and the bottom royalty. It is taking two of the mineral resources, by this Bill 42. It is taking far more money than was ever contemplated by this petroleum and natural gas lease. I say that in all frankness these leases have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Premier can say we didn't destroy any because they knew that we could change the rules at any time and we didn't promise that we would be reasonable. Nor did we promise that if they wanted to get out of these leases, they couldn't walk away from them. I suppose the Premier can say rightly that no Government of Saskatchewan promised that they wouldn't say that if a company left an oil or well site, that they could be fined \$1,000 a day, and, therefore they were taking their own chances, but that the leases are in existence.

Well, it is no wonder that politicians get a bad name if that is the kind of nonsense which the Premier is hoping to sell to the public. It is true that the document has two parties to it and the document is still in existence, but fundamentally the Government of Saskatchewan has changed the terms and then has prohibited one of the parties from backing out of the deal. As far as I am concerned — and any reasonable and fair minded lawyer looking at what the Government has done — when one of the parties totally changes the rules that lease has been torn up and destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I wanted to clarify some of the positions which are constantly muddled by Members of the Government. I have learned to listen to them, express points of views, saying the Liberals stand for this and the Liberals stand for that and I know very well we don't stand for that. I want to make it very clear as to Part I a graduated income tax is what I think would be reasonable even at an extreme rate going to 90 per cent or more. Second, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Part IV is clearly expropriation, without the courage to put to the test of reasonable compensation before the courts and Part II also is confiscatory. It is a form of expropriation, call it what you like. Mr. Speaker, this is an ominous Bill and the remarks that we make on one part might easily, by a person wishing to misrepresent us, be attributed to another part of the Bill. Be that as it may, politicians act that way and what can we do about it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill changes the rules of the game in Saskatchewan and I am very concerned about it. I do oppose the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E. KRAMER: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to at least a part of this debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's all!

MR. KRAMER: — That's all, that's right. It surprised me as I watched the last speaker who just sat down as a real example of the Opposition. These have to be the most sore crotched bunch of people that I have seen for some time. They are so busy dithering around on the fence, trying to make up their minds as to which side of this Bill they are on, that they certainly will have to see a doctor after this Session is over. I am sure of that.

It is strange to me that they will be scolding us for doing nothing on the one hand and then scolding us for doing too much on the other. It is obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is suffering and it is most ironic that Canada is suffering today, from an energy crisis — eastern Canada. And isn't it strange that consecutive Tory and Liberal Governments, tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee, over a period of years in this country of ours that is rich in natural resources, could not in the past 102 years devise an energy policy that wouldn't have gotten us into this position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — This is where it is at, Mr. Speaker. The complete failure of successive governments of Canada to give Canadians the right to their own resources and security in Canada to make sure that Canadians at last can sleep comfortably at night during the cold winters that we have. But they were so busy making deals with multinational corporations, making deals all over the country, selling out Canada to people outside of Canada, that they have failed miserably to take care of Canadians. This is why we are in this position today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — And it is the failure of people like those fence sitters and worse, sitting across the floor, that we are in this position. And then when somebody is bold enough and decisive enough to take action and say that we are going to do something for Saskatchewan, they sit and whine and scream. And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is the best example of that. The Leader of the Opposition never ceases, Mr. Speaker, to scold the people of Saskatchewan for defeating his Party in 1971. He pules and whines about not having enough Members in the Opposition; that they can't possibly block this great oppressive group over here. The choice of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that's why we are over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — And if the people of Saskatchewan had had their will and if they would have had a democratic vote there would have been only five over there if it hadn't been for the gerrymander. There are only five people that legitimately have the right to sit on that side of the House, the rest are here because of false boundaries drawn by that same little whining Member from Prince Albert, who is not in his seat. Those phoney boundaries . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I should like to make it clear that on third reading the principle of the Bill is not on debate, neither are the contents. The principle of the Bill must be discussed on Second Reading and the contents in Committee. On Third Reading it must be on the effects of the Bill. I believe that both of the last two speakers have been in order, but in crossing the line they have been out of order and I should like the Members to stay within bounds.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling and I apologize to the House. I shall get back to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. He left some things unsaid and he tried his best to continue saying them last night.

It seems to me rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. gentleman who wanted so much to debate this Bill, who wanted so much to be heard, who was complaining that he didn't have support, has suddenly departed for sunnier climates this morning, on the early morning aircraft, possibly as a guest of the petroleum corporations down in the Bahamas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — It seems ironic, Mr. Speaker, and he talked yesterday about hypocrisy. I think that is the worst exercise in hypocrisy that I have ever witnessed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill because it will do for Saskatchewan people, the real owners of these resources, what the Federal Government has failed to do. It will do for Canadian people what the Federal Government and the Liberal Party, both, provincially and federally, have failed to do. It will meet the challenge of our times and, therefore, I take great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, it seems rather odd to us that the Member of the Battlefords purposely waits until the Leader of the Opposition is out of the House. The Member for The Battlefords is the last one in this House who should ask the Speaker why somebody isn't here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. I can contribute more to this House on a Sunday afternoon than the Member for Moosomin could if he stayed here all year.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! that is not a Point of Privilege.

MR. MacDONALD: (Milestone) — It's a cinch that Sunday afternoon is the only time that he ever does contribute because he is never here.

MR. SPEAKER: — That is not a Point of Privilege or Order, either. Let's get back to the third reading.

MR. GARDNER: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of the Member for The Battlefords speak for themselves. The very fact that he waits until the Leader of the Opposition is out of his seat to make some type of personal attack on him, speaks for itself and I don't think further comment on this is really necessary.

Mr. Speaker, we are hopefully nearing the end of this special Session of the Legislature and, of course, it is a special Session of the Legislature. It was called for one special reason and no one here or in the Press or the public should in any way feel that this was just a normal fall sitting, it was a special Session called by the Premier, called for the purpose of taking over the oil business in Saskatchewan. We have had special Sessions for other purposes in the past. We have had one for this purpose at this time.

The Members opposite seem to keep saying that we don't make our position clear on this Bill. A Bill like this, of course, where they bring in 22 House Amendments before we even got a chance to go into second reading and how many more after that I don't know. I don't know how anyone could have a firm position on this Bill before seeing all of the changes and the House Amendments that are brought in. As far as I am concerned there are one or two basic principles in the Bill and I think that we have tried to make our position clear on these basic principles. I should just like to mention one of two of them again because I want to make it clear, first of all, that we are in favor of controls over oil production. This was done before by The Oil and Gas Conservation Act, I believe.

We are in favor of preventing excessive profits by oil companies because of a world situation over which none of us have any control. These things could easily have been done, of course, without Bill 42.

We want to make it clear that the one thing that we are opposed to is the confiscation and the seizure of property. We are opposed to having this done without consultation with the people who own the property, without adequate compensation to the people who own the property and without any right of appeal by the people who are wronged by Bill 42. I am opposed to this type of seizure and would be regardless of what type of property or what type of business was involved. It doesn't matter whether it is one individual or whether it is a group of individuals who are members of a corporation, to come in and take their property as is done in this Bill, is wrong.

Premier Blakeney, last night, compares this to taking a strip of land for a roadway. And, of course, we all realize how ridiculous a comparison this is. I don't know whether he thinks the people of this province aren't bright enough to see the difference between taking over someone's property and business that they are making their living with, then taking a strip of land for a roadway.

This Bill is outright seizure of property and business without appeal. And the Bill makes this very clear, this is the part that the people of the province are going to object to.

And strangely enough the Premier got up again today and said there is no confiscation in the Bill. I believe it would be inappropriate to review the contents of the Bill at this time, but certainly Section 28, 29 and 30 make it quite clear that the Government is confiscating property. They have made it clear that the Minister simply goes to the Land Titles office and if you read Sections 28 and 29 and 30, you see that he can go to the Land Titles office and transfer certain properties to the Crown and this of course is confiscation and nothing else. This is the type of thing that we object to. This is our main objection to the Bill. We have tried to make this clear in our speeches and this is why I am repeating it again today.

HON. W. SMISHEK: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, last night the Leader of the Opposition called it 9:30. He purportedly talked about the effects of this Bill. Among the things that he alleged is that this Bill and this Government is breaking oil leases, that that is the effect of this Bill. He alleged that we are tearing up agreements and varying agreements. He said we broke our word with the people of Saskatchewan and that we trampled on the rights of small people. He said that we were rushing this Bill through this House. An interesting thing too, Mr. Speaker, is that the Leader of the Opposition, pleaded with us that he was not a spokesman for Imperial Oil.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that when I went home last night and I picked up the newspaper, on page 38 there is a story under the heading, "Imperial Oil Head Criticizes Bill 42". The story starts out like this:

The President of Imperial Oil Limited, Monday called Saskatchewan Premier Allan Blakeney to give the parties materially affected by the province's controversial oil Bill a chance to comment. In a telegram to the Premier, J. A. Armstrong said his firm has just become aware,

This is interesting, Mr. Speaker, he says:

just become aware that your Government intends to proceed to enact Bill 42 almost immediately.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was given first reading ten days ago. I notice that Lionel LaBerge, the spokesman for Imperial Oil has been commenting on this Bill for the last ten days. Yet Imperial Oil says, the president says, that they only became aware of it — just became aware of it.

The story carries on:

The interest of Saskatchewan and businesses and economy of Saskatchewan strongly suggests that more investigation be taken before enactment of such reaching legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what does Mr. Armstrong say? He says he wants more time. It is interesting that Mr. Armstrong's statement and that of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition are identical.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Yet, Mr. Steuart says that he is not a spokesman for Imperial Oil.

There is another paragraph, Mr. Speaker, that is very interesting in that story and coincidentally it is almost identical to the words that were spoken by the Leader of the Opposition. Let me read that little paragraph. Mr. Armstrong said:

Future opportunities of the petroleum industry in Saskatchewan likely will be affected by the legislation impairing Saskatchewan's attractiveness to every type of investor thereby damaging future income and employment prospects for the province.

Interesting enough, Mr. Speaker, that those were the identical words that were expressed by the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — It would seem certainly by this statement that Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Steuart put their heads together on identical statements.

If Mr. Armstrong is so interested, Mr. Speaker, in employment in Saskatchewan in the oil industry, then, Mr. Speaker, why is it in 1971 Mr. Armstrong announced that he proposes to close Imperial Oil Refinery in the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — If Mr. Armstrong is interested in the oil business in Saskatchewan, I suggest to him and to Imperial Oil that perhaps what he should be doing is coming and meeting with the Government of Saskatchewan to develop a new refinery in Saskatchewan to refine the heavy crude that we have in this province. But instead, Mr. Armstrong is proposing to close the refinery in the city of Regina. Similarly Gulf closed a refinery in 1970 and in 1971.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to convince anyone that the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party are not acting and behaving like spokesmen for the big oil multinational corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is so concerned about the little people, I wonder where the Leader of the Opposition is? I wonder where he is? His people are saying that he is meeting with the teachers. Yesterday they were telling us that he was on his way to the Bahamas. They told us he was on his way to the Bahamas for a vacation. I don't blame the Leader of the Opposition. But, for goodness sake, if he wants to meet with the Miami oil barons to look for those broken leases and those torn up agreements in the Bahamas then let him go to the Bahamas. But let's not try and becloud the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party and their spokesmen during the last few days have been saying that we did not give enough notice to the oil industry about what our intentions were. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Liberal Party and to the oil industry the NDP gave notice almost three years ago of what our intentions were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — I should like to refer to the New Deal for People. The Liberals have had copies of that, they have quoted from the New Deal for People. Perhaps they are just as familiar with our commitment as we are. This is what we said about the resource development and our resources in this province. We said and let me quote:

Saskatchewan's natural resources are the rightful heritage of the people of our province, not the preserve of the private interests. The NDP believes that the Liberal policy of selling out our birthright is both unwise and unnecessary. We have faith in Saskatchewan people. We believe them capable of developing their own resources for their own benefit. Outside help is sometimes necessary but sell-out is not. Development must be aimed at maximizing benefits for the people, not maximizing profits for big business and its promoters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, we then go out and set out what we propose to do. One of the items says:

We would oppose any further sell-out of our resources.

The second, item says:

Vigorously oppose the continental energy policy. And this is what we are doing.

The third item says:

Review existing royalty and other arrangements with the view to re-negotiating where necessary with those not in the interest of Saskatchewan people. Where feasible, we will reclaim ownership and control of our resources.

This is precisely what this Bill proposes to do.

The Leader of the Opposition and his Members say that not enough notice was given. I suggest to them that they go back three weeks. Tomorrow it will be three weeks when we presented the Throne Speech. In that Throne Speech we proposed that we will take action to control the oil production in this province. We gave notice to the Liberal Party and to the people of Saskatchewan and the oil industry that we proposed to take action during this Session. Mr. Speaker, ten days ago the Minister of Mineral Resources gave first reading to this Bill. For the last eight, days we have been debating this Bill. If anybody suggests or alleges that we did not give sufficient notice, I would suggest to them, that let them look at the Liberal record. Let them look at what the Liberals did and how much notice they gave on some controversial legislation.

I suggest to them that they examine their consciences in the case of Bill 2. How much notice did they give to the workers of Saskatchewan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Three days notice and they rammed that legislation through the House. Did they allow us to refer the Bill to the committee? Did they allow the workers to examine that Bill? Mr. Speaker, with that one Bill they imposed the most vicious and compulsory legislation that was ever enacted against 250,000 workers in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — And that wasn't enough. In 1970 they extended it further and then they allowed the working people only two days notice to consider that Bill.

What did they do when they talked about the compulsory features of this legislation? Mr. Speaker, let me tell them what they did in their compulsory legislation in their Bill 2. They ordered workers back to work. If any worker who was on strike refused to abide by the legislation, he was subject to a fine of \$1,000 a day, for every day . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — On a Point of Order, I wonder if the Speaker could ask the Member to inform us what clause he is on in this Bill or what section he is on?

MR. SPEAKER: — I do say again, I do think the discussion on Third Reading is getting away, far from the effects of this Bill. I would hope that Members will keep their remarks to the Bill. It is difficult when you start asking me what one Member said. When one Member or the other one gets out of order, I hope we will get back to this Bill.

MR. SMISHEK: — In replying to the allegations that were made by the Leader of the Opposition, he told this House yesterday that this Bill is against the interests of the little people. I am merely reminding the Opposition of the things that they did against the interests of the small people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — I am not surprised at the Hon. Member from Milestone that he doesn't want to talk about Bill 2 and the things that the crimes that the Liberal Party committed during their seven years in office. I wouldn't want to talk about it either if I was them.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal record of trampling on the rights of little people is well known to the people of this province. No wonder they don't want to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, they made allegations that we broke leases,

yet not one of them have been able to identify where a single lease was broken. Not a single lease was broken. They haven't named one. They said that we are confiscating, they have not been able to give one single example. There is a difference between confiscation and expropriation. They expropriated property when they were in government. This is a right that every provincial government has. In fact, they enacted expropriation legislation making it possible for expropriation.

MR. LANE: — . . . right of refusal.

MR. SMISHEK: — That's right and we are prepared to look at fair compensation wherever there is expropriation.

Mr. Speaker, they said that agreements were broken. And that agreements were varied. Mr. Speaker, they have still to give us one example, if such is the case.

One of the other interesting things, Mr. Speaker, about the question of the agreements. We know of an agreement that has existed between the provinces and the Government of Canada and that is in the area of the natural resources. By constitution and by law natural resources are the preserve and the right of the provinces. Yet what do we see, what do we see a Federal Liberal Government doing? Despite the fact that on one hand the Federal Government gives the provinces the right to control production to sell natural resources, the Liberal Minister of Justice in Ottawa is challenging that right.

If there is anybody breaking agreements, Mr. Speaker, it is the Liberals who are violating agreements, who are challenging agreements, not this Government, I suggest to you. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that I heard during this debate in the last few days, is the Liberal concern and Liberal interest about the adequate supply of oil for the rest of Canada, and an adequate supply of energy.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal record in the area of Canadianism, Canadian development, is one of the most shameful records that can be identified. I can't help but recall 1956 when our Party and where I think most of the Canadian people were concerned about the oil pipeline becoming a Canadian pipeline to be owned by the Canadian people to be a public utility. Let us remember and remind ourselves what the Federal Government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I think we are getting away from this Bill. Those comments should have been made on Second Reading where the principle of the Bill is involved. I think we must get back to the effects of this Bill and not be discussing the debate that took place on Second Reading or the effects of other legislation.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, there were Members on the Opposition that strayed far a field and I think it is important to remind ourselves, Mr. Speaker, of the record of the Opposition in the Liberal Party on what they did in trying to develop a national energy policy. It is a shameful record. What we are trying to do here in this Bill, is to control our oil production to conserve our oil, to ensure that the farmers of Saskatchewan and all the people of Saskatchewan are going to have, now and in the

future, an adequate supply of gasoline and of oil and of diesel, because without that energy resource in this province our farm people cannot survive. Unless our farm people have an adequate supply of fuel they will not be able to keep the most important industry of this province in operation. We also know that in the Province of Saskatchewan with our severe winters as we are experiencing right now, unless we have an adequate supply of gas and fuel, many of our people would be suffering.

This Government is concerned not only in assuring that we have an adequate supply of energy now, but that we conserve it for the future generations as well. This is the purpose of this Bill and this is what our party is dedicated to, to serve the people of this province. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the resources that we have, we are prepared to share with the rest of Canada. We are interested in developing a national energy policy. No political party in Parliament or in a Legislature has fought more and advocated more the introduction of a meaningful and effective energy policy than a New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I recall prior to 1964 when we had developed the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, we had David Cass Beggs as the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. He was the strongest advocate of developing a national power grid. Did we get support from the Liberals, certainly not.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the days of the Columbia River Treaty where the NDP advocated that the Columbia River should be developed to serve the people of this country and not to be sold to the United States. Unfortunately in 1957 the Diefenbaker Government sold out the Columbia River and, Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing too, is that the treaty was not concluded when the Liberals took office. The Liberals when in Opposition condemned the negotiations that were going on by Mr. Diefenbaker with the Americans, but when they came to power they were the ones that ratified the agreement. It is a shameful act, that was one of the biggest energy sell-outs of the century, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we as a political party and as a government are prepared to assume our rightful place to develop a national energy policy. We are prepared to share our resources with the rest of Canada. We want to make sure that in Saskatchewan we have an adequate supply of resources, that those resources are not sold at a premium at which the multinational corporations will make a rip-off as they have been making. We want to ensure that the price is maintained at the lowest possible rate. We want to also make sure that we are also beneficiaries of the resource that we have. These are the issues in this Bill, these are the effects of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, our Government, our party is acting responsibly and I am afraid that the Opposition's whole behavior during this entire period has been to serve the interests of the multinational corporations, to continue the rip-off they have had over the years.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park talked about what is a fair profit. I ask him, I ask him, is it a fair profit for the oil companies to spend \$142 million in one year and take a profit of \$134 million and that is exactly what is going to be happening this year. Is he an advocate that they should have more profit, or is he a person who is concerned that we do

have some controls in this country? Obviously by his remarks I can only conclude that the \$134 million or almost 100 per cent profit in his judgment is not enough for the multinational oil corporations.

Mr. Speaker, when I take a look at some of the statistics and some of the facts about the kind of a rip-off and the kind of profits that the oil industry has been making in the last while — I see the New Times reported in October of this year that the oil industry had made some of the biggest profits in history. Exxon Corporation, the world's largest oil company of which Imperial Oil of Canada is a subsidiary made a profit in the third quarter of 80 per cent more than the year before. Gulf Oil, 91 per cent more than the year before. Yet these people are saying that that is enough. Mr. Speaker, I say it is time to stop and call a halt to this kind of unconscionable profiteering. Mr. Speaker, this Bill proposes to place some controls. I am glad and pleased that this Government has the courage to propose and enact this kind of legislation. Mr. Speaker, I support Third Reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G. LANE: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for the Bill given by the Minister of Industry and Commerce yesterday was that he said, we don't trust Ottawa. The effects of this Bill is evidence that the Government opposite doesn't trust Ottawa. They said the arguments — these arguments are different from those of the Premier's — "We have to go by the facts. Ottawa promised us nothing on the export tax, then they promised us 50 per cent and now they promised 100 per cent and we need this Bill because we can't trust Ottawa." I say, Mr. Speaker the real issue in this debate and has been right through is we can't trust the Government opposite and the people can't trust the Government opposite. The Government opposite in this Bill, the effects, are just one more nail in the coffin and the erosion of the individual rights in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Government opposite promised a producer controlled hog marketing commission, it didn't deliver and gave a government controlled hog marketing commission. They promised the Land Bank to help the young farmers get on the land and own the land. They won't let the young farmers own the land. They have given us a perpetual lease Land Bank plan. They promised this Session was to be one where controversial legislation would be introduced and then would be subject to public scrutiny, public discussion, public hearings. It's a sham, it's a farce and the Premier broke his word when he referred to this Session, because this is the one controversial Bill, we weren't given a chance to discuss it, we got 22 House amendments, and the Government opposite did try to railroad this through. The public didn't get a chance to discuss this Bill, because the Government is afraid of the public viewpoint. Ever since they got their 45 Members, they feel they know better and the public viewpoint doesn't matter any more. This Session is a waste of time and they talk about where is our Leader. Let's start asking where the teachers are opposite other than the ones in the Cabinet, and one full time one, the Deputy-Speaker is by the Speaker's appointment. They are sitting at home and they were hauled back by the School Boards and they are not here to debate this Bill and speak on this Bill and vote on this Bill. It is

a lot more shameful that they take off last Friday than you with your cheap attacks on one day by the Leader of the Opposition. Your teachers are gone from this House, because they didn't think enough of this Bill. You talk about people who are absent, where is the mealy-mouthed Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer)? He made his token appearance, he made his two bits worth of cheap personal attack and then he takes off. Where is he, out with his little photographer going around promoting his auction business? I understand that everybody . . .

MR. COWLEY: — On a Point of Order. I just wonder what this had to do with the effects of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I have been hoping to get Members from both sides of the House to stay to the effects of the Bill, I am having some difficulty, I must confess.

MR. LANE: — In answer to the Hon. Member, one of the effects of the Bill for half a day this week it flushed out the Minister of Highways, and got him to make an appearance in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The real issue and the real effect of this Bill is that we have lost the trust of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, the Government opposite has lost the trust. They have given every justification that they intend to break the word of the Government, they intend to break the word of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, without a by your leave and that's an effect of this particular Bill.

We have had promises not kept, we have had the Forestry Act promises made by the Government opposite broken, oil promises made by the Premier in the previous CCF Government and commitments are broken, without as I say, by your leave. That is an effect of this Bill. The integrity of the Province of Saskatchewan is now an issue and the integrity of the Government opposite is an issue. The word of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan has now been made an issue and the word of the Government opposite has been made an issue. It is not a question of whether we can trust Ottawa, it is whether we can trust the Government opposite and with the takeover of industries, the oil and gas, the forests and the lands itself, you know it is not going to be too long, if the Minister of Highways had his way, that jackboots would be marching down Broad Street and that is the type of government and type of authoritarian control he would favor. We welcome him back to the House again, maybe at some point in this Legislative Session he will make a contribution. We have waited two and a half years, we haven't seen it yet.

MR. FEDUNIAK: — You will wait a long time!

MR. LANE: — Yes, you are right. The Member is right, we'll be waiting a long, long time before we get a contribution from

the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the Government opposite trusting Ottawa as they justify this Bill. One of the effects of this Bill is quite simply, we can't be trusted as a province, and they can't be trusted as a government. What's next? We know what is next, oil, gas, forestry and the lands next and Section I of the Land Bank lease makes it quite clear that that's an issue, that's an effect, you have set a dangerous precedent with this Bill. For that, reason we have opposed it and that is an effect of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, when there is some order in the House, Mr. Speaker, I'll be quite happy to commence speaking, once the Members have gone through their various humorous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some sadness that I rise on Third Reading. This Bill is not as the Members on this side of the House have tried to claim, confiscation, it is not, despite your ruling on my resolution, nationalization of the industry. In fact, I think one of the best descriptions of this Bill was given in terms of its effect and what it will have and what it will do by the Minister who introduced it, Mr. Thorson. Mr. Thorson stated when he was discussing what this Bill would do in Estevan on Sunday. He said it is a modest Bill, to quote him. It is a modest Bill that will leave everybody who is involved in the industry now no worse off after the Bill is passed than they were in 1972 or 1973. The implication from the Minister is clear. The Minister has got no conception of this Bill in any way affecting the situation as it now exists with the oil industry in terms of profits, in terms of the kinds of activities which it will undertake. I want to refer at some future time to the parallel with Saskoil.

The Bill is a modest Bill. In fact, what it is and what its impact will be I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the opening bargaining with Ottawa, over the disposition of the export tax. It is not an attack on any windfall profits which have been earned to date. The Members opposite keep insisting that this is an attack on windfall profits. We conveniently forgot the windfall profits which have been earned to date by the 95 cent barrel increase over the last 12 months. The Members keep chasing after the ephemeral windfall profits which are going to be earned in the future, when and if the Federal Government lifts its freeze on prices.

No windfall profits have supposedly been earned to date, everything in the past is past history and we aren't allowed to talk about it. Since the robber has only had his hand in the till for so much money per year, we are going to let him keep his hand in the till to that extent, but if he tries to double the take we are going to do something about it then. He can keep his hand in the till at the present level for as long as he likes, it seems, because we aren't going to do anything retroactively.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in commenting about this Bill said, all it was doing was attacking the windfall profits of Imperial Oil. What windfall profits of Imperial Oil? Certainly

not the windfall profits which Imperial Oil earned in the last two years, but the windfall profits which Imperial Oil may earn if the Liberals lift the federal price freeze. The Government opposite is quite correct, I think, in analyzing that the Liberals on this side of the House have got no clear, consistent position with respect to the Bill. Has the Government itself got a clear conception of what this Bill does? Do they understand what the difference is between past and future windfall profits, between actual profits earned and potential in the future? Or are they content to haggle with Ottawa over the disposition of the export tax?

Mr. Speaker, it is a modest Bill, in fact it is even an unimaginative Bill. When presented with the opportunity to set basic well-head price at a fair rate of return, Members turned it down. When I gave them the invitation to remove some of the usual give-away incentives to business, that amendment was turned down. When I invited the Members opposite to make clear and explicit some of the imaginative programs that might be funded with the money which could potentially be raised from a vigorous program which attacked not only Ottawa, but the oil companies, the Members turned it down. Members were not interested in specifying imaginative programs ranging from expanding the Land Bank to northern programs, to day-care, to guaranteed income that might be funded. When it came time to discuss the question of giving back compensation to those robber-barons of the 19th Century, Canadian Pacific, and Hudson's Bay, the Members were too busy anxiously waiting to go home, reading their newspapers, to think about the question of what possible justification there was to give compensation to Hudson's Bay and Canadian Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I see the Government opposite, a party with which I was so recently associated, a party which two years ago had high ambitions for the people of this province that this was going to be a government which was going to tackle, not the phantoms in the back, the fainthearted dragon of Donald MacDonald in Ottawa, but were going to tackle the major problem, the oil companies, the resource companies, the foreign control of Canadian industry.

The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) in his remarks referred to the New Deal for People, indeed noble words, he didn't happen to mention however, the resolution passed at the 1971 convention of the New Democratic Party which called upon the Government to nationalize the oil industry. Do the Members opposite seriously and realistically think as they go home after this Session. that they have accomplished here something great and imaginative, that they have really come to grips with the problem of who controls resource development in Saskatchewan, who profits from resource development in Saskatchewan, how it will be developed in the future? Do they really think that this, the culmination of a rational process which has gone on within their ranks of thinking through the problems, or rather, is this a hastily put together measure which entertains a fight with Ottawa over who is going to get the money from the export tax, money which six months ago, the Department of Mineral Resources refused to deny even existed? Because six months ago the Department of Mineral Resources was putting out press releases to the effect congratulating the oil companies for increasing prices.

I think it is a time of sadness, it is a time of sadness not that the Government has become reactionary, not that they

are comparable to these people on this side of the House who waffle from one minute to the next on where they stand on any issues, as the Members have correctly assessed. These people don't know what they have got as an energy policy, they vacillated when they were in power as they are vacillating now and sometimes they agree with their federal counterparts and sometimes they don't. The idea was that the New Democratic Party didn't vacillate, didn't wait until the last minute before it decided on a policy, that it was prepared to take something and go to the root of the problem and analyze the roots of the problem and come forth with a solution which tackled the problem in its essence. I think the Members opposite in their hearts know the imposition of a tax, a tax which nobody knows how much it is going to yield, a tax law which is full of loopholes, a tax law which says nothing about any compensation to Hudson's Bay and Canadian Pacific, a tax law which doesn't specify how the funds are to be spent, a tax law which doesn't specify what may happen to the retail operators if the oil companies start to manipulate them through the back door. In other words we have got a hodgepodge of a program. Better than nothing, better than nothing. Better than the Liberals. In the sense that half a loaf is better than none, maybe I should be content with it. But there was some idea at the time that the New Deal for People was drafted, that we weren't just out for half a loaf, we weren't just out to do a little bit better than the Liberals, that we were out to commit ourselves to leading Saskatchewan people and by providing precedents in Saskatchewan to lead Canadian people towards what would be a rational socialist policy of public ownership of resources in Canada and in that duty, that responsibility, the Government opposite has failed.

MR. D. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words before this debate closes. Before I do, I should like to voice through you, my objection to the conduct of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) in this debate, and in many other debates. I think that his smutty type of contribution and personal attacks are unnecessary in this House; and I think they are a disgrace to this House. I think they are a disgrace to every Member on that side of the House. I feel that he has let down his constituents, the people that voted for him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think I tried to call Members to order and I don't think by prolonging abuses one Member has made, it will facilitate this debate. I would ask the Hon. Member to turn to the Bill please because we have heard these statements back and forth and I try to rule them out of order without being too strict on the Members and I hope we can turn to the Bill.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to just finish by saying what the effects of this Bill are. I think that we have voiced this throughout this debate, what the effects of this Bill are going to be. And, of course, the greatest effect that it has is that it sets a precedent. It sets the precedent that the Government opposite is able to confiscate private property whenever they feel there is a need. Whether the need is real or not, it is their precedent that they will, and are able to confiscate land.

The Premier said that all that he needs is acquisition of title and this somehow justifies the confiscation of private property. He says that this Bill doesn't deprive the oil companies of anything. I wonder, does he not consider that the ownership of private lands is a right and that by taking it away from somebody is not depriving them of something. Does he not feel that there is something worthwhile in owning private property; does he not feel that people have a right to own private property, whether it's oil companies or farmers or anything else? I think there is a great importance to having the right to own property. This Bill takes away that right — it sets a precedent.

I think this expropriation is an appropriate and acceptable method of taking lands into the Crown for the good of the public use. I think everyone in this House agrees that expropriation may be necessary for public highways or other reasons, but at least they are able to have this matter decided by the courts. Confiscation in this Bill cannot be decided by the courts. The Premier says that they are not depriving them of anything. Well if this is so, why is he not allowing people who own private property to take this matter to the courts and have it decided in that way?

This Bill does set a very dangerous precedent. This Bill also, one of the effects of this Bill is that it will create a great deal of lack of trust and faith by both people within this province and potential investors outside this province. It is going to destroy the faith in this Government and in this province as a whole. Of course, this Bill is going to create an air of confrontation and conflict with the rest of Canada, with the Federal Government. It invites a fight with Ottawa, invites a constitutional fight. These are the effects and the reasons why I cannot support the Bill.

They have tried to justify the fact that they are not ramming this Bill through the House and that we have had a whole week. Of course, one week is not long enough for anyone to make reasonable approaches or reasonable studies and reasonable approaches to the Government. It is impossible for the rural municipalities to get together to decide what the effects of this Bill are going to be and to present them to the Government in one week. It is impossible for the public at large, in one week or in ten days, to decide what the effects are going to be and to make representation to the Government. It is impossible for an industry as large as the oil industry to get together to decide what the effects are going to be and to make representations to the Government.

The Government sometimes think that they are the centre of the universe and that everybody knows what is going on. I submit that there are a great many people in this province that have no idea, in one week or ten days, what this Bill is or what the effects are going to be. A lot of people don't even know that this House is in Session this last two weeks.

The least that should be done is to have this Bill referred to Committee. This is why we asked for it, so that people could have a chance to make representations to the Government, to be listened to. That is all that we asked. And to suggest that this Bill is not being rammed through the House is just not looking at it in a real manner.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, would like to voice my opposition to Bill 42.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 37

Messieurs

Blakeney	Brockelbank	Cowley
Dyck	MacMurchy	Taylor
Meakes	Pepper	Faris
Smishek	Michayluk	Cody
Romanow	Byers	Gross
Messer	Thorson	Feduniak
Snyder	Whelan	Comer
Bowerman	Carlson	Lange
Kramer	Engel	Hanson
Thibault	Owens	Oliver
Larson	Robbins	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Baker		

NAYS — 9

Messieurs

Coupland	MacLeod	Wiebe
MacDonald (Milestone)	Lane	Malone
Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)	Richards

ROYAL ASSENT

At 4:31 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.

MOTION

HOUSE ADJOURNMENT

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. the Premier (Mr. A.E. Blakeney) by leave of the Assembly:

That this Assembly do now adjourn and that it 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.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:34 o'clock p.m.