

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session - Eighteenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Thursday, December 4, 1975.**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**STATEMENT**

**QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to make a statement. Yesterday the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) rose on a Point of Privilege to the effect that copies of a Bill had been distributed to the Press before the Bill had been introduced in the Assembly. I have checked the rules and precedents regarding this point. Neither the rules or the precedents require that the Bills are to be kept confidential until introduction in the Assembly.

It has been the custom of the Assembly that when a Minister is going to make an important announcement while the Assembly is sitting, he does so in the Assembly before making the announcement outside the Assembly. This custom or practice is based on the principle that the Members should be advised of new policies before the public generally. I refer to Speaker's Ruling of March 22nd, 1967, Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, page 155.

The same custom has usually applied to the distribution of Bills. This custom has grown up as a courtesy to the Members of the Assembly that they should receive copies of the Bill before general distribution of the Bill to the public.

Several Members mentioned yesterday that there was a practice of distributing Bills, copies of Bills, to the Press before introduction in the Assembly on the condition that the Press would not release this information before introduction in the Assembly. Since it is not a practice related to the Assembly I assume the Ministers would accept responsibility for their actions today as I assume they have done in the past.

I, therefore, rule that the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana does not have a Point of Privilege but caution all Hon. Members that the usual courtesies should continue to be shown to the Assembly as in the past.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**COST OF WHOLESALE OFF-SALE BEER**

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. Is the Member aware that wholesale costs of hotel off-sale beer is more than the price charged by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board stores under the recently announced price changes?

**HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment):** — I'll take that as notice, please.

### **HOW MANY TONS OF POTASH IN STORAGE**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan). I might add it's a short question and I hope to get a short answer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — How many tons of Saskatchewan produced potash is currently in storage in Saskatchewan and how many tons of Saskatchewan produced potash is presently in storage in the United States of America?

**HON. E. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — I think that question could be best answered by putting it in writing and we will see that he gets the answer.

### **STAGE OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL NEGOTIATIONS ON POTASH CORPORATION**

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the question I am about to ask fits the spirit of the ruling that you gave earlier and I should like to direct the question to the Attorney General and ask him, at what stage negotiations are at present between the federal government and the provincial government with regard to potash becoming a Crown Corporation and payment of funds to the federal government in lieu of taxes presently going to the federal government?

**MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — I tell the Hon. Member that there are no negotiations in that sense. I perceive in my mind when you use the term "stage of negotiations" a sort of sitting around the table, proposals being exchanged and so forth. We have not been asked in the past, that under the constitution of the province's right to have the potash under a Crown corporation with no claims to taxation, is sound in the constitution. And we work on that, that we are working within the law, within the constitution and proceed on that basis until we are asked otherwise to sit down and to talk.

Now having said that I think I should also be fully frank with the Member that there was in the very early stages of the legislation notification to federal officials by our officials of the nature of this Bill and the intention of this government. There has been some discussion in that area but in the sense of an ongoing discussion to my knowledge there is none proceeding on at the present time.

**MR. PENNER:** — Just a supplementary to that then. Mr. Speaker, does the Attorney General or is the Attorney General then unable to give us any statement at all with regard to, for example, an export tax that the province may have to pay once the potash has been expropriated?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well I can't give any statement to the Hon. Member about payment of an export tax because, quite frankly, to my knowledge no Member of the government yet has been asked by the federal government to consider this as a possibility. The question of export tax, the payment of an export tax on potash and the question of taxing Crown corporations, or a potash Crown corporation, really has been a matter of speculation only as among Members opposite and in some quarters of the Press. We have seen some vague newspaper stories relating to the Hon. Minister of Transport of Canada on the question of taxation and the federal revenue but apart from that there has been no formal government communication as far as I know on this matter. So accordingly as far as we are concerned it is business as usual for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and for the plans of Bill 1 and Bill 2. We are working on that basis.

### INCREASE IN PRICE OF BEER

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question I should like to direct to the Deputy Premier. It is rather a simple question and should 't require referring back to some committee. The question concerns the price of beer, the average man's drink and, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Deputy Premier what the justification for this increase was considering that the profits of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board are now approximately \$50 million according to the last financial report.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, the problem is not quite as simple as the Hon. Member for Maple Creek suggests. Any adjustments in the price of beer are made for the brewers, for the province at two levels; to the Sask Liquor Board, and to the E & H tax returned and to the licensees. The increase which will become effective Monday and which was announced by the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licence Commission respectively yesterday, means that Saskatchewan is the last province in Canada to adjust beer prices this year.

The justification for the cost I think can be explained in two ways. First of all the hotel keepers, the licensees, have not experienced an increase in their commission for several months. They have been faced with escalating costs and they will be faced with escalating costs in the future, an example being the recently announced increase in the minimum wage. Therefore the price increase announced yesterday to become effective Monday, will provide an additional five cents for on-table sales to the licensees to offset their operating costs.

With respect to the brewers, who will receive two cents per bottle increase, this is to cover their increased costs for the materials, for transportation, for labour costs. The price increase is really to offset their costs back in September 1973. Their last increase was in July of 1974, and therefore this is essentially the reason that they can justify their cost increases of 48 cents per case. It is a good deal more than that, probably in the order of 57 cents.

I don't know how this will all fit in with federal guidelines. It is possible that the brewers, for example, may be required to go before the Anti-inflation Board to justify their case.

Just for the Members I want to say that while the price increase was announced yesterday, it is not to become effective until Monday so that people planning to attend events in the coming weekend will not be faced with any unanticipated increase in expenses.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Point of Order is that the Minister has just announced several statistical data pertaining to the wholesale and retail price of beer. Our question was very simple which he put us on notice. Is he aware that the wholesale price is greater than the retail price? I don't know how he can put us on notice for our question and answer the question with statistical data to the Member for Maple Creek.

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I interpreted the Hon. Member's question for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) to be that the wholesale price of beer by the Liquor Board to hotels was greater than the price charged to liquor stores. Now that is quite a different question from the question raised by the Hon. Member for Maple Creek as to the justification for the increase announced by the Liquor Board yesterday.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister if any of the increase is designed to increase the amount of money that the Provincial Treasury will receive?

**MR. BYERS:** — Yes, the increase proposed will bring additional revenue to the Provincial Treasury in two ways. First of all the price of a bottle of beer on the table, is to be increased from 50 to 60 cents and he will be aware that the E & H tax on purchases over 50 or 52 cents changed from two to three cents. Therefore one cent of that increase will accrue to the province in E & H tax revenues. In addition the Liquor Board will recover two cents per bottle for on-the-table sales.

**MR. STODALKA:** — A second supplementary question. I believe you have indicated that the hotel owners would get five cents of the increase in the price per bottle of on-premises consumption. What will be their additional increase in off-premise sales? What will be the increase for example for a 12-bottle case of beer?

**MR. BYERS:** — With respect to on-the-table sales, their commission is presently 26 cents a bottle and that will increase up to 31 cents, that's an increase of five cents per bottle. They will receive for off-sales, an additional four cents for handling a pack of 12 and additional nine cents for handling a pack of six.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

## SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION RATES

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry & Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to make an announcement. There had been some concern in the House over the last few days in regard to Saskatchewan Power Corporation rates, particularly in regard to electricity and gas and questions in regard to the increase that took place a short time ago.

I should like to announce at this point the details enclosed in a Press release that I have issued to help demonstrate the fairness of the corporation's rates even after the increase had taken place. The town of Macklin in the Macklin Lake Resort will be served by Saskatchewan Power Corporation effective January 1, 1976. The electrical distribution facilities have been purchased from Calgary Power Limited which is an Alberta Power utility. The 360 electrical customers involved in the transfer will be placed, Mr. Speaker, on Saskatchewan Power's standard provincial electrical rate. This will reflect a savings to those customers of power who have formerly been served by a power utility located in Alberta. It will reflect savings of seven to ten per cent to residential customers, a savings of 20 to 25 per cent to commercial customers and a street light saving cost to the community of in excess of 19 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that Member opposite, in particular the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Member for Nipawin, will appreciate the savings in rates and the evidence in the gap that exists between rates charged to people who receive power service by Saskatchewan Power in the province of Saskatchewan and rates charged to people who receive power from the province of Alberta.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, may I have a ruling on my Point of Order, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I believe it was a Point of Order. I'm sorry I didn't advise you at the time.

The Minister, as I stated the other day when I gave the ruling, I believe it was on the 27th of November, has several options available to him when a question is asked in the oral question period. The Minister took one of the options that was available to him. The Member will acknowledge that, also he took a different option when another similar question was asked.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to exercise my privilege of just commenting on the Minister's statement, briefly if I may.

First of all, I don't think anyone in this House or in the province of Saskatchewan is debating the relative extent of Saskatchewan Power rates, but what we are complaining about is the immediately following an election, instead of adjusting the power rates in the province of Saskatchewan when they should have been, they were delayed and then this fall in the midst of an anti-inflation battle, the biggest inflationary rise in the prices of Saskatchewan citizens is by Saskatchewan Crown

corporation, and that's the problem that we don't like. And that's the problem the citizens of Saskatchewan don't like.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and all Crown corporations in the province of Saskatchewan should be providing leadership for other business and other organizations in this province in helping to combat inflation, instead of showing the leadership in the exact opposite way by increasing their prices up to 50 per cent in some cases. We think that's terrible.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of this Assembly, during the time that we normally introduce students, the group of students coming in had not arrived at the Legislature and they are here now and I should like to introduce them to you. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery, a charming group of students from my smallest High School, Mr. Speaker, the town of Dinsmore. These students, although few in quantity, have always done well by their quality of work in many areas. The young ladies, all of whom are in Grade 10, are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Iverson, as well as an additional teacher, as I see Miss Benesh is here. I saw the familiar face of the bus driver, Mr. Facca. I'll be meeting with these students at 3:15, and we hope that they have enjoyed their trip and their visit to this Legislature. And I know that you will all join me in wishing them a very safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **ANSWER TO QUESTION ON CABLE TELEVISION LICENCE**

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond at this time to a question asked yesterday about Sask Tel's involvement in Cable TV, and I took notice of it.

I'll be concise, as are all Members of the government. Let me say initially that I'm sure all Members in the House are aware that Cable TV is a system of TV whereby signals are transmitted by telephone wires, not through the air. The advantage of Cable TV is that it makes it possible to transmit the signals over almost infinite distances.

Sask Tel's application to the CRTC for a Cable TV licence is not competitive with, but rather complementary to the applications proceeding in the community cable co-ops. Its intent is to give Sask Tel the best opportunity to explain its role before the CRTC hearings, while at the same time to provide the CRTC with a wider choice of options in determining the most effective and efficient introduction of cable services to Saskatchewan cities.

In its application Sask Tel outlines three possible arrangements it's prepared to accept:

(a) a joint licence with approved local programming organizations. The CRTC now has power to grant a joint or special licence under existing federal legislation. A special broadcasting-receiving licence as opposed to a broadcasting-transmitting licence whereby Sask Tel would have the end to end responsibility over all signals or receiving and delivering hardware but control over all content would rest with the CRTC and an approved community programming organization, or,

(b) an arrangement whereby community organizations such as cable co-ops would be licenced on the basis of Sask Tel carrying out the total delivery function, including the ownership of the remote and local head and antennas, as well as carrying out such ongoing operations as billing and collecting.

Any of these arrangements would result in either substantially increased funds for local programming or in decreased charges to subscribers of this service.

It's a rather technical statement, but the area of cable TV is technical and complex.

In summary, perhaps just let me say that we believe that Sask Tel, by getting a joint licence with one or the other groups, can provide the service at a lower cost. They have economies of scale that obviously the other groups don't have. We recognize that the federal government has shown concern about any form of cable TV whereby the provincial government controls the content, and whether we agree with that or otherwise, the CRTC makes those decisions. We recognize that Sask Tel might have some obstacles in its path when it applies. That's why, in addition, we've funded the community co-ops, which are completely independent from the government and don't face the problems that Sask Tel does.

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Pardon me, were you the Member who asked the original question?

**MR. THATCHER:** — Yes, I was, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister about another portion of that statement that I found equally astonishing, and that was that in the event that neither of these cable co-op or Sask Tel should receive a licence, that this government would refuse the Sask Tel facilities to any private group. By this, are we to understand that the Minister, or the government, would keep cable television away from the people of this province, that we could not see such necessities such as Monday night football, etc., and be locked into the tripe of the CBC?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That is not what I said, and with all due respect to

the Member for Thunder Creek, I don't think that's what the newspaper account carried.

What I said was, and you have to state it fairly precisely. That we have not committed ourselves to selling any portion of the hardware of Sask Tel to any group, and some of the licences are on the basis that they must buy part of the hardware of the Sask Tel system. We haven't said we won't do that. We have simply said that we will not commit ourselves at this time to do it. It's important because there are other options than cable TV. There's also a system of closed circuit TV, and something else might be considered.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — When the Member rose, he has said a second supplementary, and I assumed he meant . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — I corrected myself then.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Sorry, continue.

**MR. THATCHER:** — With all due respect to the Minister, I did read your statement and I believe that it did say that you would refuse. I would ask you to check your press release if I was wrong on that.

The second supplementary question I should like to ask is: In the event that either Sask Tel or the co-ops should receive a licence, what assurance is the Minister or the government prepared to give us that this will not simply be a government propaganda medium, that it will have some degree of independence, that it will not just be, let's say, another Commonwealth or another Service Printers for the government?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I should say initially, Mr. Speaker, that it wasn't done through a press release. It was part of a much longer conversation I had over the telephone with the reporter from the Leader-Post. That is faster than a press release, but it has the disadvantage that inaccuracies do creep in. But I'm quite sure that's what I said.

As for the independence, there's isn't any problem if the community co-ops get it. We have no more control over the community cable co-ops than we do over any of the other co-ops. They will be self-financing. They'll get their capital from some other source, but we'll have no control over them at all. The concern the Member expressed about the independence of programming, obviously will be a concern of Sask Tel. What we have said with respect to the Sask Tel application is that we will not control the programming. We'll accept the licence on the basis if someone else does the programming when we don't have any control over. We point to the community co-ops as one group that might control the programming. But in the application it wasn't limited to the community cable co-ops.

## HIGHWAY REPORT

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day, I think there is something that I should bring to the attention of the House. I don't know if this is an indication of the lack of efficiency of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) or what it is, but I'm not sure — or is it part of the anti-inflation program of the present government, and I know we are all delighted that we don't have to look at the Minister of Highway's face, but there may be the odd picture of a road or a bridge that might be here, and perhaps in the anti-inflation fight the Minister of Highways might give an explanation to Members of the House.

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways):** — I'm sorry to disappoint the Members opposite. In the past they have raised some complaints about certain pictures that were in there. This is not — I want to assure them immediately — that this is not intended to appease them in any way. The Queen's Printer was a little behind and it was of necessity that the printed word be tabled here. The best part of it is yet to come, the pictures in the blanks.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We've introduced a new dimension to this Chamber, a question by the Member and a comment by the Minister.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 1 — **An Act respecting the Development of Potash Resources in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, before I start on the debate, I took a little different idea from those blank pictures. We've been having some trouble getting some of the information on resignations from different departments, and I thought there was going to be a wholesale clean-up in the Department of Highways, including the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the debate on Bill 1. This is indeed a tragic time for the citizens of Saskatchewan, when a Premier and a government of a province try to ram legislation of this type down the throats of our citizens. Just a few short months ago they received a mandate from but 39 per cent support of the people of the province. The Premier and this government did not have the intestinal fortitude to put this question to the people in their election platform.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Now what does the government do? They rush a Bill through

without allowing the citizens of the province time to even get over the initial shock of the Throne Speech.

Certainly the Premier is thinking, as did Macbeth in Shakespeare's writings, "If it were done when 'tis done, then 't were well it were done quickly'. And he looked across the House and he saw 17 rookie MLAs on this side of the House and he thought they would not be ready to enter into this debate to protect our province. I want to assure him, as well as all Members on that side of the House, there are 10 rookie MLAs in the Liberal caucus that are ready, willing and able to speak out for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The Premier should also remember the words of Macbeth:

But in these cases  
We still have judgment here; that we but teach  
Bloody instructions which on being taught  
Return to plague the inventor.

Now the people of Saskatchewan will long remember who the inventors of this Bill are, and will indeed judge them harshly, come next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — It is relatively simple to get money for our Hon. Premier, and he reminds me of a little Robin Hood who has his gears in reverse — he robs from the people and he gives to the rich. He will mortgage the souls of every Saskatchewan citizen for years to come to satisfy the ego of his government and a few activists hell bent on moving our province into the same type of regime as that in Cuba. Mr. Castro had to use guns in Cuba when he took over the industries, and I hear the Members opposite moan, but it's the people of the province who should be moaning, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Castro had to use guns in Cuba when he took over the industries, but Mr. Blakeney, uses the seat, blood and dollars of very man, woman, and child of Saskatchewan for years to come.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our Premier will give the people's dollars to the potash owners, he will purchase the potash mines. They will leave with our money, but they will also leave with two other very important items, the markets to sell the potash and the knowledge to run the potash industry. I'm sure they'll not find that in that group opposite. Where will they go? They are business people and potash experts. They will go to New Brunswick, to New Mexico, to Brazil or to Mexico and they will build new mines and they will use those potash mines to fill the orders that they take with them.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and this NDP government, are playing out of their league. They will get taken again, and they are taking every citizen of the province of Saskatchewan too. We are having another Intercontinental Packer fiasco only a thousand times worse.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — We will be having another box factory, another wool mill, another shoe factory, another tannery, only a thousand times worse.

The Members opposite hate to be reminded of these blunders, it has been so long ago, they say, yet the continue to blame the drought of the '30s on the government of the day.

The Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) is in a dream world when he expects the oil and uranium companies to come into our province by their incentives. This government has tied a can to the tail of all industries. What company or what individual in his right mind will come into Saskatchewan under an NDP government and invest one dollar after seeing the potash industry forced from this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Dyck) believes the potash industry will quickly expand and the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), he believes that many of the potash experts will stay in this province. I would guess that both theses Members believe in Santa Claus and in the Easter Bunny as well.

I appreciate the feelings and the words of the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris). I agree with him that we must look at some way to prevent the drug misuse and abuse in our society. I ask him and all Members of this House the main reason why people resort to alcohol and drugs? One of the reasons could be boredom, boredom from the lack of interest in life and the lack of interest in their daily work. I ask the Hon. Member what the NDP government is doing that is causing this type of attitude in our society. The government of this province is continually trying to kill incentive and interest of very citizen of this province. They continue to employ an over-supply of civil servants, more than is necessary to do the amount of work at hand. They continue to bring in their political friends, defeated candidates, unsuccessful NDP nominees and friends of their philosophy and put them into high paid jobs, above civil servants and senior employees of the government. They have fired and harassed many competent people in the civil service when they dared to express their own opinion or when it did not agree with the opinion of this government.

This government has lowered the morale of the civil servants to most departments in this province. They cannot find people within the department to accept senior positions. They continue to condemn business, expropriate and harass anyone who has the ambition to go and do something for themselves or for their fellow man. They are killing the incentive of all Saskatchewan citizens. They are denying the citizens of this province the right to make any decisions of their own.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the government are playing with the future of our province like addicts on an ego trip, like a group of drunken sailors. I suggest that the Member for Arm River direct a speech on temperance at this group of which he is a part. Mr. Speaker, surely the NDP government could and should look around our province if they have billions of dollars available. Why not use it, or at least a small portion of it

to create new jobs, to bring more people, and more industries into our province. Why socialize everything that is working well in giving Saskatchewan citizens good paying jobs and contributing heavily to the coffers of this province.

Why does this government not spend dollars developing industries on the irrigation project at the Gardiner Dam? Why doesn't this government spend some money getting a refinery to refine our heavy crud oil? Why doesn't this government assist an implement company such as the Versatile Machine Company in Manitoba when there is risk of its controls going across the border, encourage them to come into Saskatchewan while there is \$154 million in sales in Saskatchewan. They prefer to deal with a tractor company from a communist country when apparently they did not trust this government. Why doesn't this government build some housing for senior citizens in rural Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Why doesn't this government build more nursing homes in the province? Then again why doesn't this government get off its hands and get some decent roads in this province? The highways in rural Saskatchewan are a disgrace while we have the opportunity of having a great tourist industry, most highways entering this province are in deplorable condition. Maybe some of the money they saved on these pictures would even help, Mr. Minister of Highways. Why doesn't this government give more assistance to local governments and give them the opportunity to set up their own priorities? All these things together would not cost nearly as much money as the irresponsible potash gamble.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the government take another look at the potash Bill. Get out and check with your own grassroots people, they are disturbed at what you are doing to our province as well. They too are asking who is next? Check it out again before you make this plunge. It is not too late to back off. If you insist on getting into the potash industry why not develop a new mine, create new jobs and increase the productivity of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry & Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, I just ant to make a few remarks before getting into the main portion of my address, in regard to the statements made by the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg where he wanted to work all around the debate, the potash question and talk about some other matters under the authority of the Government of Saskatchewan.

He was criticizing the Minister of Highways and the Department of Highways because of the deplorable conditions of the highways. I should like to remind that Member that it

wasn't very many years ago prior to 1971 that the highway system in Saskatchewan generally speaking was unnavigable. (sic) Whenever they saw a highway truck or a highway crew it was the Thatcher patchers out trying to patch the highway together hoping to entice people that they might be able to manage their way down the road if they ever ventured to try it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Let me remind the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the Members who sit to your left that we now have more miles in the highway system by approximately 20 to 25 per cent than the former government had in the system. We have been confronted with some problems that obviously they should be aware of because they debate them, problems of rapidly rising highway costs, trying to contend with not only servicing that highway system but adding new miles to the system with a budget that does not add additional taxes to the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Member also if he wanted to be honest would know that in the last two years we have had adverse climatic conditions that have not only slowed down progress in regard to highway construction, but has also deteriorated the surface of the highway at much greater rates than happens in normal years. It is a human impossibility to contend with that kind of problem. I suggest that if he wanted to be honest he would refer to those matters when he starts criticizing the present state of the highway system in Saskatchewan. The Member also, Mr. Speaker, undertook to criticize the Government of Saskatchewan because he says we have, I believe he said, "an oversupply of civil servants." We have I think in the neighbourhood of 13,000 civil servants in the province of Saskatchewan. I asked one of my colleagues to get some statistics in regard to the level of growth of civil servants at the federal level and other provinces in Canada. Statistics, Mr. Speaker, show that the level of growth in civil servants is faster at the federal level on a percentage basis than it is anywhere else in Canada on a provincial basis.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — The growth rate in Alberta has been faster and is greater than ours in Saskatchewan, that applies likewise in British Columbia. It applies also to Ontario, it applies also to Quebec, a Liberal province, Mr. Speaker. It applies also to the Maritimes. In fact the province of Nova Scotia (whom do we have there? Conservatives or Liberals) We have a Liberal government in Nova Scotia . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Order!. Members will be aware that I allowed the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg a certain amount of latitude because he is new in the House. However, I am not going to allow the same amount of latitude to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He knows he is not debating the Bill.

**MR. MESSER:** — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps I should bring it to his attention so that you would bring it in turn to his attention that he was wandering in his speech.

Just to finish the sentence I was making, in Nova Scotia they have 23,000 civil servants in comparison to 13,000 in Saskatchewan. Nova Scotia a province much smaller than Saskatchewan. Check it if you want to, 23,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the subject of debate, if I may. In recent years the price of Saskatchewan potash fertilizer has risen rapidly. Through the decade of the 1960s when potash companies were constructing new mines throughout the province, the world demand for potassium fertilizer was at best questionable. Yet development continued in Saskatchewan, where multinational corporations were getting a good deal from the government of the day under Ross Thatcher and the Liberal Party. Expansion of the potash industry in Saskatchewan was occurring at a time when there seemed no light on the horizon in terms of prices which would make such expansion indeed attractive. The reasons for the expansion had to be related to some other factor or factors. Spelled out to those corporations the deal that they were being offered in terms of tax breaks and write-offs was so good that it was worth the investment and hope for the day might come when they could cash in on those investments.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite who are so quick, so quick to condemn the actions of this New Democratic government will recall that the former CCF government recognized some problems experienced by those companies who were pioneering the attempt to mine potash in Saskatchewan and offered them some special tax concessions for having the courage to undertake to pioneer the field and establish the technology to mine Saskatchewan potash. But after the change in government in 1964, the friends of those corporations, the Liberals, who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, extended the tax breaks to every company in the industry, new or existing.

As late as 1972 it still appeared that potash would be in an oversupply situation for at least the rest of the decade. While the government regulation through the potash prorationing system had secured the industry's survival, it appeared demand would increase at only a moderate rate.

Now something happened, Mr. Speaker, to change all this. Rapidly escalating oil prices, placed large amounts of money in new hands. This coupled with a series of crop failures in several nations placed a higher demand on food prices and those prices escalated very rapidly. In effect suddenly there is a new emphasis on increased production, a new emphasis on the importance of inputs into crop production such as potassium fertilizer. The price of Saskatchewan potash jumped dramatically, the multinationals who had come in a sense to rape Saskatchewan's resources at the call of Ross Thatcher, robbed their hands together with glee. They were still in business, to reap those rewards because the government of Ross Thatcher had not only given them benefits in terms of tax breaks, but had introduced prorationing to the industry to prevent them slitting each others corporate throats when there was insufficient demand for the product to keep them operating.

Now suddenly the situation is changed. Demand for potash has sky-rocketed. There was an opportunity for immense profits to be taken in the industry. The situation had changed in the province as well. What was left of the government, the former Liberal government, sat in opposition, rejected by the people of Saskatchewan, who had grown tired of existing for the

purpose of supplying primary goods to other parts of the world at bargain basement prices. The new Government of Saskatchewan set out to gain for the people of Saskatchewan a proper share of the return being realized from the sale of this valuable resource. A reserves tax was introduced to claim for the people of Saskatchewan a fair share of any increasing prices realized for the resource that was being mined.

Now the potash companies took exception to the owners of the resource demanding a fair share of the profits, as it was before it was considered quite normal to extract those resources very cheaply. They were taken aback and came out swinging against this government which had introduced those new measures. They attacked the prorationing system, claiming it is beyond the power of the province to impose the same prorationing system which had saved their very existence only a few years earlier and which had in fact been introduced by a Liberal government. They attacked the prorationing system which had by the industry's own admission saved the potash industry of Saskatchewan. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, an about-face by the companies pointing out that their idea of free enterprise is to have the best of both world, government intervention at a time of crisis and free rein on things when profits increase and business is booming.

Mr. Speaker, they challenge the very legality of the potash reserve tax, claiming it was placing them in an unprofitable position.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard other Members of this House tell you that the industry appeared to recognize the right of the people of Saskatchewan to an intervening share of the return in potash. Companies had in fact agreed to forward their proposals on an increased taxation schedule, yet following the election of June 11, 1975, the results of which must have come almost as big a disappointment to the companies as to the Members who now sit opposite, that willingness of the industry to discuss our mutual concerns seemed to fade. Next the potash companies chose to flout the law of this province in two ways. For a period of time they withheld payment of their taxes. Secondly they refused to submit financial statements to the provincial government claiming we would turn such documents over to the Crown corporations established to examine the option of the government establishing its own mine.

The potash companies chose to challenge the government in yet other ways. While demand for potash continued to climb the companies issued press releases saying they had cancelled expansion plans due to the unprofitability of operating in Saskatchewan under the current government regulations.

Mr. Speaker, we can't be sure of the extent to which potash companies ever had plans to expand in Saskatchewan. So we cannot tell how legitimate their statements are in this regard. Also the government has repeatedly called in the potash companies to comply with the laws and submit financial statements so we can examine their claims, that the level of taxation is making operations unprofitable and making expansion out of the question. We wanted to know how legitimate their views were. It was the only way we could undertake to review or analyze their situation.

Now what in effect the potash companies were trying to do

was frighten the people of Saskatchewan. They were and are attempting to create within Saskatchewan a fear that if we don't soon allow the companies a higher level of profit so that they can expand their facilities that expansion will occur elsewhere and the opportunity will be lost forever for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this government will not be blackmailed in this way. The government has long held the view that if resources are to be developed there must be adequate returns for the people who own that resource, namely the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — That expansion of potash mining in Saskatchewan should occur is certainly most logical. Saskatchewan potash reserves are considered to be the most extensive in the world. The quality of our reserves is also higher than those of other areas. Surely, Mr. Speaker, our potash deposits should be mined. We need not panic and sell them out too cheaply for fear they will lie buried beneath the prairie sod.

Mr. Speaker, one might ask what has been the reaction of the opposition parties in this House to the performances we have observed from the potash companies. You might expect that all political parties in Saskatchewan would be somewhat appalled at the behaviour of our corporate citizens in the potash business. Surely no one would condone, especially by political parties, their refusal to pay taxes legislated by the duly constituted representatives of the people. No one condones an individual's refusal to pay his income taxes. Surely they wouldn't condone that. However, we could have expected that Liberal Party would side with the potash companies. After all the Liberal Members opposite, as I said before, the remainder of the Liberal government which provided the generous tax schedules to the potash companies in the first place. Whatever promises they made the potash companies in those days, regardless of present day circumstances, they now feel that they are obliged to carry out today even though they are a Liberal Party in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, as we might have expected the opposition parties, both Liberal and Conservative, in this Legislature have been quick to rush to the defence of their corporate allies. There can be no doubt, no doubt whatsoever whose interest the opposition parties serve in this Legislature. They are not here, Mr. Speaker, to serve the interests of the vast majority of ordinary citizens who make up their constituents. No, Mr. Speaker, they are here to serve the interests of the corporate members of our society. Even though their numbers are very small their wealth in their mind is very large.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — The reaction of the two old line parties came swiftly. It began escalating in midsummer coinciding with the escalation and the confrontation between the industry and the government. The Leader of the Liberal Opposition, the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Mr. Steuart has been quoted in the Leader-Post as saying and I quote:

Our Government is harassing the potash companies.

Well let me ask Mr. Steuart, who initiated all the court cases? Who is it that refuses to obey the laws of the province as established by the representatives in this Assembly? Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I might add who have recently been re-elected after having enacted those laws regulating the potash industry.

Now not to be outdone, Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the Conservative Opposition, the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) is quoted in the Leader-Post as saying:

The Government is unfair the potash companies have a logical argument. The Government's potash policies represent unnecessary interference in an area private enterprise should be allowed to function.

An area private enterprise should be allowed to function. Now, Mr. Speaker, let's examine that statement a little more closely. Is the Hon. Member for Estevan saying that the people of Saskatchewan have no right to receive a fair return for the resources that they in fact own? Is that what the Member for Estevan is saying? Is he saying that the private enterprise has a right to operate oblivious to the regulations laid down by the government of the government or other jurisdiction in which it is operating? Is that what he is saying, Mr. Speaker? There is a little bit of confusion between what the Liberals and the Conservatives are saying over there but it all comes out the same, and that is opposition to the people of Saskatchewan in support for the potash industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Is he calling on the Government to withdraw from regulation in the potash industry? An industry in which the need for government interference was clearly demonstrated by the introduction of the prorationing scheme by the free enterprise Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Member that private enterprise should be allowed to function. I am not at all convinced that the resource sector is an area in which it should be allowed to function completely on its own. The New Democratic Party government has made it very clear that resource development is an area where the public has a right to be involved and a right to regulate the way in which resources are utilized.

The opposition's cries and bleatings on behalf of the companies has escalated even more rapidly since the Throne Speech of November 12. Mr. Steuart is again quoted in the Leader-Post on November 13 and he repeated it in this Legislature. He says:

This is the greatest risk that has ever been launched by a provincial government. The Government had another alternative, to treat the companies fairly.

We know what Mr. Steuart means by treating them fairly, take the companies at their word and back off on our objective of getting a good return for the people of Saskatchewan. That is what Mr. Steuart is in effect saying and asking for.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan was always ready to sit down with the companies and discuss our differences, as the Leader of the Opposition is so fond of saying. It was not we who ended the conversations by initiating court action. It was the potash companies.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has also been said in recent days what can and what cannot be talked about in regard to court proceedings. But let me ask the Members this, how do they propose that we negotiate with the companies, possible modification or changes in the regulations while those regulations are themselves being challenged in the court? Certainly a ridiculous proposition, because one party is not dealing in good faith.

Mr. Steuart speaks of a bad business deal as well. Here we have a resource with potential to last hundreds of years, a resource which is needed to maximize food production around the world and Mr. Steuart speaks of a bad business deal. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) speaking in Yorkton, I note from reading in the Yorkton Enterprise on November 19, he is attempting to spread doom and gloom about the place as he spoke about:

A feeling of fear and apprehension.

The old socialist bugaboo has been brought out of the moth balls again, Mr. Speaker. Because Mr. MacDonald says that the recent Throne Speech was used as a platform to trot out doctrinaire socialism.

As a result the government moves to protect the rights of the people of Saskatchewan against the rights of multinational corporations, we are called socialists and the Liberals are evidences of fear and apprehension growing in the country. The Conservative Party, too, has made it clear where they stand on this issue. The Member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) says in the Leader-Post also of November 13:

The Government is two-faced. Nationalizing the potash industry will be terribly inflationary.

The Leader of the Conservatives speaks of this move into potash as being inflationary.

It has already been pointed out several times that buying an existing asset cannot be considered inflationary. I wonder what excuse the Conservative Leader would use to expose this move to protect the rights of the people of Saskatchewan if inflation was not at this time of such a serious concern. He doesn't like this move because it enhances our freedom of choice.

The multinational corporations flout the laws of this province but that doesn't concern the Conservatives. When we act to protect the citizens of Saskatchewan that somehow curtails their freedom.

Speaking on a Provincial Affairs telecast this past weekend, the Leader of the Conservative Party expressed concern for the workers in the potash industry. Mr. Speaker, I have a newspaper article which states that the government Federation of Labour calls on the government to nationalize the potash industry. I remind the Hon. Members also that union spokesmen representing

potash workers themselves have publicly expressed the support of their membership for this action by the government. So I ask the Member for Nipawin whom he speaks for when he talks about workers needing to be concerned in the potash industry because of this move when the very workers themselves are not registering that concern.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite seem to be attempting to convey the impression that Bill 1 is an example of government running roughshod over a defenceless industry. Conservatives express an unnatural concern over the influence of the government becoming ever larger and larger. The opposition Members do not seem to be concerned by the influence of multinational corporations over the lives of Saskatchewan people. An influence so powerful that in the case of potash companies they feel they can rewrite the laws of this province to suit themselves rather than allow the elected representatives of the people of this province to carry out those laws which will be in the best interests of the people who live in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to examine for a moment just who these potash companies are that our friends opposite are jumping to the defence of. Take for example the Potash Company of America which operates the mine at Patient's Lake. It is a division of Ideal Basic Industries Incorporated. This large international conglomerate operates another potash mine in New Mexico and is also big in the cement business. In 1971 Ideal Basic Industry had revenues of \$149 million from its cement operations and \$28 million from its potash operations. In 1971, Mr. Speaker. We must remember that in 1971 potash was selling for something like \$20 a ton in comparison to \$70 per ton today.

International Minerals and Chemicals Corporation of Canada Limited, operates two mines near Esterhazy which give them the largest single potash mining complex in the world. The parent company with head offices in Illinois has total assets in minerals, food and chemical products of over one-half billion dollars annually. This one company alone has net sales of half the total annual budget of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Kalium Chemicals Limited operates a potash mine near Belle Plaine. Kalium Chemicals is wholly owned by Pittsburgh Plate and Glass. Pittsburgh Plate and Glass has net sales of \$1.2 billion annually, which is larger than the yearly budget of the Government of Saskatchewan. I am not certain that the Pittsburgh Plate and Glass is exactly an infant when compared to the Government of this province.

The potash mine at Allan is owned jointly by Texas Gulf US Borax, Chemical Corporation, and Swift Canadian, a subsidiary of Swift and Company, a large international corporation. These three, if I may say, Mr. Speaker, infants of the corporate world pack a wallop which makes the elected representatives of the people of Saskatchewan very small by comparison. Alwinal is owned by European interests from France and Germany. This company has been involved in potash production for many years. Their interest in potash is certainly primary to any concern for the people who own the potash that they are attempting to get at. Duval Corporation of Canada is totally owned by Pennzoil, a resource company with head office in Houston, Texas. With revenues in excess of \$.75 billion annually and more than \$1.5 billion in assets. This company too, is a formidable size.

Cominco is totally owned by CP investments. Here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at least we have found a company mining Saskatchewan potash who at least claims to be majority owned by Canadians. But make no mistake about the corporate character of CP investments. This company is one of the largest fertilizer companies in North America. Central Canada Potash Limited is owned by Noranda Mines and CF Industries of Chicago. Both companies have large holdings and mineral activity with CF having connections with the potash industry in New Mexico. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting is controlled by South African interests. These same interests have 15 per cent of the shares of Tarra Chemicals at Sioux Falls, Iowa. Tarra Chemicals is a large manufacturer of fertilizer which puts the parent company in the enviable position of being vertically integrated, shall we say in the fertilizer business. Amax Company Limited is 100 per cent owned by American Metal Climax Incorporated. This company also has assets in excess of \$1.25 billion. Its annual net sales approach \$800 million and its impact therefore is also very significant.

All in all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see a picture of an industry in Saskatchewan controlled by multinational giants whose size alone is intimidating and whose interests are certainly not the interests of the people who own the resource that they are exploiting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce in this province has seen fit to compare the Government of Saskatchewan to the mechanical eating machine of the movie "Jaws". I submit that the comparison more readily applies . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, I note that the Liberal Members to your left are applauding. I submit to them that the comparison more readily applies to the multinationals which gobble up company after company after company, including the potash companies which operate in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to examine for a moment the role the federal Liberal government has chosen to play in this dispute over control of resource development.

The British North America Act is clear in its delegation of resource control to provincial governments. And for something over a hundred years the functioning of this country seemed to bear out the terms of the BNA granting control over natural resources to the province.

It was not until the world price of oil began rising dramatically that the federal government decided that it should have the right to largely increased tax revenues from resource extraction and to set policy regulations in the resource industry field.

The move of the Liberal government in Ottawa to make royalty payments non-deductible for both oil and potash companies when calculating federal tax profits cut into potential royalty revenues in a way that the provinces felt could not happen under

the BNA Act.

Even more discomfoting than this action, was the decision of the Liberal government to appear with the potash companies as co-plaintiffs in the legal challenge against the potash prorationing system. The federal government argued in this case that setting of quotas in the potash industry was, in fact, beyond the power of a provincial government.

Now, this indeed is a strange twist. The federal Liberal government which found nothing unconstitutional about the prorationing regulations when they were introduced by a Liberal provincial government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberal government found nothing wrong with the prorationing legislation throughout the entire tenure of the Liberal Party as a government in this province.

Now clearly, Mr. Speaker, the appearance of the federal government as co-plaintiff in the potash companies' legal challenge of the prorationing system was not just a further attempt to break the duly constituted efforts of the Saskatchewan Government to regulate the industry in the best interest of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take some time to lay before this Legislature and before the people of Saskatchewan the reasons why this government has found it necessary to enter into direct public ownership of the potash resources, the potash industry in Saskatchewan.

We're living in a period when there is a shortfall of food in many parts of the world. It is a conservative estimate that right now 500 million people are suffering from starvation or severe malnutrition. People in developing countries are making do with less than two-thirds the amount of the protein consumed in developed nations. The situation is not improving with the passage of time. In fact, quite the contrary. The outlook for the future indicates that increases in the world food supply will not keep pace with the rate of increased population.

It is in the developing nations themselves where the rate of population growth is most rapid. For the period of 1962-72, in ten years, the world's population increased at an average yearly rate of 1.9 per cent. However, the rate of population increase in the developing countries was about two and a half times the rate in the developed countries. In percentage terms the ten year rate of population growth in the developed countries between '62 and '72 was 2.4 per cent, unchanged from the previous ten year period. The alarming point, Mr. Speaker, is that in that period, that ten year period '62 to '72, rate of increased food production trailed that of the earlier ten year period.

The goal of sufficient world food supply becomes more and more difficult to achieve.

Now to accommodate our present population, let alone projected increases, the world must look for means of significantly decreasing production. This will require an increase in productivity both in developing countries, as well as in those already developed. It is in these developing nations where the greatest increase in food production can and must occur. With improved agricultural technology that's possible. It is in the developing nations where increases in supplies of fertilizer are

most urgently needed.

During the current period of heavy world demand for potash it seems that the objective of ensuring maximum possible expansion is one which necessitates government control of the industry.

I alluded earlier to the natural position Saskatchewan holds in terms of expansion of potash production. In spite of all of the factors being in place which would indicate expansion, none is in fact occurring.

Under direct public ownership the government will ensure that expansion in our production capacity does take place. New jobs therefore will be added in the province. Jobs which we will endeavour to make as secure as possible. Planned expansion in the potash industry will allow for increased activities in those communities where the potash mines are located and for any communities where new mines may locate, should the situation call for new mine additions in the industry.

It is important to note again that such increased activity can be viewed as being more stable under public control of the potash industry than was previously the case. Most of the people working in the potash industry in Saskatchewan are Saskatchewan people, although relatively few of them are in management and virtually none of them are at the policy making level. They do make the mines and they do make the refineries work and we expect they will continue to make them work. We think that many who came from outside of our province will decide to stay here and help us expand this industry.

Certainly within the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan we have a number of talented people who spent many years in the potash industry and I have no doubt of their ability to assemble a team to manage the industry efficiently. It will be a new and a wider horizon for people in the industry. Helping to manage one mine is one thing, but managing a group of mines is something else. I say a challenge to their imagination, their initiative, their ambitions and their talents. I'm sure that many of them will be unable to resist and those people are welcome to stay and become part of this new venture.

I'm sure that many of the miners and the mill workers will feel more secure in their jobs, knowing that the decisions are being made in Regina, not in the corporate boardrooms of New York or Toronto or Houston or Chicago or Paris. They know that decisions made here are going to take into consideration their concerns and their future. They know that this government is interested in making the best use of our non-renewable resources over a period of time. They know this government is vitally concerned with diversifying our economy and preserving our communities outside of the big cities, places such as Lanigan, and Esterhazy. The government will not make decisions based simply on how much profit we can make and how quickly we can make it.

The decisions will take into account the human needs of the workers and their families. The government will be sensitive to the unhappiness and/or disruption that may be caused to families and communities by layoffs and/or closures.

When I say that, and I'm not being critical of those

businesses which have as their prime concern a quick return on investment, if that's the kind of business they are in, obviously they will try to make the biggest profit in the shortest period of time. It's not their objective to preserve jobs in Saskatchewan or to strengthen Saskatchewan's economy. They will make decisions in the best interest of their world wide operations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't agree that such a motivation is the best way to develop our Saskatchewan resources in the best interests of Saskatchewan people. We think that the future of the Saskatchewan workers and of Saskatchewan communities must be taken into account and we think a Saskatchewan Crown corporation, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan can do that job better than anyone else.

Potash workers in Saskatchewan need to be assured that this government intends to stabilize and expand the potash industry. We know that workers in the industry are looking for long term stability. We intend to provide that kind of stability. We believe that everyone in the industry today has the right to stay in the industry if they wish to do so.

Some unions involved in the potash industry have called for public ownership in the industry, so I expect that they will welcome the involvement of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. They know that they will have an employer that believes in the rights of workers to form unions and bargain collectively without harassment. I want to assure those potash workers that job security is a prime concern of the government and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and that the future of the industry and of the potash communities will be of major concern and interest to the government.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Just like Intercon.

**MR. MESSER:** — The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley says just like Intercon and I hope he has the opportunity to take part in this debate, and we will be anxiously awaiting your remarks in this debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is in regard to the government's announced effect on private businessmen which I should like to now turn my attention.

The great bulk of private business in this province in single-owner type business type business found throughout our cities and towns. These individuals for the most part are hard-working people who pay their taxes and obey the laws of the land. For the most part they are a part of the communities in which their businesses are located and they take an active part in the well being of those communities. They are very aware of the circumstances under which they operate and are very vulnerable to changes to those circumstances. These people are therefore keenly interested in the government's decision in regard to the potash industry and what the reverberations of that decision may have for themselves and their industry.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — They don't like it.

**MR. MESSER:** — The Member says they don't like it and I choose to think differently because I have been spending some time talking

about the province of Saskatchewan and certainly . . .

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The Chamber . . .

**MR. MESSER:** — The Chamber may say one thing, but they don't necessarily speak for the businessmen of Saskatchewan and I have had no less than four invitations from communities in Saskatchewan to come out and talk to them and on each of those four occasions they made it clear that they disagreed with the statement that was issued by the Chamber of which they were members.

Now I see the decision to place potash production under public control as being of great benefit to this group of private businessmen. While most of these people realized that the government's decision will have no effect on the ownership of their own businesses, some no doubt will have fears in this regard, no doubt promoted by Members of the Liberal and Conservative Parties and perhaps some of their cohorts in the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that the government's decision in potash is based clearly on its stated objectives, to secure a proper return from the extraction of that natural resource. It has never been, it has never been out objective to control any of those private businesses which operate in this province and which I have made reference to. There is need for individual initiative to identify those areas where the public requires services and to provide that service at a cost which is acceptable to the public and profitable to the individual. We've always encouraged such initiative and will continue to do so in the future.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I believe our decision will benefit individuals who are engaged in those businesses. I look for an expanded potash industry to help maintain the buoyant Saskatchewan economy and maintain those conditions which are so important to a healthy prospering business community.

We need only to look at retail value figures over the past few years to realize how necessary it is to the success of small businesses that the economy continues to operate at a healthy level and in a healthy state.

Again, I believe that the increased ability which public ownership will bring to the potash industry will help maintain the health state of the Saskatchewan economy over the long term, which in effect will add to the stability of the businesses and their families in many of our communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is further my belief that the government of this province can and will work with private enterprise in any field of endeavour provided that business is prepared to recognize that we are in fact the government and have the responsibility to set regulations governing the interest of the industry and the interests of the general public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I assumed the position of Minister of Industry and Commerce in July of this year, I have met with representatives of industry in this province. I have met with organizations representing business interests in the province, such as, and even though I think it's deserving to have some critical remarks of them, Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade. In my discussions with these people, one thing which always emerges as an important principle is that businessmen

want governments that pass laws affecting their enterprises to be consistent. They have conveyed to me that it is not regulation per se enacted by governments which concern them, but rather that the ground rules under which they operate be fair and understandable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to assure members of the Saskatchewan business community that I appreciate this concern and further that I agree that this is a most important fact, if business is going to continue to develop and thrive in this province.

I want to say further that this government has been consistent and will continue to be consistent in the rules it applies to the business world. Our movement into public operation of the potash industry is consistent with our stated objectives in the resource field. Government ownership of the industry has always been an option we have had available in terms of achieving our objectives. In terms of business not related to the natural resource sector, we have stated our objectives on a number of occasions, and I wish to restate those objectives so that everyone will be clear that the ground rules for doing business in Saskatchewan have not changed whether the business is large or small.

Our objectives in regard to business activity in the province are that such activity utilize resources efficiently without damage to the environment of the community and that it provide an activity which is beneficial to the economy of the area in which it is located. This objective can be applied to a business locating in any community in the province and is equally valid regardless of the size of the business being contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, we as the government are therefore pleased to assist private business ventures in any way possible and to provide managerial and financial help to new business ventures contemplating location in this province. We are currently doing this in a variety of ways through the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. I can see no way that our decision to enter into public ownership of the potash industry will jeopardize or change conditions related to other business ventures in this province. Quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker. The anticipated revenues which will accrue to the provincial treasury from the operation of the potash industry will give us the flexibility necessary to place greater emphasis on the development of the economy of our non-urban and smaller urban sectors of our province.

It is the desire of this government to create an atmosphere where all may thrive whether they be businessmen, farmers, professional or workers. And it is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I believe public ownership of the potash industry must be pursued. It is in this context that I believe it to be the best interest of every element of Saskatchewan society and it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I support Bill 1.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising in debate of Bill 1, I should first like to make mention of a comment made by the Hon. Member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) when he began in his defense of the

highway system of the province, he admitted that there was some difficulty in controlling the weather. I want to say that I was delighted to hear the Hon. Member indicate that there was at least something that the government is unable to control.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — We have heard much from Members opposite who speak in platitudes. They put forward a completely false premise that for some reason, and that reason has never been made clear, they have a corner on the matter of speaking for the people of Saskatchewan.

I recall reading, for example, that the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale said that he had confidence in government proposals to nationalize the potash industry because he knew that the people of Saskatchewan support this NDP government. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we can recall the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) chide Members of the opposition for distorting facts. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I can recall the Attorney General accusing the Leader of the Opposition of distorting figures related to the economics of the potash industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the House, that there was about as much distortion of those figures as there was about our prior knowledge of Mr. Schultz's resignation and about Mr. Drummond's defection from his post. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the figures of the imaginary, ordinary average potash company put forward earlier by the Leader of the Opposition represent a pretty clear picture of what is happening. Given the credibility of the other statements made in the House, Mr. Speaker, which verify our information, and given the fact that Members opposite refuse time and again to give us any figures related to the economics of this nationalization, let us look again for a moment at the balance sheet of that potash company. I think it is particularly important that we do so after hearing the fantasy put forward yesterday by the Member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange).

Let's take Statement Number 1 first of all, Mr. Speaker, and go through it. This potash mine is producing 1.2 million tons of product a year, it cost about \$100 million to construct and is valued at an approximate value today of \$225 million. For the fiscal year 1974-75 its profit and loss statement is as follows:

Volume of product 1.2 million tons: Revenue 1.2 million tons at \$42 per ton, or \$50.4 million. Cost of doing business including wages, supplies and sale, etc., \$18.65 million. Gross profit before taxes or depreciation then comes out to \$31.75 million.

Provincial taxes in millions can be broken down into a number of components: Royalties about \$.98 million; proration charges \$1.5 million; mineral tax \$1.14 million; lease rental \$.02 million; education and health tax \$.43 million; reserve tax \$11.6 million; provincial corporation tax \$.56 million; for a total of \$15.23 million.

Then there is the municipal tax of \$1.43 million; federal corporation tax of \$4.14 million, giving a total of \$11.95

million. Depreciated at five per cent and a net profit of \$6.95 million.

Now let's take a look for a moment at Statement Number 2. A statement which indicates the profit and loss statement for the same mine after government takeover based on no loss of markets and no inefficiency. This statement is predicated on the government paying \$225 million for the mine.

First of all, revenue \$50.4 million; cost of doing business, wages, supplies, sales and costs, etc., \$18.65 million. Gross profit before taxes, depreciation and interest payments \$31.75 million. Municipal taxes \$.43 million, for a total of \$31.32 million. Interest on \$225 million at 10.5 per cent for 20 years is \$11.8 million; depreciation at five per cent for 20 years yields \$11.25 million; a net profit of \$8.27 million.

We look at the repayment of the principal of the loan over 20 years and we are looking at an annual rate of \$11.25 million giving a cash flow to the government for the first 20 years in the minus category.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having entered these figures of this ordinary average potash mine into the records, I want to return to my remarks of a few minutes ago about making platitudinous statements and the example I used was the statement of the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale that he knew he spoke for the people of the province; and the remarks of the Attorney General chiding Members for distorting the facts. I should like to come back to this average potash mine a little later.

Let's look at some facts, Mr. Speaker, related to the statement related to the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale: Fact No. 1, in the June 11 election, 80.3 per cent of the eligible voters cast their ballots. Fact No. 2, of the 80.3 per cent who voted, 40.07 per cent supported the NDP. Put another way, Mr. Speaker, 20 per cent of those eligible didn't vote and of those who did six out of every ten voted in opposition to the socialistic principles of the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — It was obvious prior to June 11, that the Members of the NDP government exhibited a haughty, kind of a 'holier than thou' attitude, an attitude which demonstrated a clear lack of understanding of people and a lack of trust in people to make decisions for themselves. It was my hope, and I think the hope of many thousands of Saskatchewan residents that Members opposite should have learned something from the June election. Apparently, not only have they learned nothing from the election, but their attitude hasn't changed either.

I would have thought that they would realize, contrary to the statement of the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale, that they do not have a mandate from the people of this province to nationalize the potash industry. Not only do they have no mandate but they are not even close to representing the majority of those eligible to vote.

While I am speaking about representing those who vote,

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct some comments to this specific area. The attitude of the government toward those whom they represent was demonstrated last weekend, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) — and I noticed he just stood up and I hope he will sit down again — chastised an organization which spoke out against the government proposal to nationalize the potash industry. A statement from the Saskatoon Board of Trade which questioned the action proposed by the government was met by considerable consternation from the Member for Saskatoon Centre. I heard the Hon. Member say in a radio interview that the Board of Trade had no business speaking out on this issue. He inferred that a group who is opposed to the government takeover should keep quiet and not interfere with the business of the government. I suppose that what the Member was really saying was that the government had no obligation to listen to all groups who make up the very fabric of our society. I must say that I had often suspected this to be the case but never had I heard it so blatantly stated.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — He really inferred, as I heard it, that the government has selective hearing. They hear only what they want to hear and they are selective of the groups they want to hear.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the Member for Saskatoon Centre, and the exaggerated statement from the Member for Kelsey-Tisdale which I referred to earlier are part of the same base — a base which is out of touch with reality and ignores the people who we are here to serve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us return to this mandate question — I have already indicated that it is quite plain that the government has no mandate to nationalize the potash industry. They do not have a mandate and they did not ask for one. They did not ask for one because, I submit, they lacked the courage to do so. They lacked the courage to take this issue to the people of Saskatchewan in the same way they lacked the courage to mention increased rates to the Crown corporations prior to the election.

If I may digress for a moment while remaining on the topic of a mandate. I was amused at the reaction of the Attorney General to statements made by the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) while discussing the major rate increases of the Crown corporations. He obviously hit a nerve, because the Attorney General went on at great length to alter the issue and accuse the Leader of the Official Opposition of hating Crown corporations. The Attorney General overreacted to such a degree that I was frankly surprised (but he put on a good dramatic show for his troops). Yes, I was frankly surprised that he did not put the figures which he says are fully justified to the people last June.

Mr. Speaker, The Attorney General mentioned the ‘new look’ Liberals and then chidingly tried to tell us whom we represent. I want to make it plainly known, Mr. Speaker, that the official Opposition doesn’t need to have words put in its mouth. We know that we are indeed the ‘new look’ Liberals. What we are interested in is positive action for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — I want the Members opposite and the Press and the people of Saskatchewan to now that we are not particularly concerned about what went on in the past, a decade or more ago. But we are interested in the now and in the future. While we are sanctimoniously criticized by Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, it should be understood that we represent the people of our constituencies and that we can represent them effectively. The smoke screen of vested interests being our only concern as charged by the Attorney General is blatantly false. The vested interests which we represent are the vested interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Returning, Mr. Speaker, to the mandate question. I said a few moments ago that not only does the government not have a mandate to introduce Bill 1, they did not even have the courage to ask for one. When you look at their election platform of last spring you cannot find any reference to nationalization or expropriation of the potash industry.

In their section on resource development there are statements like:

... continue to act to see that Saskatchewan people get the greatest possible benefit from our resources.

... defend and protect the right of Saskatchewan people to the full benefits from their rightful heritage.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Well, the Members opposite apparently like hearing that again. Let's take a look at some of the statements that we made and with all deference to those sitting at my left, I couldn't find anything out of your statements but I realize that you basically mimicked our policy anyway. But here are some of the things that we said:

... ensure proper control and conservation of renewable resources through strict government regulations and inspection.

... encourage expansion of the mining industry and renew exploration in the petroleum industry so that Saskatchewan people will be provided with jobs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now I can assure you we weren't looking for nor asking for a mandate to nationalize the potash industry And I submit that the NDP did not ask nor receive a mandate to nationalize the potash industry either. I submit further that this matter is fundamental to this debate on Bill 1 and vital to the people of Saskatchewan. Nowhere does the government election platform mention the risk of nationalization.

Now the Attorney General didn't call it a risk, Mr. Speaker.

But I have heard the Premier use the term and there is no question that it is a risk. If the Attorney General wishes to use shallow arguments and play on semantics that is his prerogative. However, he is not fooling anyone — certainly not the people of Saskatchewan. It is a risk, and it is a risk plain and simple. It is a risk of loss of expertise in the industry and we already know that is already happening. It's a risk of loss of future investment in this province and there have already been concerns expressed from people in other industries about investing here. And there is a risk of huge sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear and unequivocal that Members opposite did not ask for mandate to nationalize the potash industry. Let us examine the reason why they did not. I think I know why not and I am certain that the Members opposite know why they did not. The answer is pretty simple.

They knew that the people of Saskatchewan would not accept the idea of nationalizing the industry. The Members opposite knew that the average person in Saskatchewan would begin to ask, "Who is next?" Just as that person today is asking himself, "Who is next?"

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — It's the same reason, Mr. Speaker, why Members opposite have insisted on ramming this Bill and Bill 2 through the House before Christmas. It is the same reason why the government launched a propaganda campaign in the Press and in the electronic media. They know that the people of Saskatchewan, given time to consider this proposition, would not accept it. The logic of the Attorney General in his remarks during this debate escapes me, Mr. Speaker. He talks about the magnitude of this Bill, of its great significance to the province, he talks about breaking new ground. At the same time he knows that he doesn't have a mandate, that the Party's percentage of the popular vote is lower than it has ever been; he know that there are many questions related to the economics of this proposal that are, as yet, unanswered; he knows that he is losing sleep at night worrying about the takeover, as are all Members opposite who have any business sense; he knows that what he is asking this House to do is an unprecedented risk and yet he asks Members of the Opposition to allow this Bill and Bill 2 to be pushed through the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to do that.

I said earlier, that I wanted to say a further word about the figures used to assess the business nature of this nationalization proposal. Members of our caucus have tried repeatedly and in vain, to obtain some outside figures about the costs and the enormous risk we are being asked to accept. I want to analyze the lack of logic of the position of Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, because I think this, too, is vital to the people of Saskatchewan. In his speech, the Attorney General scorned the 87 per cent tax rate presently assessed on the industry. He indicated that no businesses would accept that on blind faith. He said we needed hard evidence which, Mr. Speaker, he said he didn't have. And if he doesn't I submit he has really got no one to blame but himself and the government. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite in the next breath expect us to accept the statements they make on blind faith — they won't

give us any figures. They refuse to table any figures in the House. Strange logic, Mr. Speaker, indeed no logic at all.

Let's look at some figures, Mr. Speaker, and do some simple arithmetic. Members opposite may scoff, but remember they are not producing any, and let's also remember the credibility of some statements made by Liberal Members of the House. Let's assume that this government is going to borrow something in the order of, let's say, \$750 million, to purchase a portion of the industry. If we assume a 30 per cent down payment, something in the order of \$225 million and I read that the Premier last night in New York said something under \$250 million was there and available right now, so I think it is a pretty realistic figure. Now we can assume a debt borrowed at let's say ten per cent over 20 years of \$1.3 billion. If we add that \$1.3 billion to the original down payment of \$225 million, we have an overall payment of \$1.5 billion. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are giving up roughly \$150 million per year from the potash industry. Over that same 20 year period revenue to the province would be \$3 billion. Mr. Speaker, the figure of \$3 billion does not take into account any increases in the taxation rates. And, Mr. Speaker, with no risk at all. On the one hand, a debt for the people of Saskatchewan of \$1.5 billion and on the other a revenue of \$3 billion. A difference of \$4.5 billion, Mr. Speaker, and a bad business deal.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Well, I recognize that the Member for Bengough-Milestone caused considerable embarrassment to the government yesterday with his demonstrated lack of understanding of the situation at and, and with his continual admission of the fact that socialism is simply an euphemism — he did make one valid point with which I am certain the Attorney General would agree. The Member for Bengough-Milestone said that this topic deserves wide debate. In fact he said the debate should continue for a long, long time. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while there was little else he said that made any sense — he was right on that one point.

It is my opinion that the government should allow this Bill to be tabled, to allow people to react and it ought to be re-introduced when the House reconvenes in the spring. The government should recognize that it has no mandate, that it asks for no mandate and that it has no right to ram this Bill down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

## INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

### SOVIET UNION GUESTS

**MR. B. ALLEN (Regina-Rosemont):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might interrupt the proceedings to introduce some distinguished guests that we have with us this afternoon, who were not here during the ordinary

time.

I refer the Hon. Members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have three honoured guests from the Soviet Union, Vladimir Silantiev, a correspondent with Izvestia and accompanying Mr. Silantiev are Mr. and Mrs. Yerasenkov from Leningrad, if you would stand up.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I am sure all Hon. Member would like to welcome you to our country, and hope that you have a very interesting stay here and have a safe journey home to your country.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 2 — **An Act respecting The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief comments with respect to this particular Bill. I find it very interesting to listen to the statistical data put forth by Members opposite in relation to potash. There are two widely divergent views of statistics currently popular among the general public. One view is that published statistics are themselves invested with some quality of being not unlike the qualities ascribed to numbers by the ancient Pythagoreans and that they enjoy such a degree of infallibility that they may be accepted without question. This of course is just as nonsensical as the other and yet more popular belief that statistics can be made to prove anything and therefore by implication can prove nothing. Reputable statisticians, Mr. Speaker, do not engage in unwarranted manipulation of data nor stoop to questionable tactics in order to produce the answers they want rather than the actual answers that are awaiting discovery in the data presented.

Liberal statistics are always liberally interpreted. To try to pin them down to any degree of accuracy is like trying to nail some jelly to the wall.

Potash Bill 2 relates to the setting up of a Crown corporation. A publicly owned corporation is something which is not new in Saskatchewan, indeed it is not new in Canada. One can quote chapter and verse the number of such corporations from one end of this country to the other. Newfoundland nationalized Brinco, the British Newfoundland Corporation, including the Hamilton Falls - Churchill Falls complexes. That was brought to fruition under a Conservative government. I suppose I should correct myself, Mr. Speaker, and say it was Progressive Conservative government. I don't know whether it was progressively more conservative or conservatively more progressive. It is hard to know which direction they are going.

Quebec nationalized the Quebec Hydro, as investment figure in excess of \$600 million. That socialistic approach was initiated by a Liberal government. It is always interesting to note the Press reports with respect to current items in the news. Here is one from the Vancouver Province under date

of November 13 and they talked about expropriation and nationalization of various corporations across Canada. In the early 1960s the Bennett government in British Columbia expropriated BC Electric for \$192.8 million. That was the sociable creditors that pulled off that deal, a sum that was only settled after lengthy litigation. They also mentioned in the same category the Newfoundland government's takeover of the Churchill Falls Brinco Development. They failed to mention the takeover of Quebec Hydro, which was more than double the total amount of money involved in the takeovers related to the other two.

Mr. Speaker, we have corporations, Crown corporation across this country under all types of governments. Ontario Hydro has a total investment in excess of \$3 billion. Manitoba Hydro is in excess of \$1 billion. Sask power has \$514,516,000 invested. We have mentioned previously that the Social Credit government previously in power in British Columbia, nationalized BC Electric Company, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan have publicly owned telephone systems.

I wonder why Members opposite get so upset with respect to the proposal that we should have a Crown corporation operating in the field of potash. Mr. Speaker, no doubt opposition Members will counter the argument with the contention that the examples I have cited are all in the utility field, however, there are many examples in the ordinary field of commercial enterprise to illustrate the point. Quebec has Sidbec, a steel complex; Nova Scotia where we have a Liberal government as we have in Quebec, a steel complex in Sydney, previously privately owned, was nationalized. The federal authority in this country established Polymer Rubber, a most successful commercial industrial productive facility. British Columbia has had spectacular success with the Crown-Zellerbach operation in pulp which it purchased from a large American concern. I am sure that Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have heard the story about Ocean Falls, British Columbia. I hope they remember it.

Mr. Speaker, Liberals always have a good deal to say about Crown corporations. To them publicly owned corporations are some sort of a nefarious plot. They consistently and respectively condemn Crown corporations. They are joined in this approach by the Progressive Conservatives. I am quoting from the Humboldt Journal, November 27, "Tories Oppose Takeover." In part I quote from that particular issue:

. . . later in the evening Tory Leader Dick Collver said he condemned the Government's takeover of the industry. He suggest that if his party formed the next government (what a hope) it would establish a Saskatchewan Development Fund.

I should like to notify the Member for Nipawin that we already have a Saskatchewan Development Fund. He'll hear more about it in Crown corporation a little bit later.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that because these people consistently condemn Crown corporations that they obviously do not believe in that approach. Inevitably the Liberal Members refer to Crown corporations which were unsuccessful, particularly where there were commercial enterprises involved. Not it is obvious that there is risk in business, one cannot steal second base in a ball game and leave one foot on fist. If he can, he should be playing with the Cincinnati Reds. I think they are the people who won the world series this year. They obviously

always refer to the ones that were unsuccessful. They quote the tannery, the shoe factory, the woollen mill, the box factory, the fish filleting plant, the brick plant. Very tiny operations. Incidentally, I might tell the Members of this House that the woollen mill in Moose Jaw produced an excellent product. I have got one of those automobile blankets in my car, it is 28 years of age now, and it is an excellent blanket.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — They very, very conveniently forget about successful enterprises, Mr. Speaker,. They go into sort of “a Liberal limbo” when it comes to those corporations. What about them? Let’s have a look at a few of them.

Saskatchewan Forest Products — I have heard Liberals condemn Saskatchewan Forest Products year in and year out in this House, but it returned \$10,272,729 to the Provincial Treasury of this province since it was set up. That is exactly five times as much as was lost in the tannery, the shoe factory, the woollen mill, etc.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Saskatchewan Minerals has returned \$12,260,607 to the Provincial Treasury. I had the opportunity of being the chairman of Saskatchewan Minerals for a short period of time. I predict that Saskatchewan Minerals will raise that figure into the neighbourhood of \$18 million by the end of this year. Not bad, Mr. Speaker, for an organization that was set up on an initial investment of \$1 million.

Frankly, if it were a privately owned firm, opposition Members, both Liberals and Conservatives would be extolling it to the skies, however, they haven’t a good word to say about it in relation to the results that have been attained for the people of this province.

Saskatchewan Transportation is the publicly owned bus company. Liberals roundly condemned it when it was set up. They really condemned the bus company, it was the end of free enterprise in the field of transportation in the province of Saskatchewan. It has returned \$5,988,508 to the end of 1974 to the Provincial Treasury of this province and has provided a good service throughout this province and is continuing to provide a good service throughout this province and is in fact currently an absolutely essential service to this province. Did he Liberals support a publicly owned bus service? Not a chance. They might support a “Merchant marine,” but not a bus company.

Saskatchewan Printing has returned \$1,443,340 to the province an Sask Fur Marketing has returned some \$750,000 to the province.

Mr. Speaker, SGIO has always elicited venomous criticism from the Opposition Members. Yet this essential service has been supplied to Saskatchewan citizens, along with an accumulated surplus turned back to the province of \$8,028,865. In addition, Mr. Speaker, it should not be forgotten that the assets of SGIO now in the neighbourhood of \$56,463,000 are invested in the main

in provincial, municipal, school and hospital debentures in this province. It operates the rather unique licence insurance and eliminates in large measure the tremendous backlog of litigation cases related to automobile accidents which commonly occur in other parts of Canada where publicly operated insurance corporations do not operate. The accumulated earnings to the end of 1974 of these six publicly owned corporations — I purposely picked these six to offset the six that were unsuccessful - total \$38,768,658. The accumulated losses of the six previously mentioned unsuccessful ventures totalled about \$2,312,000. The province and the people of this province are ahead a net figure of more than \$36,500,000 on those ventures to date.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That doesn't include the Water Supply Board.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — No, I left out the Water Supply Board, that's Liberal Crown corporation It has lost millions of dollars.

I should remind this Assembly that not one dollar of that net sum would have been available to the people of this province had we had Liberal or Conservative governments down through the years.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Sask Power and Sask Tel (the utilities) have accumulated \$272 million in the last 10 years in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** . . . to make \$1 million?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I'll give you the credit when you deserve it.

The Press consistently refers to the high risk involved in the proposed publicly owned potash venture. The exploration risk for potash is not high, actually potash can be found very easily through a broad belt right across this province, stretching from the Alberta border, though not into Alberta, and across the entire central portion of the province into Manitoba and cutting back down in the southern part of the province into bits of North Dakota and Montana. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose this is very practical but if you drilled a hole on the opposition side down far enough you would probably run into potash. It would be nice to find something valuable on that side of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — The known reserves in this province in potash exceeds 118 billion tons, enough to alt more than five thousand years at present rates of production.

I was very interested in comments of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) relating to potash where he talked about the average potash mine. I wonder if there is such a thing as an average potash mine if you look at their productive capabilities. Now look at one like IMC that produces up to 2,300,000 tons a year. Sylvite in the 1 million ton range

Kalium 912,000 tons a year; Potash of America with 460,000 tons, Central Canada Potash with some 900,000 tons; Allan in that same category. You look at Duval with 720,000, Cominco with 712,000, Alwinal with 600,000, How do you find the average potash mine. I think that is a misnomer and a figment of the imagination of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview.

Demand for potash in the world is high and increasing. We export the vast majority of it of course, currently to the United States, we send some of it to the eastern province. It is interesting to note that Prince Edward Island of course, takes 112,000 tons out of Saskatchewan each year. Obviously this is due to the fact their agricultural production is somewhat different than ours and that they are not growing cereal type grains and they have a great need for that type of fertilizer in terms of their production of potatoes and tobacco, etc.

I find it very difficult to understand why the Member for Eastview would try to figure out an average potash mine. There is no such mine in this province.

Prices of potash are high and they are advancing. The best which you can get from organizations that do studies in relation to this indicate that the price of potash may well be in the \$100 per ton range by 1980. It is reasonable to predict that Potash of Saskatchewan will be an eminently successful Crown corporation in the years ahead. First of all, the product is there, the markets are there, the capability of production is there and will continue to be there whether the operation is private or publicly owned. Liberals and Conservatives in the future will be vying with each other as claimants for the success of this Crown corporation. Provincial potash ownership may even be receiving accolades from the lineal descendants of a former Premier of this province who, and I quote directly from him, “. . . favored one plant and one plant only, started by the CCF,” this reference was to the sodium plan at Chaplin which he called ‘sodium socialism.’

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of Bill 2 and the setting up of the Crown corporation - Potash of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the comments made by the Minister of Health as he is now. He gave examples of Crown corporations in Saskatchewan, in Newfoundland, in Canada, in Nova Scotia, all across the country. Every single one of those Crown corporations before they were allowed to pass into law, before they were created by the various Assemblies that were concerned with them, precise figures were given to those Assemblies as to the amount of money that is involved; whether it was \$10 million, \$600 million or whatever. In every single case this happened, and I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, it is not happening in connection with Bill 1 and Bill 2.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, I should also, at this time, like perhaps to restate our position in connection with Bill 1 and Bill 2

because there appears to have been some misunderstanding, both by Members opposite and by members of the Press, and I take full responsibility if there was a misunderstanding.

Bill 1, we oppose for many reasons, basically on philosophy, that is, it's socialism against what we say is a better system, free enterprise. We oppose it because of the risk. We oppose it because of the cost. We oppose it because the power taken unto the government through Sections 60 and 61 of the Bill. We oppose it because of the provisions of Section 45. There are many other reasons why we oppose it. In the days ahead you'll be getting into the Committee of the Whole and we'll be discussing the matter further and in particular at that time. This will take some time, Mr. Speaker, because of the very nature of the Bill, because of the complications that are arising from it. Because it will take some time, we hope that the people of Saskatchewan will pay attention to the debates that are going on in this House, both on that side and on this side. We hope that they will make their views known to this House during those debates and we hope that we can persuade the government to delay passage of this Bill so that the people of Saskatchewan can have a chance to look at it; delay it until at least the spring session.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that we will not be able to get the government to do this because they have a majority of Members over there. It's obvious that they are determined in their position to get the Bill through as quickly as they can. We say that we are going to do our utmost to point out to the people of Saskatchewan the faults of the Bill, the many faults of it, and this will take, indeed, a great deal of time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we feel in the Liberal Party that we were elected to come to this Assembly and make our views known. We feel that our main duty is to talk about legislation that comes before this province. We feel that we must point out to the government and the people of Saskatchewan the pitfalls and the faults of the Bill, unlike the philosophy of the Members who sit to my far left, who feel that they only have to make one statement, usually outside the House. We feel it's our duty as duly elected Members, to rise these points and to bring them to this House and to bring them to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan, and that's what we are going to do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Now I can't say, Mr. Speaker, nor can any of the Members opposite how long this will take, but I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House in the Liberal Party will be heard, our views will be made known, and the people of Saskatchewan will know what those views are. And that is not a filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn now to our reason for opposing Bill 2.

Bill 2 is something different than Bill 1, although they are companion pieces of legislation. But Bill 2 we do not oppose so much from a philosophical point of view, or from the risk or from the cost or the other matters which I have mentioned. We oppose Bill 2 for a more fundamental reason. We oppose

Bill 2 because Bill 2 is taking away a basic right of this Legislature. That's the right to vote on money, to vote on supply. We oppose Bill 2 because we feel that if Bill 2 is allowed to go through without facts about the amount of money involved being made public, what we will be doing, in effect, is co-operating in the destruction of the parliamentary system in this province. And, because of our opposition, Mr. Speaker, we intend to do our utmost to keep this Bill from passing. Once again, Mr. Speaker, we can only speak for so many hours, for so much length of time, and in due course, no doubt, this Bill will go through. However, I hope that the Members opposite will see the reason for our opposition; that they will come to their senses and that they will give us the figures that we require.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 attacks the very reason for the Assembly being in existence. It attacks the very foundation of a parliamentary democracy. It does this by taking away the right of parliament, the right of this Assembly, to vote on money, to vote on supply. The first and foremost duty, Mr. Speaker, of an elected representative is to vote on money matters, to inquire on behalf of the voter, the people, not only how the taxpayers' money is being spent, but how much is being spent. If we allow this bill, Bill 2, to pass without demanding this information as to how much money is involved, what interest will be paid, where the money is coming from, we would be abdicating the very function we were elected to perform by our voters. We would not be fulfilling our duty to the voters, to the people, and that is the duty that's not only imposed on the Members of the Liberal opposition, it's imposed on the backbenchers who sit over there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite, especially the newly elected Members may think that they are the government. They are not the government. The government is Mr. Blakeney, as Premier and his colleagues in the Cabinet. They are the government, not the backbench Members of the New Democratic Party. They have just as much a duty to make these inquiries, to find out how much money is being spent, as we have on this side of the House. I want to remind them of that duty.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have not, in this country, in this province, come to the stage where it's going to be government by Cabinet. Cabinet is responsible to this Legislature for all its actions. It is required by parliamentary practice, by the laws of this country to justify the actions; that is, the spending of money. In Bill 2 it is wilfully refusing to be responsible to the Legislative Assembly as parliamentary democracy insists that it must do. That is why we oppose the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Let me look at this in another way, Mr. Speaker. We have been asked by the government Members opposite in effect to give them a blank cheque to put this Bill through without knowing whether we are going to be spending a billion dollars, a million dollars, half a billion dollars, or whatever, that is what we are being asked to do at this stage. It's just the

same situation, Mr. Speaker, as if the Minister of Finance when he comes in, in the spring and presents his budget, comes into this House and he says — well, we are going to do a whole bunch of things — we are going to improve on the health system, we are going to give more money to old people and so on, but we're not going to tell you how much money it's going to cost. It's just exactly the same as that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — And you know that's not what happens, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister of Finance comes to this House he presents the budget, he tells approximately how much money the government hopes to take in in taxes, he tells approximately how much money the government intends on spending. After that, Mr. Speaker, there's a very detailed study of the Estimates that he proposes to this House and there's no difference, Mr. Speaker, in that than in Bill 2. We are entitled to know how much money is involved.

Some commentators have said, Mr. Speaker, that hard-headed businessmen don't go out and divulge how much they are going to spend before they get involved in a deal. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that hard-headed businessmen are dealing with their own money, or with the money of a company which they may represent. They are responsible first to themselves and they are responsible to the shareholders and directors of the company. In this case what the government is using is the money of the people and I suggest that they are responsible to the people for the amount of money that they are requesting.

We are not asking the government to say that if they could put into an arrangement to buy IMC or Sylvite or any of the mines, to tell us precisely how many dollars they need to do it, we are not asking for that, and I want to make that very clear, because they are quite proper in not divulging this type of information at this time. What we are asking for is a lump figure, an approximate figure that the government feels that it requires to embark on this action, whether that be a billion dollars, whether it be half a billion, all we are asking for is an approximate figure, an approximate amount of money that they are prepared to risk in this venture that they are taking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been other legislation like this, that the Members opposite have referred to earlier in their speeches. There has been the SPC legislation, and I should just like to refer to the SPC legislation if I can. I believe the Bill which set up the Power Corporation was passed in 1951, and I should like to refer the Members opposite to that Bill and in particular to Section 40. Section 40 provides that the company can borrow money in order to facilitate the purpose for its being. In that Bill a sum of money is involved, it's set out in the Bill at \$50 million. I should like to refer to some of the debates which took place when that Bill was being considered. At the time the Bill was before this Legislature, the Minister in charge, Mr. Darling, whom I don't know, dwelt at great length on why the Bill was before the House and he dealt at great length with the safeguards which are built into the Bill as to how the money is to be spent. He says that the money is before this Legislature to be appropriated, that is, the amount is set before the Legislature to be appropriated, and he gives particular emphasis in his remarks to the

fact that how much of it that is involved is set out in the legislation. I should like just to quote one of the speakers in that debate, a man who I think is still well known to the Members opposite, Mr. Fines who was Provincial Treasurer at the time. He says:

Yes, it is very clear in the Act that that is to cover all the liabilities and then when we get it up to \$50 million we must come back to the Legislature after that. In other words, the Legislature, if this Bill is passed will be giving the Power Corporation, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council authority to create a total indebtedness of \$50 million.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — The Legislature, Mr. Speaker, well let's look at a couple of other Bills.

Another one the Members opposite have spoken about is the Bill that set up Sask Tel. This Bill was also passed in 1951. I refer the Members opposite to Section 34 of that Bill. In that Bill it says that the borrowing for Sask Tel shall not exceed the net sum of \$25 million. In that Bill the money was set out for all of the Members of the Legislature to consider.

A more recent Bill, Mr. Speaker, was the Bill to facilitate the building of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. In that Bill the amount of money was set out, I believe it was \$45 million. Every single Bill in this province that deals with a Crown corporation involves the setting out precisely in the Bill the amount of money that's going to be risked.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, Bill 2 allows the government to borrow money in two ways. The first of these ways is by having the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council borrow the money, and that is the Cabinet to borrow the money on behalf of the corporation, and the second way is for the corporation itself to borrow the money.

Now let me deal firstly with the first way of borrowing, that is through the offices of the Cabinet or the Minister of Finance. Bill 2 says as follows:

The Minister of Finance may, out of the consolidate fund, advance moneys, etc., etc.

But I'm particularly concerned with subsection (3) of Section 2:

The sum or sums of money mentioned in subsection (3) shall be raised in accordance with the Saskatchewan Loans Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have to go to the Saskatchewan Loans Act, which I just happen to have with me. The Saskatchewan Loans Act says as follows:

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize the

provincial Treasurer to raise, by way of loan upon the credit of the province, as provided in Section 3, such sums of money as may be deemed expedient, and as may be from time to time appropriated by the Legislature.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in Section 2, subsection (2):

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize the Provincial Treasurer to raise, by way of loan upon the credit of the province, as provided in Section 3, such sums of money as may be deemed expedient, and as may be from time to time appropriated by the Legislature.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this government intends on raising money by virtue of Bill 2, that is the government raising the money, they are obliged to conform to The Saskatchewan Loans Act. They are obliged to come, by law, to this Legislature and tell us how much money is involved. If they do not do so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that any money they borrow will be borrowed illegally, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that investors anywhere in the world who are considering advancing money to the government for this scheme, they should be made well aware of its provision.

Now the other way, Mr. Speaker, under the Bill that the government can borrow money, or that the money can be raised, is through the Potash Corporation itself making the loans. Now as I have indicated to you before, that in every other act in Saskatchewan involving Crown corporations, there is a limit set out, and it's not in this Act. For some reason the government does not want to give it to us. I think as well, Mr. Speaker, the government should be aware that when the corporation borrows money it is also subject to the provisions of The Saskatchewan Loans act. I quote Section 18:

This act applies to all loans heretofore, or hereafter authorized under any Act of the Legislature.

And that's what Bill 2 is. The Saskatchewan Loans Act applies to Bill 2, so if the company borrows money under Bill 2 it must comply with the Saskatchewan Loans Act and it must come to this Legislature for an appropriation. If it doesn't do so, Mr. Speaker, it also will be borrowing money illegally. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government should be aware of these proceedings. Obviously they are not. Obviously they have ignored them for their own reasons — what they are we don't know. But this government, if it intends through Bill 2 to raise money, to buy potash companies, is obliged by law of The Saskatchewan Loans Act, it's obliged by parliamentary practice that evolved over hundreds of years to come into this Legislature and tell us here just exactly how much money they want. Until they do so, Mr. Speaker, they cannot raise any money.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — I refer you, Mr. Attorney General, to The Saskatchewan Loans act, and I think if you give it some consideration you'll find that it applies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say about this particular Bill, and I should like to beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — May I remind the House that the Hon. Member has already adjourned the debate once and is unable to adjourn it at this time.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Members opposite would not object to me adjourning it at this time, so I need the leave of the House to do it, and I'm asking for leave.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I cite to the Members the rules of the House — Rule 28:

No Member may speak twice to a question, except in explanation of a material part of his speech, which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

And on the 27th of November the Hon. Member adjourned the debate, and he has asked us to adjourn the debate at this time.

Mr. Speaker rules the motion out of order on the grounds that the Member had already moved a motion to adjourn the same debate.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to now enter this debate, unexpected as it may be.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And particularly when all my colleagues are now getting ready to enter into one of the very important matters that this province has seen for some time, the Liberal convention which will discuss the confiscation of the potash industry by the NDP. Therefore it is rather important that this House do adjourn early . . .

**MR. KRAMER:** — He has killed the spectators.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I tell you, we thought the Minister of Highways was dead already because this is only the second day that we have seen him since the House started sitting.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is one remark that I should like to make. I listened to the Attorney General talk about filibuster. I heard members of the Press talk about a filibuster. It rather frightens me, if that becomes the attitude of the government. When I have stood in this House and watched the Bill to appropriate \$50,000, and every Member on that side of the House and every Member on this side of the House stood up and spoke on some occasions two and three times because of amendments on \$50,000. In this particular Bill, Bill 2, that the Attorney General is shouting filibuster, the first man to speak in the opposition is that man. That is the only man.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Tony spoke on it.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Not in this Bill. No . . .

Will you please check your records. All right two Members.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The Leader of the Opposition has not spoken, the Leader of the Conservative Party has not spoken. We haven't even heard from the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan about this Bill and those Members are talking about costing \$1,200 a day. If we can delay this Bill for a month it is liable to save the people of Saskatchewan \$1 million in interest rates.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that is distasteful to a legislator it is to turn around and have a Member of the government suggest after one or two speakers, on perhaps the most important piece of legislation that this House has entered into for their consideration in years, is to suggest that it is going to cost \$1,200 a day for us as legislators to consider a Bill that we are talking about perhaps \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important that the Saskatchewan public realize what is going on. We have no intention of filibustering, if that is the word they want. I certainly do hope that every Member on this side of the House speaks once on the principle. I do hope that every Member in this House speaks again on an amendment or two. If the Member for Regina Rosemont doesn't get up and tell the people of Saskatchewan what he thinks of this Bill and the importance of this legislation and if the Member for Melfort doesn't tell the people of Saskatchewan what he thinks about this Bill, they are abrogating their responsibilities and the responsibilities of an elected Member of this House. I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that \$1,200 a day to carry out the responsibilities on something as important as the confiscation of this whole industry in the province of Saskatchewan, that kind of an argument is juvenile and not germane to the situation in any way, shape or form.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I want to also suggest that if the Liberal opposition did what the Conservatives are doing that there would be an uproar from the Press, an uproar from the taxpayers and an uproar from the people of Saskatchewan about us abrogating our responsibilities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I want to repeat what my colleague has just said, we will debate as vigorously as possible the passage of Bill 1.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Filibuster, filibuster.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — You can call it filibuster if you so desire. We will do the same with Bill 2. If the NDP want to see that this Bill get through very quickly, then all you need to do is stand on your feet, tell us the amount of money in global terms that you are talking about, tell us the interest rates you are

going to pay, tell us where you are going to get the money, what are the terms of debt retirement and tell us the kind of accounting you are going to do and that Bill will slide through much more quickly than you can imagine.

There will be no need for a filibuster. What we are talking about is holding this House as long as possible on Bill 2 until you carry out your responsibilities of providing information that you have an obligation to do. I would hope that the Members of the government and the Members of the Press and the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party will recognize the responsibilities of the government, and what are the responsibilities — and my colleague from Lakeview made a very important point — that you Members in the back benches are not sheepdogs. You Members are supposed to have some responsibility to your constituents. You should be standing up and asking just as many questions as Members of the opposition. The Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) I heard him talk about the hate campaign. I heard some of the other Members opposite talking in this debate. I would hope that they too would want to participate. I know of Bills that have taken two and three months to pass this House. One Bill was two years ago, setting up the Hog Marketing Commission. I can remember a Bill in 1965 that took four months to pass this House. One that established utilization fees, it took about four months. You thought that was important. I am going to tell you that the people of Saskatchewan think this Bill is important. The opposition thinks this Bill is important. If you are worried about that \$1,200 a day, it won't bother my conscience, but it will bother my conscience a lot more if we abrogate our responsibilities and permit you people to evade your obligations. We know what these people want to do and I want to tell the Member of the Progressive Conservative Party, they want to slide this Bill through as quickly as possible. We have watched this performance before. We watched it on Bill 42. The government wants to take hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money in the next four years to convince the people that it was such a good thing. They have already begun before the Bill is even passed. I wonder in the next four years how many hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money can I suggest to you the advertising that you are doing in propaganda to set up a potash company or to confiscate the potash industry before the Bill is passed is costing you the \$1,200 a day. It is costing you over \$1,200 a day. Every time you turn on the radio to any station in Saskatchewan, "our new head office, Sask Minerals," every time you pick up the paper a full page ad. You know what a full page ad costs in the Leader-Post, \$800 for one ad. Now you complain about \$1,200 a day to keep this debate going to explain to the people of Saskatchewan.

I wonder why members of the Press are not talking about the hundreds and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money that will be utilized for propaganda over this Bill. Instead of that they are worried about the \$1,200 for the opposition to carry out their responsibilities as elected Members. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Filibuster!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — We haven't heard from you.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I introduced the Bill, where were you?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — We still haven't heard from you, you didn't say anything. We haven't heard from the Premier. If you are trying to suggest Mr. Attorney General that we come in with a Bill of this magnitude and you stand up and give us a three and one-half hour dissertation and say nothing, give us no facts, no figures, then we are supposed to have Mr. Malone stand up and then quietly steal away and you begin your propaganda machine.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say and as I indicated we are on our way to a very important function and I know all the Members of the House would be so happy to see us go and carry out that great convention. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:13 o'clock p.m.