

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Eighteenth Legislature
22nd Day

Monday, December 15, 1975.

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

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Saskatoon Board of Trade

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would direct a question to the Attorney General. Did the Attorney General at some time during the last three days tell the media that unless the Saskatoon Board of Trade ceased its advertising campaign against the potash nationalization that Saskatoon as a city would not get the head office for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan or words to that effect?

MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I can answer the Member quite clearly on that, No, I did not tell that to the media. What I did say to the media in response to a question as to how I felt as a Saskatoon MLA what the chances of locating the head office of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan were in Saskatoon in the light of the Board of Trade's campaign. What my reaction to that was and my reaction is, as I told the media, I will tell the Member now, that speaking personally, I believe that the head office should be located, or back up, and say a good case for locating it in Saskatoon could be made. I should like to advocate that it be located in Saskatoon, as a Member of the Cabinet from Saskatoon. But, that the Board of Trade campaign which I viewed to be very negative, made it very difficult for me to convince my colleagues that Saskatoon was the place to locate because it is represented by many of my colleagues that the Saskatoon business community, some of the Saskatoon business community at any event, are very hostile to the potash proposals.

That is not a situation of saying that if the Board of Trade continued its campaign that it would not be located in Saskatoon. No decision has been made as to where it should be located. I'd like to see it located in Saskatoon but I tell you that if the Board of Trade does speak for the business community or at least some of the business community some of my colleagues might quite legitimately ask whether or not the business community really wants the head office of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to locate there. The Board of Trade was making my job all that much more difficult in Saskatoon. That's is what I said.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If that implication was intended certainly the news reports that we saw did not give that implication so would the Attorney General be prepared publicly to apologize to the Saskatoon Board of Trade and to the citizens of the city of Saskatoon for his threat and to withdraw publicly the implication that he left with the citizens of Saskatoon that somehow the Saskatoon Board of Trade

does not have the same rights as every other organization or citizen in our province to air its opinions as it relates to the Government of Saskatchewan at any time in any way.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear that the Saskatoon Board of Trade in my opinion, this is self evident, has the right to take, like any organization, any position it wants to respecting any government action. I have maintained that position at all times prior to the potash issue. I maintain that during the potash dispute, I will maintain that position long after the potash is forgotten as an issue. That is not the issue at point.

I have no apologies to make if the news media did not, did not properly report what I indicated here. I spoke to the news editor of CFQC, personally, this morning as a result of some conversations, and had the news story read back to me. If the Members opposite think that I am not giving them more or less the correct interpretation of what I said yesterday, today, it's at their liberty to take the news tapes and check the transcripts as I have indicated. I invite them to do this.

I simply repeat again, as I did yesterday, the Board of Trade can maintain any position it wants but let it not be misunderstood by anybody that that makes it just a terrifically difficult job for some of us who feel that Saskatoon should be the head office for PSC to convince the Government that that is indeed where the business community would want to do business with it.

MR. COLLVER: — Second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Attorney General not agree that coupling those two facts together: (1) That the Board of Trade has a campaign going against the potash issue, the correctness of that campaign, or the advisability of that campaign, notwithstanding that they do have one going that the Attorney General has coupled together the fact of the campaign together with the implication that somehow as a result the city of Saskatoon might not get a head office, might not achieve a benefit. Would the Attorney General not agree that if that implication is left with the city of Saskatoon and with the citizens of the city, that it may possibly constitute a threat and therefore, that there may be in the minds of some of the implication of a threat and in turn the possibility of even going as far as the word extortion.

MR. ROMANOW: — The Hon. Member can choose any kinds of colorful adjectives that he would like, which no doubt will be the subject of a very colorful news story outside the Chamber. I tell you that as far as I know there is only one Board of Trade of all the Boards of Trade in Saskatchewan which has taken an active opposition campaign, like the Saskatoon Board of Trade, and that is the Saskatoon Board of Trade. I wish as a Saskatoon resident, where I was born and where I maintain a home and I hope to go back some time to maintain my living as well on an active basis, was adopting positions like some of the other Boards of Trade. Moose Jaw for example does not have this campaign and is actively seeking for location of the head office. I wish I could say that to my colleagues and convince them that Saskatoon is in the same boat. Yorkton is doing the same thing. I say that that is fighting for the interests of the Saskatoon people, not

threatening them, but fighting to make sure the head office can be located there if at all possible. But anybody would acknowledge, surely even the Member for Nipawin would acknowledge that in the face of that type of adverse campaigning, adverse, and I think totally negative campaigning that it is difficult for those of us who feel that the head office should be located in Saskatoon to persuade our colleagues that it is to be located there. I said that to the press. The issue is not yet decided by the Government. We'll see what kind of a resolution will come at the end. But I totally reject suggestions such as threats, or extortion or whatever. I think the Hon. Member doesn't believe them either.

MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements made by the Attorney General, could we regard this to be the future Government policy to stifle freedom of speech of people and organizations? Is it to be future Government policy that by using the power of the taxpayers' dollar that they will deny public investment in a community if it voices opposition to a Government policy?

MR. ROMANOW: — Again, Mr. Speaker, I must say with all due respect to the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland that that is the phoniest side issue of this whole comment that I think I have heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Ooohhh!

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, it is. The Members opposite imply that I don't have the freedom of speech to give my opinion as to what I think the negative aspects of the Board of Trade campaign are. They say that I shouldn't be saying that as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Oh, they should have the freedom of opinion and freedom of speech but I should not have it. I find it very difficult to the Board of Trade, for example, which takes the position on the one hand that this is a bad, terrible business deal, that we are bankrupting the province. Putting those cartoons, I say demeaning cartoons, are not in the character of the Board of Trade, an organization I always supported in Saskatoon, and I find it very difficult for them to take that position on the one hand and yet at the same time take the position that they want the head office of the Potash Corporation in Saskatoon. How in the world can we maintain the credibility and the consistency of the interests of Saskatoon people given that type of an activity? I want to tell the Hon. Member as diplomatically as I can that I reject that. They can take any position that they want. I have always maintained that position, any kind of a position as I can and I find it very difficult indeed to get what I think are the interests of Saskatoon as the head office of the corporation in the light of what I think is a very negative campaign.

MRS. EDWARDS: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Board of Trade does not have the right to put statements in the paper and have advertising about their opinion of government policy what right has the Government to use the taxpayers' money to run a campaign and propaganda promoting government policy?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Hon. Member and the Members opposite once again, no one, no one is questioning the Board of Trade's rights to put on any kind of a campaign that they want at any time in the newspaper. No one can question my right to think that that campaign is bordering on being silly with the cartoons that are being run. That's my right but it is also an indisputable fact that that type of a campaign in Saskatoon only, I remind the Member, not in Yorkton, not in Moose Jaw, not in any of the other areas, in Saskatoon only, when it should be working to the benefits of the city of Saskatoon. When we should be working as the Board of Trade to promote the interests of Saskatoon in obtaining the head office, what they are doing is trying to destroy the operation and in the process destroy what I think is where this head office should be located, right in Saskatoon.

MRS. EDWARDS: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that other Chambers of Commerce, through the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, have objected to the Government action?

MR. ROMANOW: — I tell the Hon. Member that I don't know. I have not seen paid newspaper ads.

MR. STEUART: — Don't make a statement.

MR. ROMANOW: — She has asked me a question. I'll give the answer as best that I can, now you just sit down and keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Could the Member be heard, the questioners and the answerers, please.

MR. ROMANOW: — I just want to tell the Hon. Member that I don't know whether or not, in response to her question, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce is conducting the same campaign. But I want to tell the Hon. Member I have not seen any paid newspaper advertising by the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce. I am advised for example, that the Saskatoon Board of Trade ads are paid for independently of the Saskatoon Board of Trade. Now if that's the case, perhaps, it should indicate on the bottom of the line that this ad is sponsored by individual businessmen, or individual citizens as opposed to the entire Board of Trade. I may be wrong on that, may it is the entire Board of Trade. That's beside the issue. The simple fact of the matter is that no other individual Board that I know of, I could stand to be corrected and if I am I will apologize to the House, no other single Board of Trade of any other community other than Saskatoon, my home town, is conducting a campaign which I think is to the detriment of the people of Saskatoon when we could locate this head office in Saskatoon. That's the answer I give the Hon. Member.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Mr. Speaker, could we have an answer as to whether the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce sent a letter of protest to any Member of the Government, the Premier or any other Members?

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member should hold the

question in reserve until there are no more questions to be answered.

Potash Takeover to Cause Strain With USA

MR. STEUART: — I would like to direct a questions to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that Mr. Porter, the former Ambassador from the United States of America to Canada, has recently made a statement, I think it was just in the last day or so, to the effect that the threat to take over the potash industry by the Government of Saskatchewan will place a strain on the relationships between these two countries, between the United States of America? Is he further aware that the State Department for the Government in Washington, the Government of the United States of America, has in fact sent a note to External Affairs, Canada, expressing concern about the same matter, the proposed takeover of our potash by the Government of Saskatchewan?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I will try to give answers to the two questions; The answer to the second one is, Yes, I am aware that some sort of a communication has gone from the Government of the United States, (I don't know whether it came from the State Department), to the Department of External Affairs at Ottawa. I am aware of that.

Second, you ask whether I am aware that Mr. Porter made some statements. I am aware that there are some press releases reporting that he has made some statements.

MR. STEUART: — Well, in view of this, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Premier. The Premier recognizing that this has taken place and I am sure recognizing that this might have taken place and recognizing that this situation might very possibly cast some shadow on the future of markets of the potash industry in Saskatchewan to our largest customer, the United States, where we sell 70 per cent of our potash, and recognizing that being the Premier of one of the provinces of this nation that what he is doing and what his Government is doing could have serious implications from the national point of view with our largest trading partner, did he in fact carry out, before he launched the province on this course of action, did he in fact carry out consultation with the Federal Government, with External Affairs, about this very real threat, this very real danger in mind?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The answer is, Yes.

MR. STEUART: — A supplementary question. What advice did you get from them and did you follow it?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think it would really be inappropriate for me to state what the Department of External Affairs told to the Government of Saskatchewan. I don't mean in any way to evade the Hon. Member's question but I think it is fair to say that the consultations I had with the Federal Government were of the type that they would have expected me not to report in this Legislature. Let me put it that way.

MR. STEUART: — To follow up on that, didn't the Premier recognize this could be a threat to the future . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. STEUART: — I asked him that question and he hasn't answered.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Regina South.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I asked a two part question in that supplementary. Did he consult and did he look on this as a possible threat to the future of the potash industry in Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think it is quite clear the Leader of the Opposition has asked several questions.

MR. STEUART: — I asked a question and three supplementaries. I am sure it is not a ruling that there can't be two parts to a question. That part about the threat to the future markets of the Saskatchewan potash industry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I am only trying to operate within the practices that have been laid down for the Assembly, now if the Leader of the Government wishes to answer as another part of the supplementary.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I apologize if I didn't meet all the points raised by the Hon. Member. Clearly there are problems existing between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States now which could affect our trading relations there. There is the issue of Time Magazine, the issue of the Cable TV blackouts, the issue of the Auto Pact and the issue of potash. I, for my part, am prepared to allow the Government of Canada, my Government even though I didn't personally elect it, to speak on my behalf on those matters. I take the position that provincial Premiers should be very cautious about what they say with respect to international relations. I propose, therefore, to be cautious and to say that I have considered some of the aspects that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised. I believe they have been given appropriate consideration and I am sure that if anyone needs to speak on behalf of Canada with respect to potash or Time Magazine or Cable TV or Auto Pact or any of the other outstanding issues, the Hon. Mr. McEachen or the Hon. Mr. Trudeau are quite capable of so doing.

Snowmobile Proposals

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. The Snowmobile proposals which are before the House are causing enormous confusion among farmers and ranchers in the province and indeed the farmers and ranchers are getting pretty riled up about them. Now we think in these circumstances the best thing we can do in this House is withdraw that Bill, give it over to an intersessional committee and hold public hearings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — In fact I want on behalf of the official Opposition, Mr. Attorney General, expressly to ask you whether you would be prepared to do that very thing?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, if I might just say this to the House. There is confusion. I can sense that as well in some of the communications and correspondence that are forwarded to my office. What I am sure all Hon. Members realize is that the proposed amendment seeks to cut down on the possible liability that a farmer could have as a result of a trespass of a snowmobiler on his land. What this amendment tries to do is to cut back on an expanded liability that the farmer apparently would have as a result of a recent Supreme Court case, Veinot versus Kerr Addison, I believe is the name of the case, and we felt that this expansion by the Supreme Court put an unnecessary added risk burden on our farmers. Therefore, what we should do is legislatively undo that expanded risk by the Supreme Court by virtue of this amendment. The confusion has cropped up because some farmers think that we are putting a responsibility on their shoulders and that is clearly wrong. What we are doing is restoring the law to what it was prior to the Veinot versus Kerr Addison case. What somewhat bothers me about the suggestion to refer it to a committee is if we do this the law of Kerr Addison will be the law and conceivably in some action within Saskatchewan, if it goes that far or is interpreted by a Saskatchewan court, the decision of Kerr Addison may be binding and we may find that rather than achieving the objective of helping our farmers we are indeed hamstringing our farmers. So I have taken a little bit of extra time to answer the Member but I would specifically say to your questions that I should like to consider that proposal and discuss it with my colleagues in Cabinet and see whether or not some response can be made in due course by referring it to an intersessional committee. But if it does, I think we should be clear that the Kerr Addison case will be the law, the common law and therefore could add an additional burden on the farmers of Saskatchewan which we have tried, through this proposed amendment at least to cut back.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The provisions that have been put before us nonetheless, Mr. Attorney General, impose upon land owners, including farmers and ranchers, a liability to trespassers even in some circumstances. What most farmers or ranchers I think would like to see is that they have no liability to trespassers on their land except what they deliberately inflict.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — That is their chief concern, the proposal . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. We were informed some time ago that it was against the rules of this House to bring up matters in a Bill that is before the Legislature. We are concerned that this is coming up at this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I think that the Member should avoid discussing the principle of the Bill since the Bill has not even had second

reading. If he could continue his question to the nature of a supplementary without getting into the principle of the Bill, I would appreciate that.

MR. CAMERON: — That was merely by way of preamble, Mr. Speaker. I have a very specific question I want to ask. May I say in response to the Point of Order, my learned friend over here raised, that we have been asking a whole series of questions on potash despite the fact that we have two potash Bills before us. I say by way of preamble that the proposal that is now before us imposes upon landowners a responsibility of injury to snowmobile drivers and passengers. Now I'll say again by way of preamble that the farmers think, many of them, that they should bear no responsibility to trespassers. Are we prepared to put that kind of a proposition to an intersessional committee and have public hearings on it? That is to say that farmers and ranchers should have no responsibility for injury except in those circumstances where they deliberately do something to cause it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I think this is a two-part question. I should like to say that first of all I do not agree with my learned friend on the question of this Bill imposing a liability. What this Bill does is simply state the liability which existed with or without Section 25 of The Snowmobile Act or with or without the amendment to The Snowmobile Act. A liability could very easily attach to a farmer given a proper set of circumstances whether the land is posted or not posted. We have done nothing to change the law in that regard. That has been maintained for quite some time.

As to the second aspect whether or not we would be considering an intersessional committee to study a drastic cutback of the traditional common law position and the duties owed as between a trespasser and a farmer or other landowner, again I would have to answer the same way as I did to the first question. It is something that we would want to consider before we made any final decision in this regard.

I can only conclude by saying, I am sure the Hon. Member would agree with me, that if we did come down the line with a law which does very drastically cut back on the farmer's responsibility well that may be the way we should be going. It certainly would be taking away a fairly well established body of principle in common law which fairly reasonably defines the responsibilities as between trespassers and owners now. Maybe we should be going by way of a policy route but we hadn't thought when we introduced the amendment that that is the way we should be going. So, as to the intersessional committee I would simply repeat again that we will take that under consideration.

MR. CAMERON: — A second supplementary. It is a matter of semantics whether or not the Bill imposes a liability upon landowners. Certainly if the proposals before the House passed it wouldn't remove in total the liability of a landowner.

Yes, I have a second supplementary. My question is are you prepared to publish a booklet and make it available

through all the municipal offices in the province about the state of the law as a result of these amendments so that snowmobilers and farmers can be very clear on what their respective obligations are? At the moment they are not.

MR. ROMANOW: — I think, Mr. Speaker, here, there is quite clearly a demonstrated need for more information because the law while perhaps being more or less settled is certainly complex. Subject to the facts that in any one individual case can be further complicated. Accordingly, the need for information I think is demonstrated by this amendment. Farmers up to now I think probably suspected that they had no liability under some circumstances and these amendments have raised the level of consciousness and awareness and the need for information to a very high degree. I think the suggestion of a pamphlet or a booklet has a considerable amount of merit. I think that would be one of the advantages of an intersessional committee. It would be of educational and publicity value. Therefore, I can only say that we will consider the suggestion by the Member that a pamphlet be prepared or some sort of a committee be set up in this area.

CONDOLENCES

Father Athol Murray

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I beg the indulgence of the House for just a brief moment.

I think most of the Members of the House are aware that the Province of Saskatchewan lost one of its very outstanding citizens early this morning in Pere Athol Murray. I am sure that all the people who have known Father Murray are a little sadder today because of his passing. But at the same time I think most realize that he led a very full and productive life and he was now approaching his 84th year and, in fact, I think most of his host of friends, alumni and students will remember perhaps with sheer joy every time they think of Father Murray, for his outspoken frankness, his outrageous antics on occasion, his warmth, his dedication to youth, his love of sports. No one, I think, could ever have the good fortune of knowing Father Murray and ever forget him. I am sure that anyone in this House who had the opportunity of crossing his path will remember the strength of his personality, his colorful language, his chain smoking and we could go on and on.

I do wish just at this time to register on behalf of myself and I am sure on behalf of all Members our regrets at the passing of Father Murray, particularly to those students who are now attending Wilcox and to members of his faculty and those remaining numbers of his friends, and I should like to do that, Mr. Speaker.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, if I might rise to associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat. Monsignor Murray was a well known figure in Saskatchewan for many decades. He founded Notre Dame nearly 50 years ago, he was a driving force in both its creation and its operation. I

think it is fair to say that Pere was very well known throughout the whole province and he will be mourned by friends in every corner.

Pere was an older man as my colleague from Indian Head-Wolseley indicated but he never lost his zest for life and his spirit of adventure. It was perhaps this quality of always looking for today's adventure which endeared him to generations of young people who attended Notre Dame.

He was an outspoken critic of much of the many events in the contemporary world, I think that is fair to say but he never withdrew into any nostalgic reverence for the past. He was a man for today and always interested in today's problems right up to the day of his death. I think that anyone who saw Pere Murray living this vigorous and full life can express envy of anyone who is able to put that much into his life. It is, I think, these qualities which will cause him to be missed by many. And his unique contribution to the province will be long remembered.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, may I add the words of sorrow of the Progressive Conservative caucus and the Progressive Conservative Party to those already stated. Pere was a friend and a fine man and I don't think that he would want us to remember him as anything but a jovial person and perhaps a political animal as well. Therefore, I would like to add to the remarks already made that interestingly enough Pere, I believe, was born a Conservative and probably died a Conservative and he has gone to see John A. Macdonald and Winston Churchill and those whom he admired so much.

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, because I had the pleasure of attending Notre Dame a number of years ago I, too, should like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers.

I well recall, and that was a number of years ago, having attended there one year. Times were tough. Pere was scratching around so were his students, but I have to say that I thoroughly enjoyed myself, and I am sure that all the other students who attended at that time enjoyed themselves also. I also think that Pere must have on numerous occasions wondered where I had gone wrong, politically speaking, although I never heard him say so publicly. I do want to say that I do know many admired him, including myself. He will be a figure sorely missed in what is sometimes a turbulent Saskatchewan. He helped to make it turbulent at times, and I think, the province is better for it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 1 - An Act respecting the Development of Potash Resources in Saskatchewan be now read a second time and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Cameron (Regina South).

MISS L. B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased

again to continue this debate on Bill No. 1. The last time I was trying to ask the Government to consider that perhaps our money could be better spent in other ways than expropriating the potash industry. I gave them positive alternatives to this and I suggested it was easy to criticize but as long as you could suggest some positive alternatives perhaps to which reasonable people with responsible attitudes will listen.

Some of the alternatives I mentioned last time, very briefly again, were to look at the needs of the senior citizens, the need to increase their provincial supplement, the need to ensure that they have a minimum income of \$350 to \$500 for singles and couples. The need to eliminate some of the hardships that they encounter now in nursing homes. I mentioned that in an area in Alberta which is right near my constituency the cost of nursing home accommodation is \$115 and \$130 respectively for single and double rooms, whereas when you come 12 miles into my constituency, it is \$378 and \$388 which is about \$200 difference. I think this is money that could be very well spent by our Government to help those needs. These are people who have given much to the Province of Saskatchewan, they have contributed to this province and to a good deal of things that people like myself have to be thankful for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — I think this is one of the ways we could spend our money more wisely than in expropriating the potash industry.

In addition to this I mentioned that there are needs for physically and mentally handicapped people. I think that a good program would be to develop a training program either at the university or at the technical level to train people to work with the mentally and physically handicapped. This is much needed, we have many workshops and they are run by the Social Services Department or initiated by the Social Services Department. They are doing an excellent job in this matter but only a few people are trained adequately and I think this is where additional money could be spent to help to ensure that these people have adequate facilities.

I think also that besides these positive suggestions that I have made, that we should insist that our priority be on people - people not potash. I would ask your indulgence for a time this afternoon to suggest some more ways in which you could spend our money more adequately.

Let's look for a minute at our Saskatchewan Assistance Program. I am reading or quoting from this booklet describing the Saskatchewan Assistance Program. It says:

The purpose of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan is to provide financial assistance and health and welfare services to persons in need and persons who are likely to be in need if services are not provided. The objective of welfare services is to lessen, remove or prevent the causes and effects of poverty and dependency. Who is eligible? A person who has proved that he is financially incapable of providing for himself and his dependents or who is likely to become so. Need or potential need is the only condition of eligibility.

Now these are very good objectives but I have a number of cases that have been brought to my attention where there were no other alternatives as it indicates in here yet they didn't qualify. Some of the discrepancies in this program is that you have to have a minimum of \$3,000 or less in your savings in order to qualify for this. I should like to ask many of you if you have \$2,000 or \$3,000 how long would that last you? I think we are creating a dependency on the welfare system. Many of these people who do need such programs as the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan now have to demean themselves and they find it demeaning to have to go on one of these programs. Many of these people are older people and they have worked all their lives for Saskatchewan but they find at the end of their years that they don't have enough funds adequately to support themselves. But they have to make sure that they give up all except for \$3,000 so that they can come under the qualifications of this program and I think that money could be well spent to increase the numbers that can receive this assistance and yet let them have some savings. Two or three thousand dollars in this day and age is nothing and I think this minimum has to be raised which would allow more people to use the Social Assistance Program. This is a positive way in which we could help the people of Saskatchewan.

Now because I come from a rural area and because the heart of Saskatchewan is in its rural community, I should like to mention a number of things that could be done for the rural area by spending this money, instead of on potash.

Grants and tax credits could be given to businesses to encourage them to improve and restore . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I hesitate to interrupt the Member, as I hesitated to interrupt the other day when she was speaking. She is rightly so speaking on the Bill and the amendment which has been offered and that is in order. However, the comments that the Member brings forward must be related to either the acquisition of the potash industry or the amendment, reference to a special commission. If the remarks are not related to that, it is strictly out of order. The problem that creates for me is then I have to allow other Members to be able to answer the comments that you have been making that are out of order. I would hope that the Member would relate her comments to the principle of the acquisition of the potash industry or the reference to the special commission. The debate becomes very wide-open when you are relating it to, in fact, a miniature Throne Speech within your speech, if I may term it that way. Because I think you have been talking about a considerable number of areas and relating back and forwards to potash every once in a while is not sufficient. I think it has to be related to the principle of the Bill and if the Member could relate it to the principle I would appreciate that.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Point of Order, I believe the Member very clearly stated in her remarks that she was seeking alternatives to the use of the money that's being used for the takeover of the potash industry. I believe that she has tied in her remarks to those alternatives and I believe that one of the main considerations of the Bill is money, that is the amount that is involved in the expropriation. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider her remarks in that light. I believe

she was very careful to make her remarks in that manner, that is alternatives to the money that's to be spent and I believe that would keep her remarks within order.

MR. SPEAKER: — This is a very difficult area and I appreciate the Member's comments but I think that the money would only be borrowed for the acquisition of the potash industry, it would not necessarily be borrowed for anything else. It becomes arguable whether it's going to detract from some other programs because you are using the money for potash. We get into the argument about where the money might otherwise be used, but I think that it has been clearly stated by the Member who presented the Bill, that this in no way impinges on the financing of the province. Now you might say that's argumentative and it couldn't be debated, but the question before us is not spending money on other programs, but in fact, the principle of this Bill, and the reference to the special commission. I think the Member's remarks should be more closely related to the principle.

MR. COWLEY: — Speaking on the Point of Order I think I must agree with Mr. Speaker that while I perhaps don't agree with the argument, it's fair to put the argument that the potash industry expropriation or otherwise will cost money and it might cost money as the Members opposite argue that could be used for other programs. I think it's fair to put that argument, it may be the wrong argument from my point of view, but I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it's within the rules to then spend a great deal of time itemizing in detail how the money might otherwise be spent. I think that's the key to the question. Not the argument. But really rather to go into, as I think Mr. Speaker said, a Throne Speech debate and itemizing all the difficulties in another particular area which is not directly related, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with your ruling.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, rising on the Point of Order. I don't want to get into an argument with my friend across the way, but surely it is proper to make suggestions and to itemize those suggestions as to how this money may be spent. The Minister has conceded that it is a proper argument to talk about how money can be spent and I suggest to you that in doing so you can give details. Now you may find that those details, to you, are too detailed but nevertheless I would suggest to you, Sir, that the rules of this House allow for that detail to be given to you. You will recall the Attorney General in introducing, I believe it was Bill 2, not this particular Bill, but in Bill 2, he dealt at great length with Crown corporations and as he got into them, he started talking in detail the amount of money that was spent and which was earned by those Crown corporations. He talked about the fur marketing board and every Crown corporation that I can recall was dealt with by him in his introductory remarks to Bill 2. I say what is proper for the Attorney General is proper for the Member for Wilkie.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would be quite prepared to allow the Member for Wilkie or any other Member to discuss all of the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan when we get to Bill 2, because we are taking about the vehicle, the method for doing it and it's quite in order to discuss the alleged failures or successes of Crown corporations in discussing Bill 2. But that doesn't make it right to discuss

the detailed expenditure of money that might be obtained for purchasing the potash industry, when no one has said that the money would be obtained for purchasing the potash industry, when no one has said that the money would be obtained for anything else but the acquisition of the potash industry.

I say the Member is straying from the topic, the principle of the Bill.

MR. STEUART: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, I have to question your ruling. On the matter of debate on second reading of any bill, in the past the widest possible latitude has been allowed. Surely, an argument put up by the Opposition to any bill that involves the expenditure, the borrowing against a credit. I think no one will deny that if the potash industry happened to fall on bad times, that it might call on the public purse, it's a distinct possibility, and surely then we must be allowed the widest latitude to try and point out to the Government that they should consider other priorities and in dealing with those other priorities surely our Members have a responsibility to give some details to show they have done some research and can place a counter argument to the Government in our attempts to have them reconsider this Bill.

I think it's a most serious ruling and a most serious change of direction in regard to debate in this House on second reading, that if we can't offer alternatives to the proposed spending or possible spending of money from the public purse that is implied here in what we are doing in this potash bill.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will after checking the record of the debate when the Member was last debating it see that I have given the widest possible latitude to the member in the debate and as a matter of fact I regret that I gave the Member that much latitude at that time. I should have drawn the Member's attention to the fact that I felt she was straying from the topic at the time.

Now with regard to the acquiring of money for the purpose of the acquisition of the potash industry in Saskatchewan or reference to a special commission, I'm prepared to give any Member all of the latitude that I can within the principle of those Bills. I think the detailed discussion of the spending of funds in social welfare is not necessarily related to this particular Bill or the principle or the money, because in fact, I don't think the Government, the present Government or the previous Government was prepared to borrow money for welfare programs in the manner that the Member is suggesting at this time. I think that the Member should confine herself to the principle of the Bill. I'm not saying that she can't say that should be spent on them. I don't say that I would restrict reference to programs, but detailed discussion of the programs I think is out of order.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, with all deference I think you are making a value judgment here, which in deference I don't think that any Speaker has the right to make.

The Government is asking this House to vote permission for it to go into the potash business. By its own admission their

involvement in the potash business will involve hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. Granted to be borrowed and granted what you say is right that we don't and never have in the past, it isn't to say we might not in the future, because we have the right, but never in the past has this Government or any government, borrowed money for the payment of current bills, for welfare or education. That doesn't mean they might not.

However, the implication that we maintained from the beginning of this debate, is that if they go into this potash business and if it falls on hard times they will have committed themselves to the repayment of certain money, backed by the credit of the Government of Saskatchewan. There is no question they have said this. When they borrow money they are going to put the Government of Saskatchewan's credit behind it. That means if there is a default then the Government of Saskatchewan would have to pay the money. They would either have to roll the bill over, roll the money over and borrow again, or they might have to reach into the public purse to meet the interest payments and it wouldn't be the first time a government has had to reach into current revenue to pay off debts they have incurred.

Now, the Premier has said this will be self-liquidating, but that's a hope, it may be. If it does, as we all hope that it would be, but it's just a hope, he has no guarantee.

So, I think this makes it very germane to the argument. We say the Government is taking a chance with the public purse and since we are convinced it is taking a chance, there are other things you could be doing that we think are much more within the view of the Government, much more their responsibility than getting into this business.

MR. SPEAKER: — For good or ill, Speakers from time to time are called on to make subjective judgments and I think that's a fair point. It may be questioned in the House whether they have made the right subjective judgment and my subjective observation at this time, is that the detailed discussion of social welfare programs or other programs in other departments not related to this is out of order. I think the Members should confine themselves to the principle of the Bill, and not continue a detailed discussion of programs in the Department of Social Services.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might address myself to the Point of Order because indeed I believe that largely you are right as far as you have gone in your thinking about the matter. If I could bring you back to what the Hon. Provincial Secretary said. He conceded that a discussion of funding and possible other expenditures was in order and I think that with all due respect, is the point that you have missed and to a limited extent that the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake misses.

The position that we've taken and I think it's a valid position and is a position for valid argument, is that the tax revenues that the potash Bill and legislation have - that the potash legislation that we now have on the books is bringing in, that the expenditure may be in jeopardy. Indeed we have suggested repeatedly to Government Members that what will happen is that they will be using some of the \$140 million or so that

they would be taking in in reserve tax to pay off the purchase of the industry. Now if that's the case, that's different from the billion or three billion or whatever it is to buy the industry because I agree with you completely as far as you have gone that there is no suggestion and I wouldn't think that it's a proper suggestion, that the Government borrow money and use it for things like social welfare spending, but our position is that there may be money lost to the taxpayers, money that has been spent on things like social welfare and then the Hon. Member is suggesting to you that putting social welfare spending, for instance, in jeopardy is too great a risk to take by passing this Bill.

Now I wanted as well, Mr. Speaker, to refer you to Beauchesne's in two areas particularly, page 110 and 111, and the areas on those pages that I hope Your Honour might view are brief. At the beginning of paragraph 119, Beauchesne says:

One of the main functions of the House consists in debating public issues. A function which can only be filled by complete freedom of speech.

And then beginning in the next paragraph:

The mere object of shortening sessions may lead to an undue curtailment of this freedom of speech. The duties of a representative Parliament are too important to be performed in a hurry. No question should be decided until it has been fully discussed. Although some effort ought to be made to economize time, every shade of opinion has the right to find expression and Members who desire to give their views should not be prevented from doing so.

Beauchesne then goes on quite obviously to say that where the principle of freedom of speech is used and Beauchesne describes that as a sacred principle, that that shouldn't be used as a means of unduly delaying debate and I suggest this is not the case.

At the top of the next page and this I think is crucial, Beauchesne says:

In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

I suggest to you that this is a borderline case, when you view it not as money taken, borrowed to use in the purchase, but as money that may be lost in tax revenues, used in another way that are then lost from the Department of Social Services or other departments.

MR. SPEAKER: — The crux of the Member's argument on the Point of Order is that the other revenues of the province may suffer and programs consequently would suffer and that's why the Member is discussing it. But the point that the Member has been putting forward and I've been listening rather closely to the Member.

MR. MERCHANT: — This Member is speaking in both debates.

MR. SPEAKER: — The last time she discussed

the issue and now she was putting forward the argument that the money borrowed to acquire the potash industry should be used elsewhere. Now I may be misinterpreting the Member's comments because I don't have them before me now, but that seemed to be the point at issue. In any case the amendment that has been put forward by the Members to my immediate left, is to suggest that the matter should be referred to a special commission, not that the money should be spent somewhere else.

MR. MERCHANT: — This Member is speaking in both debates.

MR. SPEAKER: — I agree, the Member is and the Member has a complete right to speak on Bill 1 or the reference to the special commission and at the conclusion that will have terminated the Member's right to speak.

I make that observation now. I think we should get on with the debate. If the Member can keep closer to and not discuss the intimate details of the Department of Social Services in this Bill, I think it would not limit her right to be heard or any variety of opinions to be heard with regard to the principle. I don't wish to raise the matter again. I will not raise it again until some other Member raises it.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for the problem that I have caused, but I must also remind you, respectfully, that at the beginning of my comments the other day, I did state that this was not the fact that we would necessarily be using the potash money. I definitely said that perhaps programs would suffer and I was referring my comments in this light. I am not very expert in this manner of debate and I do accede to your ruling but the thing is that I was trying to express that the people in Saskatchewan, like myself, don't understand perhaps the technical details but they do understand that things such as these programs I have outlined and I did it in a very sincere way in order to offer alternatives, but they also question what is going to happen if, for instance, the Saskatchewan Assistance Program is cut back or get away from welfare, what, for instance, is my crop insurance program rates should be put up or what, for instance, if road building suffers, because we have spent our money in this way and I was trying to point out and I did very definitely say that our programs could suffer if we risk our capital on the potash industry. I did point that out and if I didn't make it clear, I beg your pardon for that, but this is what I was trying to get at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — It was suggested that maybe I am not on the right line but I believe that I am representing the people of Saskatchewan and this is what they are feeling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — So, in the same light, I will continue - and I am glad to see that you are listening over there, Hon. Member . . .

MR. ROLFES: — I'm listening to every word you're saying.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Very good. I think that is of interest and of concern to the people of Saskatchewan and I will try to put it in their terms and in my terms in the best way that I can.

Now, moving away from Social Services which some people will be glad of, I should like to discuss just for a minute a few others briefly, Mr. Speaker.

For instance in the Department of Culture and Youth. Now I am asserting that there are many areas where money could be spent if we had it and programs could suffer if we were in a situation where our finances are limited, due to some business deals as we are proposing here in the Legislature. One of them is in the Department of Culture and Youth and Recreation and the way in which these could suffer is that right now they are having a minimum amount of financing and I think we will have to look at our priorities for the people of Saskatchewan and find that perhaps recreation and culture and youth may be one of our sustaining programs in the future. Any lack of financing due to whatever reason could duly harm these programs and what we should be looking at is perhaps new priorities to develop these programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — And I would suggest that we might begin to look at such programs as recreation because they not only fulfil certain needs like physical fitness and the occupying of leisure time and contribute to the development of the people of Saskatchewan and any lack of finances in no matter what range would hinder this development.

I should also like to read, quote, which is:

Man is the only creature who can talk himself into trouble.

I would suggest that perhaps this is what the Members opposite are doing, they are talking themselves into trouble by going into the potash industry. But on the more optimistic side I should like to say that man is also the only creature who by talking things over can find his way out of trouble. And we are asking the Government to use this ability to get the opinion of the people of Saskatchewan about the potash takeover and to get out of trouble. We say that the people of Saskatchewan have the right to express their opinion and that should be the essence of our Government in Saskatchewan. I ask this Government and Members of this Legislature to give the people of Saskatchewan this right to express their opinions whether or not they feel this is a good business deal.

I will be supporting the amendment and will ask the Assembly to be responsible representatives of the people and to also support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the amendment to Bill 1.

This Government has stated that they believe that the

nationalization of the potash industry is one of the most important steps this province is ever going to take or has taken and in feeling that way they surely cannot feel that they have a mandate from the people of this province to take this step because only 40 per cent of the people did vote for the NDP out of about an 87 per cent vote. And in that election that this vote was taken there was absolutely no mention of taking potash over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I will agree that the Regina Manifesto of the '30s said they believed in nationalization but that is a long time to take some of us voters back who weren't even born then but it wasn't mentioned in this election.

The quick passage through the Legislature of this Bill allows no time for either the Government or the voters of this province to consider their actions. The people of this province should be given an opportunity to appear before a commission. This would enable them to put their views and concerns before this Government. Is this Government so unsure of the feelings of the people of this province that it doesn't dare to ask them for advice? The NDP have surely not lost all respect for the democratic process that they will ram this Bill through against the wishes of the majority of the voters.

The feasibility of being able to hold and keep existing markets should be shown to the people of this province. I think it is very disrespectful not to. The people of the province should be able to judge the studies if there are studies for themselves and be able to appear before a commission of inquiry to state their feelings on such an important matter. The NDP state that they did not have the specific takeover in mind before the last election and therefore did not specifically include it in their election platform. If this is the case they have had about five months in which to have conducted studies into the merits of such a proposal, a very short time for a step of this magnitude I would say. They have declined to state if they have even bothered to make such a study. Maybe they use clairvoyance or something to come by their decisions. If they have made these studies they refuse to table them, they have refused to bring them out not only for the people of the province but for the elected representatives. Therefore, I am inclined to believe for that such studies have never been asked for by the Government. I am afraid that this Government considered that the nationalization of these industries and the furthering of socialism is of more importance than if such a step is a businesslike step for the benefit of the people of the province.

The Government in voting against this amendment would be displaying a callous disregard for the well-being of the people of this province. There is certainly no substantial argument that there is not time to conduct such an inquiry, the potash industry is not going to disappear overnight. It will be there a long time. There is certainly no necessity to take such important legislation and try to pass it in the fall Session. Introduction of the Bill in this Session and then putting it before a commission of inquiry would fulfil the purpose of assuring that the Bill has the approval of the people of this province. Certainly alternatives to the high financial risk of

acquiring the potash mines should be considered long and considered well.

In the purchase of these mines we are talking of about acquiring a debt load of one to two times our yearly budget. This means the repayment of such costs could well equal over ten years one-fifth of our budget. They say, oh, no, it is self-liquidating but I think we should keep in mind that I have heard that tune sung before in my life, to raise all the wheat you can, to raise all the beef you can so I kind of distrust the argument when they say, raise all the potash you can, there is a market for it. Sometimes you will find that the market is there but the dollars to buy it aren't and you are left with your product. Before a financial commitment of this magnitude is undertaken studies certainly should be demanded. A step of nationalization of private companies could have far-reaching effects on the investment climate of this province. Such a rash step by a socialist government should not be taken until the people of this province have a chance to review its full implications and have voiced their feelings as to the wisdom of this direction.

It is no light matter for a government to take a step which would blow the development of this province for years to come. We hear now rumors in the investment field that Saskatchewan is not a place to invest. We may acquire and borrow money for our potash but we certainly will need more money if we hope to develop the copper mines north of La Ronge, money if we hope to develop our uranium and we will find that we haven't got the borrowing capacity and we certainly will not have the trust of the investor to borrow this money, if as soon as it is operating we nationalize it and take it over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — And so nationalization in this area could prevent us expanding in many areas. And I feel that the people should be given a chance to express their feelings, after all it is the people's province, not my province and certainly not the NDP Government's province, it is the people's province.

This lack of expansion could shrink job opportunities to a point where young people have to leave this province to find employment. In fact, this exodus has been a fact over the years under a socialist system and many of our people have left. Rather than try and reverse this trend the Government seems to feel that they would rather, I think, increase this exodus. They seem rather to want a province full of fresh air, no jobs, and socialists, rather than a growing province. Certainly a commission of inquiry must be set up and allowed to conduct hearings. To deny this opportunity to our citizens would be a disserve and a shame to democracy. Mr. Speaker, I will support this amendment.

MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter in the debate on Bill 1 in support of the amendment.

In doing so, I want to say I am speaking as a responsible elected Member of this Legislature. I am speaking as a citizen of Saskatchewan who was sent here by the people of the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency.

I also believe that any MLA who sits in this Assembly and does not speak and express his or her opinion on this, the greatest gamble ever taken in our province, is not a responsible representative of his constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I do not think those Members are responsible representatives of their constituencies, and I think in all honesty they should resign their seats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I note that most of the backbenchers on the far side of the House do their better speaking while speakers on this side of the House are trying to give speeches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, if one of these days, the Member for Cutknife-Lloydminster (Mr. Kwasnica) has enough interest to sit in his seat, I dare say some of the Members may indeed feel they have signed a stranger in the House. While those opposite shout- that was the fellow from Cutknife-Lloydminster, he is a stranger to me.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, I'd remember him from the last time.

MR. NELSON: — While those opposite shout 'filibuster', the Press report 'filibuster', those to our left say little. I wonder what are the implications of that word 'filibuster'. I went to the Library and I checked the word in the dictionary, Mr. Speaker, and I find the following meaning. Hold your applause and I will continue. First the meaning was "the tactics in the U.S. Senate of prolonged speaking to prevent or delay legislation. "Second, a freebooter." On checking again on the meaning of freebooter, the meaning was simply "a pirate". On following the word pirate, I found the meaning was first, "a sea robber" and secondly, "one who steals a literary or artistic idea".

Mr. Speaker, I suggest if there are indeed those in this Assembly that fit this description, it is certainly the Premier, Attorney General and their Government who are . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — . . . indeed pirating the potash industry of our province. For my feeling, let those across the floor, those to my far left, or anyone in the Press, call it what you may, filibuster, delaying tactics or responsible opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — We are here representing the people who elected us. The people of this province and we will do just that to the best of our ability.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we may be repeating thoughts or points made by other Members of our caucus, but surely we have that right and indeed that responsibility to express our thoughts and concerns on this most important issue. Many of us in the Liberal caucus are here for the first time. However, unlike others in this Assembly, we are willing to do our learning by participating and by representing the people who have elected us.

The Premier says it may cost \$500 million or maybe \$1 billion; \$500 million or maybe double that. Mr. Speaker, can we consider this a responsible statement? Can we honestly tell the people of Saskatchewan that it will cost every working man in our province \$500 each or it could well cost \$1,000 each plus interest. I believe we must have hearings on this all over this province and see what the people of this province really think, we should hear and we should listen to their concerns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — For some years I was in business as a car dealer and a machine dealer and if a customer came to my business and he didn't know what he wanted for his trade-in, whether it was \$500 or \$1,000, I quickly wrote on the prospect card, "Very little interest in dealing and the buyer was not in a serious mood."

I do not believe the Premier is in a serious mood when he mentioned these figures, expecting us to accept a range of \$500 million. I suggest the Premier is still playing games with this Assembly and with the citizens of Saskatchewan. He doesn't really know what he wants to buy - he doesn't really know how much he wants to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is long overdue for the Premier and his Cabinet to put all the cards on top of the table. Stop playing with the jokers and at least tell the people of Saskatchewan what game he is playing before he throws their money in the pot. What better way of doing this than to go out to the people with hearings on this issue. Let the people of this province be heard, Mr. Speaker. We, in the Liberal caucus will accept the wishes of the people of this province.

Let me repeat gain, the NDP did not go to the people in this province . . . asking for a mandate to take over the potash industry in the election campaign of 1975. If they had, they know, and we know, they would not have received even the 39 per cent vote from the people.

Mr. Speaker, every speaker opposite continues to tell us of the hundreds of years of supply of potash we have in Saskatchewan. I believe they are probably right on this. But, one of the reasons they give for the potash takeover is the delay of expansion by the potash companies. And in the next breath they say they must save our potash for the hungry world for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I live in a rural constituency. I visit that area every weekend and I speak to as many constituents as possible each weekend. I can assure the Hon. Premier that well over three-quarters of the people (and they are of all political stripes) are against this potash takeover. Many of the other 25 per cent are not sure what's going on and about 5 per cent think it's all

right. Many of those who are against it told me they supported the NDP. Yes, it would be very easy to let these Bills slide through and then send the Blakeney Government down the same road as the Barrett gang in four years, but what will happen to our province in the meantime. My answer is: Certainly Saskatchewan first!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — . . . Saskatchewan now, Saskatchewan tomorrow and Saskatchewan in four years.

In the next four years if this potash Bill goes through, we would be completely stagnating any resource development from the private dollar. We need expansion of our resources to get our province moving. It will not happen with the threat of state takeover hanging over the heads of everyone who dares to own anything in our province.

Our Premier has stated the potash companies have boxed him in. First, he claimed they were not good citizens. I certainly say he was wrong on this. They have been good citizens of our province, they have gambled their own time and money, and have created good jobs for people of Saskatchewan.

Second, he says demand is up and expansion is needed. Does he really believe the potash companies can pay over 80 per cent of their profit in taxes and royalties and still have something left over for expansion? Has he not been the one to put the potash companies in that box?

The Premier then says they must take over the industry because they refuse to pay their taxes. This, too, is twisting the truth. What really happened is, the potash industry dared to use the laws of our country to see if the tax was just. Surely in a democracy this should be everyone's right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Has the Hon. Premier something other than democracy in mind?

Mr. Speaker, I think he has. I think he has set up his own kangaroo court. He has accused, tried and convicted the potash people, and all for his own purposes. Our Premier and his NDP have had this plan in mind for some time. Long before June 11th. They did not mention it at that time because they knew well the people of Saskatchewan would reject it. Now they do not want to discuss the matter at hearings. They do not want the people to have any say in the affairs of our province. This NDP Government has attempted to discredit the potash mines to the public so they can in some small way justify this terrible takeover.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has put the industry in a box, and now he can pick them off like fish in a barrel. He has, and is doing something else. He is putting a wall around our province; he is saying 'off limits to outside capital', but the wall will not keep the people inside our province. There are many companies that will not wait for their confiscation or expropriation. They will leave. Yes, they may well leave and take up residence in

British Columbia, now that the threat of socialism has been put out there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — I might say I am very proud of the young man who packed Mr. Barrett's bags. He hails from a good constituency, by the name of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and his hometown was LaFleche.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan want to be heard. They want to lend their assistance. They can't phone the Premier's office, it apparently upsets the Hon. Premier. Surely, the proper thing to do would be to appoint a commission and to find out the wishes of the people of our province. The Government may find many believe these potash mines are not that terrible group of people the Premier has painted them. Many are sure the Premier and his Government should immediately go to them and sit down and talk over the problems. I believe they can pay high taxes and royalties. But we cannot be so greedy that we do not leave them just a little.

The Government has full and complete control over them through taxation, which is normal and right. But it is only right, however, as long as the governments use justice and common sense. This Government has not been using either.

Mr. Speaker, how does this Government expect potash mines to expand when they take over 80 per cent of their profits?

Negotiations can certainly be worked out if both sides sit down and talk over the mutual problems. A portion of the tax collected could be returned to the companies for expansion use only. If you are willing to leave them a fair return on their investment the potash industry will co-operate.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the potash people have said they will co-operate. Let us now ask the Government of the province to check into their stand. Let them check with the citizens of Saskatchewan. Let them hear what they think. Surely the Premier should not be afraid of the voice of the people.

The continued cry that comes from the members opposite is that we should buy back Saskatchewan. What a hollow and shallow sound these really are. Firstly, these potash mines cannot be lifted from the ground and taken from our country. Our Government has proved it has the complete life and death control over the industry. We do not have our money invested, and yet we are reaping a great amount for our Provincial Treasury. We really have the best of both worlds, so why shout 'state control'?

Buy back Saskatchewan, they say. But how foolish - are they buying back Saskatchewan when they go to New York to borrow U.S. money to make the purchase? Is this buying back Saskatchewan? I say not with foreign money.

It really bothers me to hear the ever-righteous group opposite say 'buy back Saskatchewan'. Who all shall we buy it back from, Mr. Speaker? From those who dared come from south across the border, those from the United States? Then what of those from Europe? We also have those from countries all over the world. These people all came to our province from outside our borders. Shall we buy it all back, Mr. Speaker?

My father and my mother came from Denmark way back shortly after the turn of the century. They, like most citizens, earned the right to live in our province. Does this make everybody a bogeyman because he didn't originate here? Do we buy everything back, Mr. Speaker?

Is this Government telling us that they are planning a full takeover of everything? I'm not sure that isn't their plan. After all, most of our farmers came from outside Saskatchewan, many from the U.S., many from Europe and from other foreign countries. Is this what the Land Bank plans for them - buy back Saskatchewan?

Buy back Saskatchewan. What does the Hon. Premier really plan to do with it all? He has a lot of political friends, but I can assure him personally they haven't the ability and secondly, they haven't the ambition to take over farms and industries in this province.

I'm sure the Hon. Premier's friend, Barrett on the West Coast may not be as friendly as he used to be, if he intends to give back part of it to him. This Government's handling of the potash industry put the fear in the people of British Columbia and I'm sure Barrett will be blaming his present unemployment situation on the Saskatchewan NDP. Not one of the Members opposite would invest in this foolish potash deal. Then surely, don't force Saskatchewan people to invest without going out and knowing if they are willing. We are offering the Government that opportunity. Don't sell Saskatchewan citizens' souls without hearing their last words, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Speaker, as the potash companies have said, and I say to the Hon. Premier - the Hour is Late; But not too Late.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, on speaking to the amendment to Bill 1, the nationalization of an existing industry, such as Bill 1 gives the Government sweeping power and is a drastic change in the direction the Government of Saskatchewan has been following in respect to how our resources in this province will be developed. The implications and repercussions of such a socialist move by the Government will have far reaching effects, not only on this generation but future generations. It would seem to me that any responsible government would wish to have the solid support of the electorate before passing legislation such as Bill 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The Government had the opportunity six months ago, at the time of the June election. They had the opportunity at that time to present the question of nationalization of the potash industry before the people of this province. This was not done. The people of this province were not given the opportunity to express their opinions on this very important issue.

The hostile reaction of the Government in the last few days, and in fact even today, to those who express their opposition to this move of the Government would lead one to believe that the Members opposite are afraid to go out and listen to the commonsense advice the average citizen in Saskatchewan may wish to give them.

The Government has chosen to follow a course of political public education, with propaganda, using huge sums out of the public purse to accomplish their goal of convincing people that the Government action is right.

Such a government is following a dangerous and treacherous course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The threats of retaliation to those who express their opposition threatens one of our basic freedoms - the freedom of speech. A far more serious and frightening issue than even the disastrous move of nationalizing the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — People of Saskatchewan will soon realize that they are not being consulted; they are not being listened to on this very important issue. They will soon realize that they are being brainwashed. Unfortunately, we cannot turn back the clock. We cannot go back to the June election and make this the issue that it should have been. However, that does not mean that there are no alternatives.

The important point to keep before us is that the people should have the opportunity to be heard on such an issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The amendment as proposed would provide the vehicle through which the taxpayers of this province could express their views. The people of this province should, first of all, be given the time - time to study and learn what all the financial, economic and political implications that such a move by the Government would mean to this province. And then the people should be given the opportunity to speak. Through this commission of inquiry they would have that opportunity.

I know of one group of people who would speak, not to the political issues or the financial issues, but they would speak about their concern about another matter, and that would be, the Government's priorities in spending. They say the government's priorities in spending must be mixed up.

Speaking last week to a geologist, he says that governments today in this western world should be putting all their energy, their expertise and their money towards finding new sources of energy. The world is running out of petroleum. The day may come when we don't even have the fuel to run the potash mines. It is a sad day in Saskatchewan when we have a government that does not realize that our money and our expertise should be at this time put towards the urgent problem of locating new energy

sources, so that the standard of living enjoyed today can be insured for tomorrow's generation.

It is a government with their priorities mixed up that proposed to borrow billions of dollars to buy an existing industry, which is already providing us with millions in tax dollars annually. The tax dollars collected annually are needed and they are needed badly to enrich our programs in health, housing, highways and to help with municipal spending.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment recommends a commission of inquiry. The makeup of such a commission has been suggested in the amendment. I agree with the suggestions. For instance:

- (1) A chairman drawn from the judiciary;
- (2) A financial expert;
- (3) A person knowledgeable in the mining and marketing of potash;
- (4) A person fully conversant with constitutional law;
- (5) Two members of the general public or Saskatchewan, one at least of whom should be a woman and a mother.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — Such a commission would be empowered to hold public hearings throughout the province and to report back to this Assembly with all convenient speed as to the financial commitment and various risks involved for the people of Saskatchewan in the takeover of potash mines by the Government. It would report on the alternatives to state takeover; and the dangers and disadvantages weighed against the benefits for the next generation of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, why would the Government not accept such an amendment? Can it be that they are afraid? Are they afraid that the people of Saskatchewan would tell them that they do not want the nationalization of the potash industry. Surely a responsible government would be in favor of seeking the advice of the people at this time. If the Government does not come to its senses and insists on ramming this controversial legislation through at this time, I would predict that the people of this province will not be fooled. They will remember and they will exercise their right to vote and express themselves at the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It is a dangerous and treacherous course the Government has launched this province on.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting the amendment and I hope the Government will do so too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS - 20

Steuart	Nelson	(Assiniboia- Collver
	Gravelbourg)	
Stodalka	Clifford	Larter
Lane	Anderson	Bailey
Wiebe	Merchant	Berntson
Malone	McMillan	Ham
Cameron	Thatcher	Katzman
Edwards		Birkbeck

NAYS - 31

Blakeney	Faris	Shillington
Pepper	Kowalchuk	Rolfes
Thibault	Robbins	Cowley
Smishek	MacMurchy	Tchorzewski
Romanow	Mostoway	Skoberg
Messer	Larson	Allen
Snyder	Whelan	Koskie
Byers	McNeill	Johnson
Kramer	MacAuley	Thompson
Baker	Feschuk	Banda
Lange		

Presentation of Bull Whip

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, prior to starting of debate I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the House to introduce a matter of importance at this time. In light of good and speedy government I'd like to present to the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) a bull whip which hopefully will ensure that the Members on that side will not lose a vote because of lack of Members in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might reply to that. I want to thank the Hon. Member for that gift and I would venture to say that I have always thought that the Liberal Party and bull whips went hand in hand. I guess this has proven that. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The debate continued on Bill 1 - An Act respecting the Development of Potash Resources in Saskatchewan.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with Members on this side of the House in hoping that the Whip on the other side keeps his job after today's error in judgment or whatever it was. Over here we think he is doing an excellent job. We are very

happy and hope that he stays in this position for the next three and one-half years.

Mr. Speaker, on perusing the remarks of the Attorney General who is responsible for so-called marshalling this Bill through the House, he mentioned that there were three basic options open to the Government. If I can reiterate for all concerned the three options that he referred to on page 416, Hansard, November 26. I think this is approximately the third week of debate on nationalization of the potash industry. He said there are three options. The first option is to allow free enterprise; the second option would be by way of legislation and regulation used by government to ensure development, promote development conservation and a fair return to the people of the province; and a third option is the one that is obvious the public can assume ownership directly of their resource development itself.

Those words of course had somewhat of a familiar ring to them. I was very pleased to recall that basically the same words were used in the Debates and Proceedings in 1973. The difference being that those words and those three options were used not by an NDP Member, a former NDP Member certainly, Mr. John Richards, at that time an independent, one of the leaders of the Waffle movement. A very strong advocate and I very cautiously say, not an advocate of nationalization or expropriation. He refers basically in exactly the same words used by the Attorney General in this debate. Mr. Richards said that the Government had three options. One suggestion has been joint ventures. The Province of Saskatchewan buy up shares presumably on a minority basis. John Richards former NDP Member, very prominent in the party opposite and probably have him back joined the party again in the interim.

Another option is that of a marketing board. That is another consideration given by the Attorney General. And a third basic option referred to by Mr. Richards, the third basic option is that implied by the NDP program and that implied by his motion at that time urging complete public ownership of the potash industry.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that when those three options were first discussed in this Legislature back in 1973, by Mr. Richards, the Government opposite refused to allow Mr. Richards to speak. Forty-five Government Members discussing nationalization of the potash industry refused to assist Mr. Richards. Not one Government Member at that time of the 45 NDP elected had the political and personal fortitude to even second the motion of Mr. John Richards when he wanted to discuss the issue of nationalization of the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — They were so afraid of the issue at that time. Now they stand up, Mr. Speaker, and say, we have a mandate. No better proof that you don't have a mandate to nationalize the potash industry was in the refusal of the Government opposite to even allow discussion of nationalization of the potash industry in 1973. And no better proof that you don't have a mandate was your fear of discussing nationalization and expropriation back in 1973.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the reasons for the Bill, not by Government Members, who have pointedly refused to join this debate. When we have the most monumental takeover and economic decision by a government in the history of this country, the Finance Minister (Mr. Smishek) has hidden, refuses to speak, refuses to participate and refuses to make a contribution to this debate and that is shameful.

When the Minister responsible for the new Saskatchewan Potash Corporation refuses to say a word in the Legislature about this Bill, obviously the actions of the Government opposite are shameful to say the least and I think not only embarrassing, I think that what the Government opposite is doing is one of the cheapest forms of partisan politics, when you can simply sit back and ride on your majority, let the Opposition talk itself out, not even say a word about what I have said is the most monumental economic policy ever implemented by any government in the history of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I think that you are making a travesty of this House, I think you are making a mockery of this House and I think in reality you are holding the people of this province up to ridicule by your, as I have called it, dereliction, of your parliamentary duties and a dereliction of your duty to the people of this province. I think it is a shameful act when the Government refuses to use the parliamentary forum to discuss its policies and instead spends thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money on a propaganda effort to try and convince them of the rightness of your ways, using an ad agency to tell your story that you are afraid to stand up and talk about yourself.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP accuse the potash companies of refusing to expand production. And yet they talk about conserving our resources in their ad campaign that has been going on in the media of this province.

The question obviously arises, how can a government expand production on the one hand and conserve our resources for future generations on the other. Obviously the government's position is schizophrenic to say the least and certainly that type of approach is misleading to the people of this province, your advertising campaign is misleading and it is incumbent upon you as elected Members of the Government to stand up and be counted in this Bill and speak to this Bill, join the debate . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . put the true story before the people of this province.

The Government says on the one hand it is going to conserve for future generations and at the same time it says it is going to get the potash companies because they refuse to expand. The Government at the same time says that borrowing \$1 billion is not inflationary and yet any commonsense thinking economist knows full well that it is. The Government on the one hand says that markets for the potash are strong in the

foreseeable future and again the Attorney General made that comment in his second reading speech, yet on the other side we don't have any information, we don't really know what the situation is and for that reason we need these awesome and frightening search and seizure powers put into this Bill. Obviously, the Government is inconsistent to say the least and certainly is deliberately and blatantly misleading the people of this province on the potash Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — How can the Government say logically that markets are adequate, adequate for the future, when it says it doesn't have the information. If we go back to the debate of John Richards in 1973, he made it quite clear that he wasn't advocating nationalization, although he was a known socialist, all he advocated in his motion at that time was further study of nationalization. He did that very carefully. One of the reasons that only asked for a study and not outright nationalization because he said that the people of Saskatchewan and the Government did not have the information on markets, and didn't know what the potential Far East and Pacific Rim market would be and did not know what the effects of nationalization would have on the American market. There was a man who advocated publicly what most of you privately believe and are afraid to talk about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Even he wasn't sure. As I say he very pointedly only asked for a study and he did not advocate outright nationalization and expropriation.

The Government proposes legislation in this Bill which will allow government employees to raid, search and seize from offices and homes of potash employees and allows government employees to take any and all information out of the homes and potash offices and the potash mining property. On the other hand the Government refuses to give information to the people of this province, the Government refuses to tell the people how much of pension funds are going into the nationalization of the industry. Again it is a rather sad performance on part of the Government opposite when it says it has to have all this information takes awesome arbitrary powers, and yet to give a fair and reasonable estimate to the people of Saskatchewan it adamantly refuses to do so, we get the ludicrous estimate of the Premier of anywhere from half a billion to \$1 billion.

I am going, Mr. Speaker, to devote some of my comments to that aspect of the Bill dealing with the search and seizure sections. These sections are surprising, and I am sorry the Attorney General has left, because the Government opposite and NDP Members opposite often hold up several pieces of legislation. In the field of civil liberties being the touchstone of their policy, and they have proudly waved around this province, and I think with some justification up until this Bill, the old CCF legislation establishing the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. In 1974 the NDP brought in a much heralded piece of legislation establishing the Civil Wrong of Privacy, the legislation made it an actionable wrong to invade another's privacy, that was done as I say in 1974. If I can quote from the Attorney General, the same Minister responsible for the search and seizure powers

page 1688, March 21, 1974, speaking on the privacy legislation.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, the principle of this Bill is to create a civil right to privacy as a part of the laws of this country and a part of the laws of this province. The purpose of this Bill is to create a right that up to now the common law has not kept pace with the demands of today's society. The purpose of this Bill is to provide individual freedoms for individuals in society.

I am going to repeat that for the Members opposite. This is the speech of the Attorney General in 1974 about the privacy Bill where he says the purpose of this Bill is to provide individual freedoms for individuals in society, a right that is subsequently being taken away by Bill 1 in nationalizing the potash industry.

Going back to the Privacy Bill. I am a little disappointed that the Hon. Member from the back is not paying attention to this because this particularly refutes your whole record on civil liberties and this particular Bill demeans the Government opposite and demeans each and every one of the Members opposite, if they would dare even stand up and vote for the awesome powers and abuse of civil liberties that you have set out in this Bill.

The purpose of this Bill is to enhance the civil liberties of all of us in this society, (that was his stand at that time.)

He goes on:

The government which has legislative jurisdiction over the Criminal Law has reacted, the Federal Liberal Government is to be congratulated because they outlawed under Criminal Law some aspects of this invasion of privacy.

It is incumbent upon us as provincial legislatures to follow the lead and to make concurrent provincial legislation because we have the power over civil matters to ensure this civil right to provide the civil cause of action in the case of violations of privacy, to be complementary to the federal laws in order to ensure that the right to privacy is a right that is enjoyed by all the citizens of Saskatchewan.

That was the position of the NDP in 1974.

What is their position today? The powers being undertaken by the Government Members opposite under this Bill are just about as wide ranging as the powers taken under the War Measures Act, something that the Government opposite opposed, something that all of a sudden they now seek to make part of the law of the Province of Saskatchewan. Once this Bill is passed the NDP will be able to encourage government employees to enter on with or without a search warrant and with or without any restriction on how they enter the property, forcefully or otherwise, any mining property. Such mining property by definition includes any and all buildings used for or capable of being used for the production, transportation or marketing of potash. And I have eliminated some of the potential uses that those buildings can be used for. Obviously any office in downtown

Regina, Saskatoon, or wherever, used by a potash company, can be forcefully entered into under the powers taken by the NDP in the sections of this Bill. Any potash company employee who is involved in mining, refining, processing, production, transportation, storing or marketing of potash, can have his home broken into by a government employee if his home is even capable of being used for the purposes set out in this Act.

The situation in the way this Bill is drafted, if a mining employee takes work home at night, and the government wanted the records, it could walk into his house, force their way into his house to take all the copies and take the information that they wanted. You are asking us to vote for that piece of legislation. Again I think the proposals demean the Government Members, certainly demean the NDP's supposed record on civil liberties.

Nowhere in the Bill are there limits on how the government employees are to act when they raid any such property. Again force is pointedly not ruled out in Section 60 and 61. The Attorney General in Second Reading, very, very quickly passed over these particular provisions. All he said was that they are far-reaching powers. It is certainly an understatement for a total destruction for the intent of the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights and it is certainly a total rejection of the rules that must be followed to obtain a search warrant in criminal matters.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of Government Members opposite, I am going to take a look at what the criminal law is with regard to search warrants, search and seizure. It is interesting if we go to the Criminal Code, Mr. Speaker, Section 443:

A justice who is satisfied by information upon oath that there is reasonable ground to believe that there is in a building, receptacle or place, or anything upon or in respect of which any offence against this Act has been or is suspected of being committed, or anything that there is reasonable ground to believe will afford evidence with respect to the commission of an offence and anything that there is reasonable ground to believe is to be intended, to be used for the purpose of committing any offence.

In other words, quite simply, if a prosecutor or the police wish to obtain a search warrant, they don't just walk into an individual's house, no matter what the criminal record is, no matter what the past record of that individual is, it is contrary to the law of Canada to allow any law enforcement official to walk into anyone's house without getting the permission of the courts and only with certain proof and certain things which must be proved by the enforcement officials, then there must be reasonable ground to believe, not the arbitrary approach of the Government opposite, which doesn't even say that. The Government opposite has no restrictions on its powers to break into any mining property or any property which can be used for marketing, production, etc. of potash.

The law of course is quite clear with regard to search warrants, you can't just go in and get a search warrant, you must have a good ground for obtaining a search warrant. As a matter of fact, the Government opposite when it was the old CCF were well involved in the development of the law in search warrants. The Government opposite when it prosecuted one

Schumiatcher attained some degree of notoriety with its former employee of the Government or hired by the predecessors of the Government opposite and a summation of the law in that case is quite clear when it says that a search warrant whose description of the documents to be seized was insufficient, and which left it to the discretion of the executing officers as to what should be seized, was quashed. That is Schumiatcher vs the Attorney General of Saskatchewan, a 1960 case. I am sure the Attorney General does not need the citation. I understand the former Attorney General had something to do with some of the basic training of the present Attorney General, and I would sincerely hope the incumbent Attorney General whose record aside from the current civil liberties aspect has been excellent, would do all the people of Saskatchewan a favor by not taking his legal advice from the previous Attorney General, but would start going to some lawyers with a much different record in this particular field.

The law is also quite clear with regard to criminal jurisdiction that a justice who was negligent in issuing a search warrant is not entitled to an order protecting him from civil proceedings, so there is a severe burden on the justice before he awards a search warrant and he does not do it just as an automatic right. The law again is quite clear when it says that a search warrant should not authorize a fishing expedition. Obviously I am going to have to explain that for some Members. The description of the evidence should be so specific that the searchers can identify the thing to be seized. It is the justice, not the informant who must be satisfied that there is a reasonable ground for believing the facts required to be established before issuing a search warrant. In other words the law of Canada protects the rights of individuals so that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . a government must in criminal proceedings, must specifically identify what it is looking for on a search warrant. It then must give proof to the justice that a search warrant is needed, that there is reasonable probable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed, and the justice himself must satisfy himself that there is reasonable ground to believe that an offence has been committed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It's surprising, notwithstanding the obvious law in Canada, that the NDP say that it doesn't apply with potash companies and mining employees, and won't apply to employees of the potash corporation; that their authorities will have the right to walk into any home that they feel is being used for one of the purposes set out in the Act, at any time, day or night.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Regina Mafia!

MR. LANE: — And even the law of Canada makes it clear that a search warrant is only to be effective during the day, unless absolutely necessary otherwise. You don't even give that protection to the people of this province.

I think that in reality Sections 60 and 61, that the Government is in reality practising selective civil liberties. Where it was politically advantageous to bring in a Human Rights Bill you implemented one; where it was politically advantageous to establish a civil wrong of privacy, you decided to pass legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — And when it is politically expedient to break every principle of those bills, and every principle of civil liberties and the protection of the individual and his right to be free from unwarranted government intervention, you're prepared by just simply introducing legislation into the House, passing it, saying to heck with your previous record, and saying that your previous record means nothing, that you are prepared to tend it, twist it, or even break it for the political desire of getting the potash companies and their employees.

The possible only saving grace, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that only one individual has even attempted on the Government side to defend these powers. I said at the outset that I agree with other Hon. Members that I think the Attorney General has done a good job as Attorney General. I have argued with the Attorney General, I have argued in the past with the Attorney General where he closed down a government building, closed down the Centre of the Arts to a company because he disagreed with their business practices, although their business practices were not at that time illegal, which was certainly a breach of The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights which somehow had a law which allowed freedom of assembly. We now have the awesome powers being taken by the Government opposite under their Bill 1. As I say, the only saving grace is the fact that only one Member on that side has even attempted to defend the Government's position and has even attempted to pass over these awesome and frightening powers in Section 60 and 61.

Mr. Speaker, the Government obviously I think will stand condemned by the people of Saskatchewan for its powers in Sections 60 and 61. There were other ways I think that the protection given for people being charged, or under suspicion of criminal offences, could easily have been put into this bill; that the arbitrary right to forcefully enter any such property did not have to be given; that they could have applied to the courts and showed cause why information was necessary, and I urge the Government opposite to restore some of the very basic protections that are so necessary in a free and democratic society; protection which you are arbitrarily taking away from the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I have other criticisms of this Bill.

Members opposite say that the Government can run the potash industry as well as anybody else, as well as the private sector, and yet time and time again all that we have seen is failure with government-run industries. SGIO has become a haven for political appointments and has lost millions of dollars to such an extent that the Government has had to subsidize it. Saskoil has been such a failure that the Government opposite

has had to admit failure in the Throne Speech and say that incentives are needed to try and get the private sector back in Saskatchewan. Subsidies were needed in 1975 to help the private independent oil companies and oil service companies to survive. The very companies that Saskoil put out of business in the first place, the very companies that the Government opposite put out of business with its previously bad legislation.

We've got Saskatchewan Power now and firings of senior employees have become commonplace because they wouldn't do the Government's bidding and they wanted instead to act in the best interest of the people and the corporation . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . by raising rates when it was good sound business practices to do so. It happened to be that sound business practices conflicted with the political exigencies of the Government opposite who were facing an election. I think that the Government's record is certainly not one to be proud of. I think that the Government's record on acting in the private sector is poor, to say the least. It has been a record of failure; it's been a record of political decisions as opposed to management decisions, and there is no doubt based on the track record that we can expect the same situation to exist when the Government nationalizes the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are other reasons for criticizing this Bill. I think as a matter of philosophy that the Bill can also be opposed. I think that the Government opposite, by nationalizing the potash industry, is ignoring and is in fact driving out one of the great strengths of the so-called bad multinational corporation and that is its management capabilities.

Obviously in the field of commerce the great strength of the American corporation has been its strength of management. They are probably within that area, the most well-educated and well-trained people in the world. They are not bound by government strait jackets to the extent that they are not a static bureaucracy. They instead must thrive on change in order to survive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I'm going, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to quote from a book that I have quoted in this Legislature before and it obviously fell on deaf ears. Shall we try it again? They may be here in body, but certainly not in spirit because they are not participating in this particular Bill and we can only assume that in fact most of them secretly oppose this legislation otherwise they would be up speaking and establishing their position. I'm going to quote from first of all the Foreword of "The American Challenge" by John Jacques Servan-Schreiber, certainly not so-called neo-fascist or endorser of the multinational corporations, or whatever phrase you are using today or whatever one is politically acceptable today. The Foreword was done by Arthur Schlesinger, again maybe known to some Members opposite. He is discussing the very aspect of the multinational corporation and

its strengths and he is also discussing the very aspect of American managerial and industrial strength. He poses himself the question:

Wherein does the secret of American dynamism lie? Not the least fascinating aspect of this book for American readers is the portrait they will find of their own country. The secret does not lie, as DeGaulle (and Lenin) would insist, in the pressure of surplus American capital for investment outlets abroad; Mr. Servan-Schreiber argues that nine tenths of American investment in Europe is financed out of European resources. Nor does it lie in American plans for political dominion; Mr. Servan-Schreiber rejects conspiratorial explanations. Nor does it lie in American scientific and technological superiority; he has no difficulty in showing how many basic discoveries were first made in European laboratories. The disparity lies, Mr. Servan-Schreiber contends, in the "art of organization" - in the mobilization of intelligence and talent to conquer not only invention but development, production and marketing. He thus defines the "ga", to use the hopeless current jargon, as less technological than managerial. American industry spills out across the world primarily because of the energy released by the American system - by the opportunity for individual initiative, by the innovative knack of teams, by the flexibility of business structure and by the decentralization of business decision.

Every one of these strengths of the American system are condemned by the Members opposite and every one of these so-called strengths of the American system are being thrown out the window by the Government's imposition of a static management system on an industry that thrives on technological change that has to constantly adjust to new markets and has to constantly adjust to new products.

He gives an example, again, one that I have quoted in this House in the past, and it may be for the edification of the new Members opposite, because they somehow believe that nationalization is the answer. He gives the example of France nationalizing IBM France. To quote:

Suppose a new regime wanted to nationalize IBM France, which is several modern plants and a research laboratory, in France. Having taken control of these handsome installations, the government would find that it had mistaken the shadow for the substance. What counts today for a corporation is not the walls or the machines but the intangible elements that cannot be nationalized. Just as in biology the cell is different from the sum of its component molecules, so a corporation is different from the production factors that go into it.

By nationalizing IBM we would simply force its managers and technicians to emigrate. We would be committing, on the scientific and strategic level, the kind of "intellectual suicide" that Hitler's anti-Semitic policies produced in Germany 30 years ago.

What will the potash companies do if they are nationalized

in Saskatchewan? Obviously their management people are going to leave. They have got too much tied up in their own companies. They are probably extremely loyal to their companies and they are well paid, and they invite the challenge of producing and growing something that a nationalized industry cannot give them. They will either put their money into other fields, or they will take the money from the people of Saskatchewan used to buy them out, and put them into new fields and new resources. And that's the great tragedy of this Bill. You don't recognize the great strengths that these companies have and you have failed to take advantage of those strengths. You have failed over the last four years to take advantage of those strengths, and in fact, I think you are committing intellectual suicide by driving the management of the potash corporations out of Saskatchewan and by replacing it with whatever form you intend to take, which is a static-management situation.

I talked at the outset about the question of mandate. The Government opposite knows it has no mandate to nationalize the potash industry. It was mentioned in 'New Deal 1971'. But when the Government had the opportunity to debate nationalization in 1972-1973 not one Government Member was able to stand up, or would stand up to second Mr. Richards' resolution. Not one. When he wanted to talk about studying nationalization, the Government Members who were in the House at that time were afraid to speak. Not one of them would even second his Motion to consider debating the possibility of nationalizing the industry. Obviously you had no mandate. You were afraid to even talk about it in 1973 and you were afraid to talk about it prior to the election, and you kept the issue away from the people of Saskatchewan because you are afraid to get into the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — You didn't mention it in 'New Deal 1975'. Again, because I think you were afraid to. You don't have a mandate to nationalize the potash industry. When you represented 54 per cent of the people of this province you were afraid to talk about it, and now that you represent only 39 per cent you should withdraw this Bill, you should take it back to the people and give the people a chance to air their feelings. It's their money, it's their gamble; it's their risk; it's their children's risk, and it's their children's gamble. It is being taken by your hands and you have no mandate.

I'm going to move a further amendment, Mr. Speaker. The Government saw fit earlier this afternoon to refuse that the Bill go or the question of nationalization will go before a commission consisting of certain individuals and in a certain format.

The Premier is on record as stating that the highest court in the province is this Legislature. Perhaps with that position of the Premier, he would endorse this Bill going before a special committee of this Legislature.

If we are to take the responsibility of legislators, certainly no one can object to this amendment. There is ample precedent, Mr. Speaker, because in 1972 the then Attorney General and the present Attorney General was faced with bad

legislation, as this is, the Government opposite introduced legislation which would prohibit a Saskatchewan citizen from leaving his farm land to his children if the children lived outside the province. It was bad legislation. It was subsequently changed after a committee. The Government didn't have a mandate for that legislation then, just as it has not a mandate for nationalization of the potash industry.

I'm going to quote the Attorney General at that time and I'm sure the principle applies and I know the Members opposite will understand the principle, and it will be very interesting to see whether Government Members opposite are consistent in their principles or whether again this is all being based on political expediency and whether the Attorney General at that time was talking in a political way and not really concerned about the true issue at that particular time.

The Attorney General said in debate at page 2058:

The simple fact of the matter is, No. With respect to the Land Bank we were clearly elected on that issue of the Land Bank. We got a mandate on the Land Bank and we are proceeding with the Land Bank because we held hearings with the people of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Agriculture met thousands of farmers and knows their views and it comes in as Government policy as a matter of legislation. We did not campaign on the foreign issue and if we did the Minister said in second reading it is his intention to hand the matter to a committee and we ask you to join with us in that task to make sure that we have got the best possible legislation on foreign ownership and corporate ownership that the Province of Saskatchewan can have to meet this very pressing and important problem. And I say to the Members opposite that surely we can bury our political differences in the resolution of that problem. I am sure that those Members of the committee on our side will be prepared to do that. We had strong differences over the Family Farm Protection, but the committee worked well.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite didn't have a mandate and didn't run on the foreign ownership of land legislation that it introduced in 1972.

The Attorney General at that time stood up in the House and said that he did not campaign on that legislation, that we want to hold public hearings. He said that we want to give the people of Saskatchewan the best legislation that they can have to deal with that serious and pressing problem.

He argued eloquently for the right of the people of this province to speak on a very pressing issue on legislation that had been introduced by the Government opposite. He argued at that time it was in the best interests of the people that it go to a committee. That he didn't have a mandate, that the Government didn't have a mandate. That it was a pressing problem and should be dealt with in the best way.

The official Opposition takes the same view today. We feel that this pressing problem is one that deserves the same consideration as the Attorney General spoke about in 1972.

We believe that the people of Saskatchewan want the best

type of legislation to deal with the preservation of our resources. We feel that the people of Saskatchewan want to have a voice on the potential gamble of millions and possibly billions of dollars. We feel that the people of Saskatchewan have that right to have a voice and we agree with the thoughts and the speech of the Attorney General as he gave in 1972. We think that the Government should be consistent in its policy. I feel too that the Government should be consistent in the way it treats this Legislature. If it had no mandate then and it was a pressing problem, it certainly has no mandate for nationalization now and it has become a pressing problem. Then, in the Government's own words, what should be done is a special committee of the Legislature. I have drafted the following motion or amendment, Mr. Speaker. It's not quite word for word with the one that the Attorney General introduced in 1972. The only modifications, however, are a couple of names of individuals who are no longer with us or have attained their higher position in the Cabinet. The only minor change that at that time rather the words used in that motion that such committee be directed to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of agricultural lands by non-resident, foreign and corporate persons. The only substitution that we have made is that such committee be directed to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of potash mines by non-resident, foreign and corporate persons and government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — That is the only change that we are making. We heartily endorsed what the Attorney General said in 1972. We agree that it's time to give the people a voice. In the words of the Attorney General, that the best way of doing that is a special committee of the Legislature. We have every confidence that the Attorney General be consistent in his position and therefore, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) I move the following amendment that all the words after the word "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Bill No. 1 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to a Special Committee on the Nationalization of the Potash Industry being composed of Messrs: Kowalchuk, Thibault, Lange, Pepper, Feschuk, Mostoway, Larson, Dyck, Lane, Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg), and Wiebe:

That such Committee be directed to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of potash mines by non-resident, foreign and corporate persons, and government; That such Committee will have power to sit during the intersessional period and during any Legislative Session except when the Assembly is sitting, and that notwithstanding Section 58 of The Legislative Assembly Act (Chapter 3, R.S.S. 1965 as amended) allowances and expenses shall be paid to Members of the Committee when sitting during a period of adjournment of any Session, at the same rate as prescribed in the said section of the Act;

That such Committee will have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public, and for this

purpose to hold meetings away from the seat of Government in order that the fullest representation may be received without unduly inconveniencing those desiring to be heard;

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

Mr. Speaker, I know the Attorney General will join with me in endorsing this Amendment, seconded by the Member for Morse, I so move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The debate continues concurrently on the main motion and the amendment.

MR. ROMANOW: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I note that the proposed motion calls for the establishment of a committee and for the expenditure of public funds for the maintenance of that committee on an intersessional basis. I would ask Your Honour to reconsider whether or not the motion is in order on the basis that it is a well accepted principle of parliamentary rule that an Opposition cannot vote or move a vote for supply in this fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the Attorney General can wait a second I'll have an item here that clarifies that situation.

Speaking to the Point of Order that was raised by the Attorney General. In 1973 Mr. Speaker referred to the Journals of Saskatchewan, 1968, page 195. A Point of Order was raised that the amendment would create an expenditure for the Government. Mr. Speaker, ruled that the amendment did not create an expenditure for the Government and ruled that the amendment was in order. This was in effect requesting setting up a committee of the Legislature. The 1968 reference was with regard to the establishment of a committee at that time which was in order.

The theory being that the operation of committees is a usual function of the Legislature and does not necessarily make an added expenditure on the Legislature of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I do not challenge your ruling, I am perfectly happy to accept it, except that I would wonder whether or not the committee referred to then was a sessional or an intersessional committee. That makes all the difference; because a sessional committee involves no additional expenditure, whereas an intersessional committee where there is specific provision for the payment, clearly does involve additional expenditure. I'm not questioning your ruling, I'm just wishing to record my views on this, since if it arises again with respect to an intersessional committee I will want to check the records to see whether or not our precedent from 1968 is in fact relevant for an intersessional committee.

MR. SPEAKER: — Are there any further points

to raise on this particular Point of Order before I call it 5:30?

It being now 5:30 I leave the Chair until 7:00 o'clock this evening. When I come back at that time, I will bring back a final decision, if a further one is required.

MR. MALONE: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I understood that you had made your decision, that the Premier in no way challenged your decision and I assumed your decision stood.

MR. SPEAKER: — The members will agree with me that the motion was just handed to me now and I haven't had time to check precedents. I will check them.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, you gave your decision. Sorry to be on my feet while you are, but you gave your decision. The Attorney General got up and questioned your decision, you gave your decision again and nobody has questioned that decision. The Premier was very clear when he rose, that he was not questioning your decision in any way. So I take it, Mr. Speaker, that you have made up your mind and the matter is now finalized.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order did you or did you not call it 5:30?

MR. LANE: — You asked if there were any other comments on the ruling if you call it 5:30. There were some comments on the ruling but certainly the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) has a right to speak until 5:30 if he so wishes.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak very briefly to this point, if the Members think I am out of Order then I will sit down. I want to say, that surely the purpose of this is not so much whether it is 5:30 or not but whether or not the motion is within the rules. If Mr. Speaker says he would like to take another look at it what harm can that be.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, you are in effect reversing yourself if you change your mind. You have made your point, you have held the motion to be in order twice. Nobody has taken exception to that decision. The Premier did not take any exception whatsoever to it.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, if that is the case I will challenge it.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take it as 5:30 now and in the future I will not make a decision until I have had time to give it full and complete consideration and the House will wait for my decision.

The House recessed from 5:30 o'clock p.m. until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

SPEAKER'S CLARIFICATION OF RULING

MR. SPEAKER: — If I may just offer a point of clarification to a matter that arose just before 5:30. The matter before the House was an amendment offered by the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) with regard to submitting the subject matter of Bill 1 to a special committee of the Legislature. At the time I ruled that that would be in order. I have in order to clarify my own thinking on the matter, checked the record and I find the following; that this is in fact an expenditure of funds within The Legislative Assembly Act, Chapter 3, Section 58. I go back to check the record and I find the following. The establishment of a special committee which appears on the blues at this time under the name of Mr. Romanow does not require voting of funds for the establishment of that committee, it is within The Legislative Assembly Act. I go back to 1972 and at that time I find that a Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands was established, it names the Committee. That Committee was established without a necessary vote of funds at that time. I go back further to 1968 on an amendment proposed by Mr. Lloyd:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This House declines to proceed with this Bill until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a select special committee of this Legislature with provision for public representation to said committee and a report of such an investigation is tabled in this Legislature.

That was found to be in order at that time and I would therefore rule and ask the debate to proceed concurrently.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the amendment put forward by the Member for Qu'Appelle. We are asked to consider a special committee to examine the position of the Government with respect to potash, the decision to control the potash industry through ownership. And I suspect to go through the normal channels of hearing representation and hold hearings and so on.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, a delay could be involved through this procedure for some considerable length of time. I see two things wrong with the amendment.

I don't have a copy of the amendment before me but as I listened to the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle it seemed to me that something was missing from the amendment and that was very obvious to us, that the Conservative caucus was not represented. I don't see how we could consider supporting an amendment with such an obvious omission. I am ashamed, Mr. Speaker, of the Member for Qu'Appelle although I am not surprised that he would ignore the Conservative caucus to his left since they are an obvious thorn in his side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I notice with

interest the efforts of the Member for Qu'Appelle to butter up the Attorney General. If it had been anybody else, if it had been anybody else on the other side of the House I think we might have considered it, certainly the Attorney General would have. But since it was the Member for Qu'Appelle, it is obvious he wasn't very serious. But what he was attempting to do was to take us back to 1972. In the area of the potash industry you just can't go back to 1972 because the situation with that industry was significantly different then than it is in the year 1975.

The attitude of the companies with respect to this Government, attitude of the companies with respect to the policies of this Government were considerably different three years ago than they are now today.

Mr. Speaker, we can't support any suggestion for delay beyond the normal debating practice, the sensible debating practice of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Our Government announced our decision on November 12, this was immediately followed by the introduction of Bill 1. Now I am sure that all Members are fully aware of their responsibilities to their constituents, particularly in light of June being not so long ago. Particularly in light of what happened last week. There is a point to be made for all Members of this Assembly in what happened in British Columbia. Particularly Members opposite must be concerned. Obviously all Members are aware of bread and butter politics. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members have been in contact with the people within their constituencies. When one considers the length of time that this Bill has been before the Legislature, it seems to me there has been ample time for representation from all Saskatchewan people through newly elected representatives. If there hasn't been time the Government Members on this side of the House are certainly prepared to provide sufficient time through sensible debate and we will remain in the Assembly until the debate is completed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, certainly the delay that is suggested by setting up this committee will only encourage the potash companies to step up their attack on this province, the province's right to develop the resources for our people. I say, Mr. Speaker, when any resource company challenges the province's right to tax potash, and those companies are supported by the Federal Government then it is no time for delay, it is time to take action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — It is time to take action and all Members should stand united behind the people of Saskatchewan.

Everyone knows, including the potash companies, Mr. Speaker, the constitution of this country. If the potash companies have suddenly become so concerned about the so-called

double taxation then why do they adopt such drastic measures that we have been witnessing against the people of the Province of Saskatchewan? Why did they not attack the Federal Government in terms of their decision with respect to income tax?

Mr. Speaker, the delay should not be supported by the Members of this Assembly because this means certainly a delay in the expansion of the potash industry. To meet the markets of the 1980s our industry must expand and must begin to expand now. The companies over the past year or more have been unwilling to move. They are apparently prepared to leave the new markets of the '80s to the Soviets. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House, and I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan support us when we say we are not prepared to abandon the expansion in the market areas for potash to the Soviets. We need to get on with the job and we need to get on with it now.

I ask the Member for Qu'Appelle to reconsider his proposal to delay. I ask all Members to support the Members on this side of the House in defeating the amendment to Bill 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the amendment and the main motion. Let me first of all offer the apologies of the Member for Qu'Appelle for not including the Conservative caucus in his amendment. I am sure that all Members will realize and understand that throughout this entire debate the Conservative caucus has been so quiet that it wasn't difficult to overlook them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I should like to suggest to the Conservative caucus and also to the Members opposite that if they feel that concerned about the error that was made by Mr. Lane, the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle, that they move a subamendment to our amendment and you can rest assured that our 15 Members on this side of the House will support any such subamendment that is proposed either by the Conservative caucus or the Members on that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I was rather amused by the comments made by the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) when he talked about the responsibilities we as MLAs have to our constituents. I agree with him, we have a responsibility, we have a responsibility as well to our constituents that when someone does phone whether it be collect or otherwise that we do answer that phone and accept that telephone charge and that we do listen to the views expressed to us by our constituents. I think we have to take into account as well that for the majority of the time that this particular . . .

HON. N. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, will the Member permit a question? Is he aware that the former Government did not accept any phone calls reversed to the Minister's offices?

MR. WIEBE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to defend or protect or to argue against what some other government did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I can tell the Member opposite that I was not aware of that fact and I don't think it has any bearing whatsoever on what that particular government did nor does it have any bearing as to what I, as an MLA do. I can tell the Members opposite that any time a constituent of mine phones me whether it is collect or not, that telephone call is answered and those charges are accepted. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, the next Liberal Government will follow that policy. I might point out too, that just because one government does it does not mean that the next government has to do it. Two errors do not make one right. Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, I think that question was ill-advised and had nothing to do with the debate at hand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, prior to the time I was so rudely interrupted, let me go on to say that we as MLAs must take into account the fact that for the majority of the time that this Bill has been before the House, we in this province, and in Canada have gone through a mail strike. Many of our constituents because of that strike did not have an opportunity to voice their opinions to us. It takes a considerable amount of time and debate with this Assembly before our constituents know and become aware of the fact of what this Government is proposing or what any government is proposing. As well, MLAs on this side have not had an opportunity to write to their constituents and advise them on the legislation put forth and to explain their point of view on what they feel the Government should be doing.

I point out as well, that we have a responsibility, all of us when we go home to our constituencies on the weekend to take the time to drive around our constituency, to talk to the people we represent, to go into coffee shops, to attend public meetings or even to call a meeting of our own to advise the people that we represent what the Government is doing. I dare say that you can probably count on one hand the amount of MLAs in this Assembly that have accepted this responsibility and called a meeting in their own constituencies and explained to their constituents exactly what is going on in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I guess I should have said on two hands and one foot because I am sure that the 15 Members on this side have certainly held meetings and advised their constituents of what has happened.

The Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood also said that it is time to take action. He left the House with the impression that there was some dire or urgent need that the potash industry in the province be nationalized immediately.

It is funny that that need arose so quickly right after the last election. If there was a need in July and if there is a need now, was there not a need in June or May or March? Why all of a sudden the hurry? Why is it necessary at this time to

all of a sudden say that we have to nationalize the potash industry and we have to do it right away?

I think that if we are responsible MLAs as the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood had suggested that we would come up with the proposals that are required to nationalize the potash industry. We would explain the costs, what effect it would have. We would show this Assembly and the people of the province the studies which the Government has done prior to making their decision. We could then take those proposals and studies to the people of Saskatchewan and say, what do you think? Do you think that we should as a Government on your behalf nationalize the potash industry? Allow them to make a decision as great as this takeover. When you look at it that is twice the annual budget of this Government of last year. A fantastic amount of money.

So again, I would urge Members on both sides of the House to disregard the comments made by the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood and vote in favor of this amendment. And I say as well, Mr. Speaker, that by voting in favor of this amendment you are voting in favor of the right of the people of Saskatchewan to express their own views on legislation as drastic and as vital to the future of Saskatchewan as this particular legislation is.

The Member mentioned something about the reasoning why we wanted this legislation to go before the people, so that we would come up with some political propaganda, we could possibly make some political hay out of it. And we could counteract in effect, the brain washing job which this Government is doing with the taxpayers' money in this province. Just let us have a look at what they are doing. Let's see how honest they are in reporting to the people of Saskatchewan on this Government takeover. We have a number of full-page ads, "Home Office Saskatchewan makes Good Sense", and the ad goes on to say: "Can Saskatchewan make a go of potash mining?" And here are the reasons why we can. First of all, the markets are there. And I agree with the ad, the markets are there. In 1975 the markets for potash are there but where in this ad does it say that the marketing for potash will be guaranteed for 1976 or 1977. What guarantee are you giving to the people of Saskatchewan that the United States, for example, which is now taking 70 per cent of the potash we produce, what guarantee have you given to the people of Saskatchewan that once you nationalize the industry that the U.S. will not refuse to accept any potash coming from Saskatchewan. You've not told the people of Saskatchewan that in your ad. What guarantee have you as well that the company whose potash mine you do expropriate, what provision have you got that, that mine will allow you to have the regular markets which it has enjoyed over the past few years? This again is not mentioned in your advertisement. You say here that we have what is needed, you say here that by expanding production we'll be able to meet our share of this industry's increased demand. Well, again let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on the one hand they talk about preserving the potash in the province for future generations and on the other hand they talk about expanding production. I wish you people on that side of the House would be a little more coherent, if that is the right term, in the speeches and representations which you make to the people of Saskatchewan. On the one hand you are saying that you are nationalizing the potash industry to preserve the benefits of the potash for the future generations of Saskatchewan and on the other hand you say, "There is an urgent need," as the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood has just

said, "There is an urgent need to expropriate that potash now and to produce more and sell more."

Well, you know, here is another reason why we feel this amendment is so necessary, because the Members on that side of the House are confusing the people of Saskatchewan. On the one hand you say, we want to preserve it for future generations and on the other hand you say, we've got to take it over right now so that we can expand production.

Let's look at expanded production. Say that this is what your true feeling is that you do want to expand the industry and you want to do it quickly. You are going to spend upwards to \$2 billion and I am using that figure because we don't know how much you are going to spend. You figure out how much a potash mine costs, it doesn't take you long to determine if you buy all 11, you could be spending close to \$2 billion. Couldn't you expand the production of potash more rapidly by building a mine of your own and allowing the others to continue in operation the way they have been? Instead of spending billions of dollars on something that is already here and I can't for the life of me see where that is going to increase production. Buying a mine is not going to increase the production of that mine. You have to increase the capabilities of that mine and that is going to cost you more money.

This ad goes on to say:

Our reputation is good, financially speaking, it is better than nearly every other province. We have the lowest debt per capita in Canada and we have got the cash flow, that is why we can borrow the money we need and pay it back from the potash acquired.

Well, let's just take a look for a moment, Mr. Speaker, at why Saskatchewan is in the particular financial position it is today. Is it because of good management of the Treasury Benches opposite or is it because of some good fortune which has befallen the Province of Saskatchewan. I have a tendency, Mr. Speaker, to lean towards the latter. Our financial position today has been because of the farming industry in this province. It had nothing to do with what the Treasury Benches have done on that side of the House. All that they have done, Mr. Speaker, is collect the tax revenue and found a fantastic way to spend it. But have they spent any of that money on creating new wealth to add to that good fortune. Mr. Speaker, they have to admit themselves that they certainly have not. There has not been one major industry attracted or started in this province by the Government Members on that side of the House. Again the good reputation that this province has earned is because of the farmers in this province, because of the world situation in terms of wheat and because of the good national policy of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Otto Lang.

We have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to that fantastic financial reputation if we happen to have a crop failure? What's going to happen to our tax revenue - again the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) mentioned the Federal Government. Sure if we have a crop failure the Treasury Benches on that side of the House are going to get down on their knees and on to Ottawa, and say, the reason why we had a crop failure is Ottawa's fault. Come on, send some more money into this province so that we can spend again a fantastic amount as we

have in the past. They are not prepared to accept any of the responsibility or any of the risk themselves, Mr. Speaker. Again, when something goes wrong or the threat of something going wrong, you always hear, 'Ottawa', you always hear, 'Ottawa'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — The ad goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people are here, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan already has a core of highly capable people. Don't the Treasury Benches has a core of highly capable people. Don't the Treasury Benches realize that three of those highly capable people have already resigned because of your intention to take over the potash industry? In their resignations they stated that they were not hired to nationalize or expropriate potash, they were hired to build the potash industry. So again, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the Government is misleading the people of the Province in this ad. Why didn't you go on in that same ad and say that, the people may be here, we had them, but because of our actions three of them have decided to resign and leave this province.

The ad goes on to say that we have the experience. "Saskatchewan has a lot of experience in tackling new approaches for our province." Let me say that this Government's venture into the potash industry is somewhat similar to a venture that was made a number of years back by Mr. Columbus when he discovered the new world. He didn't know where he was when he got there and he didn't know where he had been when he got back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — And, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what the Government is doing when they tackle potash. You've never been there before but I am sure when you get there you won't know what to do and when you get back the people will have to bail you out and you'll wish you hadn't been there. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that before the modern age of Columbus ventures out on this type of venture that they do take the suggestions which we have made and allow the people of Saskatchewan to voice their opinions as to whether they want the potash industry in this province expropriated or whether they don't.

May I suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, the reason the Members on that side of the House are not going to support this amendment, is not because they have a feeling for the people of Saskatchewan, it is not because they feel that there is such an urgent need that the potash industry be nationalized, might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are afraid to support this amendment because they realize that after six months of listening to the people of this province, the people of Saskatchewan will say, No, hold back, don't nationalize the industry. And another socialist dream will have bit the dust. It is unfortunate that people will have to wait four years before they have an opportunity to voice their opinion on legislation as vital as this one.

Going for a moment, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. MESSER: — Are you riding off into the sunset?

MR. WIEBE: — Oh, I am sure, Mr. Messer, that you will probably be riding into that sunset long before I will if you nationalize this potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Well, you know whether it is 15, 11 or 1,500, at least I am here and Mr. Gross isn't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And the people are better off.

MR. WIEBE: — Going on, Mr. Speaker, to talk for a moment about the Bill itself. Regardless of how we look at it, this Bill is going to cost somebody an awful lot of money. But let's look at what the Bill could do to this province other than money. What would that cost be? Let's look at new industry that we have tried to attract into this province and I ask the Government Members opposite once this Bill becomes law who will come into Saskatchewan? Who will venture into this province to invest his own money or millions and millions of dollars of other people's money to develop a new industry when they see what has happened to the potash industry. You can rest assured that they are going to detour Saskatchewan again as they have done in the past four years but much more so now into Alberta and now into British Columbia.

You know it is surprising when we talk about the potash Bills 1 and 2, a person hates to admit this but when someone talks about your Government, and it is my Government whether I am sitting on that side of the House or this side of the House, one cannot speak in terms of pride because believe you me, Mr. Speaker, I am not very proud of what this Government is planning on doing to an industry which we invited to come into Saskatchewan.

Let's look at another cost, let's look at jobs. By no more new industry coming into this province what are our young people going to do if they have to look for jobs? The only alternative that is open to them now is the civil service and regardless of how large the civil service gets somehow, somewhere along the line there has got to be an end to it. Again, I believe there is due risk. As I said earlier, we could lose a lot of the markets which we presently have for potash, what happens if we can't sell it? The province could be loaded with potash but if we haven't any markets for it we're not going to benefit and the people of Saskatchewan aren't going to benefit.

Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the role of any provincial government is to provide a service and an industry when the private sector will not do it. The private sector has indicated that they are willing . . .

MR. COWLEY: — Who said that?

MR. WIEBE: — I said that, and I make no apologies either for saying it, because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is the responsibility

of Government and I will stand on that responsibility . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying I have already spoken on Bill 2 in terms of Crown corporations and the Speaker, might call me to order, Mr. Attorney General, if I wandered off the subject and talk about Crown corporations. I would love to get into the debate with you on it but reluctantly I must stay on Bill 1.

Okay, let's go and look at some areas in the province where the private sector has not provided a service to the people of Saskatchewan where I would have no objections to the Government getting involved with or in. If the Government feels that Saskatchewan is in the financial position it is which would allow them to borrow anywhere from one to two billion dollars, then let's look again at the southwest part of the province. Let's look at what is happening in the Swift Current area. Let's look as well at what is going to happen to that oil industry after January 1st. Exports of that heavy crude will be cut off.

MR. COWLEY: — By whom?

MR. WIEBE: — It doesn't matter by whom. Mr. Speaker, the point is that export is going to be cut off so what is your responsibility? The crude that is manufactured or pumped in that part of the province is of a heavy crude. There is no refinery in Saskatchewan to refine that crude. Wouldn't it be much better, Mr. Speaker, to spend a few million dollars on a refinery located in Swift Current or in the Swift Current area to refine that crude so again we wouldn't have to rely on the Americans to take our crude oil and refine it.

MR. COWLEY: — What would you do about gasoline as a matter of interest?

MR. WIEBE: — Well, what should we do with the gasoline, let's sell it. Why do we have to rely on Alberta? Why do we have to rely on Alberta to provide us with a fuel that is needed to run our tractors and our cars? You know, it is that kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, that those people feel is justified in nationalizing the potash industry. What's wrong, Mr. Speaker, with building a refinery in the Swift Current area? But I can understand the Member for Biggar's reaction to this because the Government doesn't hold very much stock in the southwest part of the province and especially the oil industry in the southwest part of the province.

Let's look at the new map which was handed out today. On that map they have got little figures depicting what kind of industry goes on in the various sections of Saskatchewan. The southwest part of the province we see a couple of steer heads, I imagine that's what it is, representing ranching. They have got a wheel representing manufacturing but they have completely ignored the oil, petroleum and natural gas that is produced in the southwest of the province. So as far as the Government is concerned there is no oil or natural gas produced in the southwest part of the province. They are certainly ignoring it in

these maps and they are certainly ignoring any help that should be forthcoming to preserve what industry we do have there.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me re-emphasize the point that to protect the oil industry that we do have in the southwest part of the province, we need a refinery. Why not allow the present industry that is there to exist and to continue to grow and you can rest assured that a refinery located in the city of Swift Current or instead I might suggest in the towns of Success or Cantuar which are located in the Morse constituency to enable the industry to maintain its growth and its strength.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more other suggestions which I should like to make to the Members of this Assembly regarding Bill 1 but, I think I have thrown out enough food for thought tonight that hopefully after Government Members have had a chance to sleep on it, they will come back with a change of heart tomorrow morning and will support the amendment as presently written.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Shillington that Bill No. 16 - An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act, 1973, be now read a second time.

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the debate on Bill No. 16, the rent control legislation. I want to discuss the substance of the measure in itself in some respects and I want also to discuss some of the subsidiary questions that arise in an indirect way from the legislation itself.

Turning to the first of those areas, I had an interesting discussion a day or so ago with a constituent of mine from Regina South, who is a tenant. I want to pass on the substance of that discussion to Members of the House because I thought it was particularly relevant and rather intriguing in the process. We have in Regina South perhaps a greater concentration of renters and tenants than in most constituencies in the province. This gentleman is a tenant in my constituency and he has been renting for some six or seven years. He is one of the many tenants who has had to pay some \$170, \$180, \$190 and ultimately \$200 a month in rent. Like most tenants he hasn't been very happy with the increases that he has had over the past two and three years, nor is he very happy about the prospects of increases in the future. I would have expected in talking to him as a tenant to find him pretty much in favor of the legislation now under discussion. But he asked me in the course of the discussion we had, to urge upon the House a good deal of caution with respect to this Bill. What he told me is that he came here from Czechoslovakia some seven years ago. He said that in Czechoslovakia in the post-war years locating accommodation there grew extremely difficult and with the scarcity of available housing and apartments, tenants were experiencing as they are now here, rent increases one after another. He said construction at the time was fairly brisk but failed to keep pace with the enormous demand. The government answered that situation by bringing in a system of rent control.

He said at first the people were very happy. Then as time went on, construction and new apartments began to decline and he said an already tight situation became even tighter. He said the government responded a second time by itself getting into the construction business. He said that didn't last very long before it was realized there wasn't a very significant measure of help by the government getting into it in that limited way.

The government then took a third step and that was to take over all construction firms in the country of 50 employees or more. The government was going to do a job the construction industry wasn't doing with the rigid controls that were in place. Despite government having taken over the large construction firms, he said the situation still didn't improve very much.

The government took an additional step, step number four. They took over all the construction industry in the country, including the small firms as well as the large firms and the individual bricklayers and masons in the process. Now he said when he left Czechoslovakia, seven or eight years ago, the waiting lists for apartments had grown so long it took eight to 10 years to get a suite. He said with long waiting lists of this kind and apartments so scarce, good accommodation became a prize, a prize pursued with rare passion and vigor. He said the result of that was to bring in its wake, serious graft; graft abounded in the allocation of rental space. He said indeed the government itself began to use apartment accommodation as a special inducement to the highly skilled and those in particular demand at a particular time. He said the result of that inevitably was favoritism for certain classes over others. He said, a most interesting thing that the chronic losers in that process were the old, those without influence and those whose occupations didn't fit the preferred classes as defined by government. This gentleman spent some seven years in European universities and is today a journalist, so he is neither uneducated nor inexperienced. He asked me if I would express his views to the House and urge upon the House some caution in this respect.

We can understand very well the appeal of rent controls in times of high inflation and scarcity of accommodation but we should be very cautious indeed and we should in the main be concentrating our efforts not in controlling rent but concentrating on increasing construction. That's the other side of the coin and the far more productive side of the coin. I don't suggest, with respect to this particular Bill that we are necessarily today heading in the same direction as my constituent who had seen the Czechoslovakian experience but one can see in this measure and the way in which the government is talking about it, some unmistakable similarities between the situation he described and the situation we now see today.

We have been hearing these past several days some hints, if I might put it that way, some might put it a little stronger, about the Government itself getting into the construction industry. Indeed, it has been suggested by some that the rental control measure is part of the process by which the Government will justify its entry into the construction business. Now, the Government has indicated to us that indeed itself, it is not entirely sure if this is the right course to be taken or the right measure. Now we say if that is the case, then why is the Bill not limited in time? The Government has said repeatedly that the province has sought from Ottawa greater flexibility

with respect to the national control restraint program, including it has said the option for the provinces to opt in for an 18-month period rather than the 3-year federal period. Again, we ask if that is so and undoubtedly it is, then why is this Bill not limited in time to 18 months?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — There can be no argument with this but that this Bill has every appearance of a permanent measure and it is the kind of Bill that we ought not to permit to become a permanent feature of our system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Now the Government has said that this isn't so, that they don't intend it to be permanent. But I ask them if you can blame us for being skeptical in those respects when a simple amendment to Section 27 of that Act would remove our doubts. Section 27 merely says that the Act will come into force on the day of assent. We say why doesn't it continue and have a one-liner and that would simply be, "and shall expire 18 months from the day of assent."

Our caucus has said to the Government and I repeat, that we are prepared to support a system of rent controls as an extraordinary measure to meet an extraordinary circumstance. This is one and only one of the several things that we have been asked to do in the national interest by the national government in the fight against inflation.

We have a series of questions that we put to government in all seriousness. We say:

1. Where are the other parts of the package that we have been asked to implement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Which includes a comprehensive system of wage and income guidelines for provincial jurisdiction.

2. Why is this Bill not limited in time to 18 months or three years?
3. We ask why it is weighted in a peculiar and strange and unfair way against the fair-minded and decent landlord?
4. Why are these hints around about government having to get into the construction business itself? We seek some clarification of that.
5. Lastly and among others. Why is there no appeal to the courts?

As Hon. Members know Section 38 of that Act specifically prohibits an appeal of the decision of a rentalsman or the commission to the courts.

Now I ask the Members opposite in all fairness, if you were

seated on this side of the House as we are, given those circumstances, I say you too would be skeptical. We ask for your clarification and assurances in those respects, beginning as we do with a general willingness to support a rent control system in the fight against inflation.

I want to direct some attention of Members to Sections 2, 3 and 55(g) of the Act. This raises as I said earlier, a subsidiary question, but one which I think is very important not related so much directly to the substance of this Act as some of the practices that we have permitted to slip into the system. Subsection (4) of that Section 3 gives the Cabinet power to declare that any part of the Act will not apply. In a similar way clause (d) of Section 2(b) gives the Cabinet the power to apply the Act to any room or building not even mentioned in the Act.

Section 55(g) contains a similar power, one which is described in the explanatory notes that we got with respect to the Bill, it says:

The Cabinet may suspend the operation of all or any part of this Act indefinitely or to a specific date.

Now what we ask you and we ask you seriously because this is a pattern which we see again and again. What kind of a law is it that gives Cabinet the power without reference to the Legislature or indeed to anyone else to override or add to it as it will. It is the function of the Legislature to make the law and not the Cabinet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Yet in a very real sense, the Cabinet is put above the law in this Act and it certainly has the power to add to the law or subtract from the law as it would.

Mr. Speaker, we take serious issue with this practice. As I said we have seen it time and again, we see it now again in this Bill. I say to all Members of the House, that if we continue to tolerate this practice we will ultimately wind up with a Legislature that is impotent, we will in the process emasculate it. We remind the Government again and one ought not to have to do this, but we remind you, that the constitutional power in its totality is divided between the Legislature which makes the law, the Cabinet which administers it or executes it and the courts which interpret it and apply it.

The Cabinet, in effect, in this Bill and in many Bills is taking unto itself, in a sense, the function of the Legislature. This division of power that I have mentioned and they are so basic, is becoming increasingly blurred and apparently deliberately so.

Now what is true in respect of the Cabinet's attitude toward the power of the Legislature, is also in some respects true in respect of the power of the courts. Indeed in a sense that attitude, particularly the one toward the courts is a bit frightening in some of its implications. Let me use two examples to make my point. Speaking to Bill 16 the Government Whip said the other day in this House, "Why provide people with an appeal to the courts? All that would do is weight things in favor of

the landlord and their lawyers." He spoke disparagingly, indeed very disparagingly of the courts and the bias and the unfairness of the courts in the system. He said again, why should we have a right of appeal? Tenants themselves wouldn't want that because in effect, making the point, the courts can't be trusted to be fair.

I say that that kind of a statement shows no conception whatever for the proper role of the courts in our system. I want to take just a minute to remind the Hon. Member, and all Hon. Members, that the courts are there not only to decide questions as between citizen and citizen but indeed questions as between government and citizen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — And a right which has been won over the course of centuries of history and a right which we have at all costs to preserve in our society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — A second example I use to demonstrate the attitude of which I speak is that the Government as you know, has repeatedly decried the fact the various potash companies challenged the Government in the courts. There are different ways one can interpret an action of that kind, one can speak as Members opposite do, of the potash companies challenging the Government, challenging as the Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood said, "The right of the people to do something," speaking in those kingly terms as though we the Government necessarily are the people. You the Government aren't necessarily the people.

I remind Hon. Members that the first challenge in respect of the legislation was successful for the potash companies. The first judgment that came from the courts said that the Government exceeded its power, that a Minister acted contrary to the statute, beyond the scope of the statute and in the result had a judgment against him for illegal intimidation. That was the result of the first action. But that isn't so important as the attitude of the Government that says, don't challenge us in the courts. If you challenge us in the courts we'll have to respond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I give these two examples to demonstrate the point I make that the Government is taking unto itself in a sense, powers that never belonged to it, powers that have throughout our history in this country and throughout British history belonged in the one instance to Parliament and in the second instance to the courts. In other words, the Cabinet in this Bill and in other Bills, is slowly shrinking the power of the Legislature and contracting the power of the courts while amassing for itself a growing and expanding power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I say we are going to have to arrest this trend in this Bill as well as other pieces of legislation that we see come

before us. I urge Members of the Legislature to begin the process of preserving for this institution its power right in this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker, we will be bringing forward a number of amendments, some seeking to curtail the powers the Cabinet has taken for itself, powers we say are rightfully the Legislature's and to provide for an appeal to the courts. We will be bringing forward an amendment to limit the time-frame of this Bill to 18 months or three years, probably 18 months and we will most certainly be advancing an amendment to Section 55(h).

I want to refer relatively briefly to that Section 55(h). Again, and I ask the Government to correct me if I am wrong in this, but once again here is a section which demonstrates an attitude of government which is not satisfactory. It says in effect that this law, these controls of rent increases, the jurisdiction of the rentalsman and the commission shall apply to all the citizens in the province with the exception of one; the one exception is the Government. Again I say what we legislate for others we must assuredly legislate for ourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — What we expect of others, we must be expected to do as well. As I say, I stand to be corrected in respect to that one. That is how I read that section, that the Crown is not bound by the **effective** rent control provisions of this Act. I ask you to bear that in mind. I ask for some explanation from government in that respect. I assure you that we will be bringing forward some amendment in this respect.

May I reiterate again so that there is no misunderstanding. We began in the official Opposition with a genuine willingness to support a rent control system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — As I say, as an extraordinary measure, in an extraordinary period in the fight against inflation. We say there are some serious problems with this Bill, we will be doing what we can to improve it and we will be looking particularly at what we think is, in a sense, an abuse of the power of this Legislature as well as the courts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a couple of words to the debate.

I was interested in the comments made by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and I felt that in some respects if his interpretations are accurate and I do not now dispute that, although I reserve my right to do so in committee, then some of his points are well taken.

I think, with respect to his point of his appeal to the courts, it must be remembered that many people do not view the judicial system in the same way that he or I view the judicial system.

Many people feel that to have an appeal to the court, is effectively to have their rights removed. I found this curious when I was first a Member of this House and I found people coming to me and saying that they were not getting a proper settlement from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. They had a policy, had suffered a loss and felt that the SGIO weren't paying enough. And I said that the policy provided them with the right to sue the Insurance Office if they felt the money wasn't enough. To which they said, "oh, the courts are no good. They are just lawyers and cost and expense. There ought to be a board." I can remember a particular person saying this to me, "There ought to be a board, I ought not to be thrown on the mercy of the courts." And this view, whether the Member for Regina South will admit it or not, is very, very common among the public. They feel that to be required to hire a lawyer, to be required to go into court, is a very heavy burden. And many people are seeking a tribunal before whom they can go and whose procedures they understand. This is the comment I have made to the legal profession before, that either we, (and I now speak as a lawyer) make our procedures understandable, more understandable to the public, and make the procedures more comprehensible to the litigant, or we are going to be left at the post. And we are being left at the post as more and more administrative tribunals are being set up by every government in the western world. But I am digressing with respect to the particular Bill. I concede at least some strength in the point which he raises, and we will be looking to the Bill with a view to introducing a provision which would provide for an appeal to the courts on a matter of law from the commission and presumably also from the rentalsman. But, as I understand it, the rentalsman's decisions are appealable to the commission. We would be prepared to look at that with a good deal of care.

If, as he indicates, the Bill allows the scope of the Act to be added to in a way which is inappropriate, we will examine that since we do not feel that it is necessarily appropriate for Cabinet to be able to add to the scope of the persons who are covered by the Bill in a substantial way.

I think that any provision in an Act which permits the executive Council, or anyone else to define a term, permits that Executive Council to add to the scope of the Bill in a peripheral way, and this of course is very, very common in legislation. However, the courts clearly do not allow the use of that power to add in a substantive way to the Bill.

With respect to the position of allowing the Cabinet to exempt people from the provisions of the Act, we are not prepared to make a change. We believe that there are, or may be, quite a number of classes of accommodation where it is not necessary for the Provincial Government to operate the rent control system. And one would think, and I'm merely speculating now, (and I don't want it to be taken in any other way), speculating that an organization such as Pioneer Village for example, may not require a system of rent control by a provincial government.

MR. STEUART: — Why?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Member opposite asks 'why' and the answer is that it is essentially operated by a non-profit organization and not for the purpose of profit. That they operate on the principle

that their rents cover only costs. Since the Act permits landlords in any case to get rents sufficient to cover their costs, it may well be a duplication of effort to provide a regulation for that particular type of organization. On the other hand, there may well be classes of accommodation which are regulated by other external boards. One thinks of the limited dividend companies of the old variety, such as Gladmer Park in this city where, as I understand the effect of the federal legislation, the rents are effectively limited. That may be wrong; that is my understanding. It may well be that in order to remove regulation where it is not necessary, there ought to be a provision permitting exemption of accommodation. That strikes me as reasonable. It strikes me as such would permit a government to enforce the substance of the Act without necessarily regulating where regulation is not necessary.

On the matter of the duration of the Bill, it is, I think, not reasonable at this time to suggest an 18-month limitation. This will merely generate pent-up pressures for substantial increases in rents 18 months hence. Certainly one would hope that the regulation period will be not over long. I think no government wishes to get into the business of regulating rents. Our Government did not regulate rents until it was urged to do so by a Federal Government, notwithstanding the fact that there were some reasons for regulating rents in this province.

In the last election we campaigned on a program of rent review, because we felt that some action needed to be taken, but that a thorough-going rent control is very difficult to combine with a vigorous construction program. We now have the most vigorous residential construction program in the history of Saskatchewan by a very wide margin, and we wish this to continue so that there will be a great deal of accommodation for the many hundreds of people pouring into this province every month.

With respect to the comment that the Government is suggesting that it get into the business of apartment block construction, clearly this Government has no wish to enter the business of apartment block construction if we can induce apartment block construction by any legitimate means other than under government auspices. I do not regard very substantial subsidies to private entrepreneurs for apartment block construction as a legitimate means. I do suggest that it is legitimate for a provincial government to pay what amounts to a subsidy to an individual in respect of the construction by him of a house for him to live in. You only do it with respect to one unit, and you give a measurable benefit of \$1,000 or perhaps some like sum to one family. But to give a benefit of \$1,000 per unit to a man who is constructing a 50-unit apartment block, obviously raises very serious questions of public policy. I would find it difficult to justify a subsidy of that level to a private entrepreneur at the same level per unit as paid to an individual house owner who builds one unit.

Having said that, we would very much prefer apartment block construction, as indeed private residential construction, to be carried on by people other than the provincial government. We look to co-operative, private and joint ventures, the sort of thing that has been happening with, at least in numerical terms, such spectacular success in the last year or two. If this can be continued it may well be that we can deal with our housing crisis in the only way it can effectively be dealt with and that's to have a modest surplus of accommodation. In the

meantime, some measures must be taken. If wages and salaries are to be limited, clearly the cost of accommodation must be limited in some way.

I make these comments because I respect the views expressed by the Members opposite, latterly the Member for Regina South. I believe this Bill ought not to be the source of a large amount of controversy in this House, on the basic principles. I acknowledge that there are a number of ways to accomplish the ends set out in the Bill and I acknowledge that there may well be legitimate differences of opinion and we are not wedded to every word or every clause in the Bill. We are prepared to consider comments made by Members opposite. I hope I have indicated we are prepared to do so, and I invite all Members to support the second reading of the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, before the Premier takes his seat, would he consider a question or two?

Question number one, Mr. Premier, you mentioned the limitation of the time limit and the potential for pent-up demand on rental increases in 18 months. As I understand it there may be two problems here with the 18-month time frame, one being that it comes up in June 30, 1977, which is in the middle of planting and so on with any calling of the Legislature to be reintroduce it if necessary at that time, and the second is the so-called pent-up demand. Would the Premier not agree that the pent-up demand is going to occur on wages, on professional fees, on anything that is controlled? But the reason for the limitations of the program is to attempt to ensure that the long-term is not full of permanent controls and the second question that I would have is: The Premier mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the Bill somewhere there is mentioned that the property owner can get his costs out of the property and if he could direct my attention to that section of the Bill so that I could study it.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That provision is not in the Bill with clarity since it refers to regulations. My understanding is that some of that at least is to be covered by regulations. I would invite my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Shillington) to comment more fully when he closes the debate on that point.

With respect to the pent-up demand, I concede the point that that is likely to be true in other areas as well. I confess that I am turning back my mind to the last time we had rent controls in this province and how they were removed. They were removed by a process of gradually decontrolling. It was done in the early, early fifties, commencing in 1950 and going on for a period to 1952, 1953 or 1954. I would not anticipate it would take that length of time to decontrol here because we are not dealing with an eight or ten year build-up as was the case during the World War II and the post-war period. There still may be a process of decontrol required; I'm looking into the future. But at that time it was done by permitting landlords and tenants to agree on increases, and a variety of methods of decontrol were arrived at and the process took two or three or four years really. But then, again, I emphasize there was a very great deal of pent-up demand and a serious

housing shortage which was at that time still very much in evidence.

MR. S. J. CAMERON: — Mr. Premier, if I might for clarification, may I say incidentally we are very pleased with some of the assurances that you gave us respecting appeals and restricting some of the powers of the Cabinet. The particular sections I refer to and you may want to make a note of them, are Section 2(b), which gives the Cabinet power to define residential premises; subsection (4) of Section 3, which gives you the power to declare some parts of the Act not applicable, and Section 55(g) which gives Cabinet the power to suspend all or part of the operation of the law. Now those are the three sections and subsections specifically that I refer to in connection with the power of Cabinet and as I say, we are pleased indeed to get your assurance on those.

MR. BLAKENEY: — As I indicated, it is our view that the definition of 'residential tenancy' is fairly wide here because it is meant to cover other aspects of The Residential Tenancies Act, and that it may well be that it would not be necessary to apply the rent control provisions to all tenancies that are covered by The Residential Tenancies Act. I used the possibility of Gladmer as an example, whereby, as I understand it, there is already effective rent control there. I may be misinformed on that point though. So we would not, initially at least, be favorably disposed to eliminating the provisions permitting the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to exempt given premises from the application of the Act. But I think perhaps this can more appropriately be discussed in committee.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, would the Premier permit one further quick question?

If the time-frame of 18 months is bothersome from the standpoint of calling the Legislature into session to obtain once again approval to carry on, would the Government consider a time-frame perhaps of 22 months to enable the Government to overcome the problem of the signing of documents with the Federal Government, while at the same time allowing the legislature once again, the opportunity to introduce controls if necessary at that time?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to the Hon. Member's question is that we would be prepared to give it some consideration. We are still uncertain as to the length of time of the federal program e.g. whether it's going to be 36 or 39 months, or 18 months. And we are uncertain on some other aspects as well. But we will consider it because I think we are conscious of the fact that it is desirable, if in fact controls are not to be of long standing, that this fact be made known so that those who may be thinking of constructing rental accommodations will have our best effort at seeing into the future - and none of us can effectively see into the future - so that they can make their decisions based upon that.

MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in this debate, and I might say I enjoy the tone and the

atmosphere of this debate much more than some of the sessions we have under Bill 1 and Bill 2.

As a rural representative I think I am possibly one of the first people to enter this particular debate. While we do not have many apartment blocks in our rural constituencies, at least in the constituency that I represent, we do have a few and certainly we still have some ideas on rent controls. I suppose our problems in the rural constituencies are to have adequate housing and the type of housing that is available. We are always interested in programs that are aimed at improving this type of housing in our towns and villages within our constituencies.

I'd like to congratulate the Premier on the openness of his remarks and his willingness to accept suggestions.

I should like to begin by saying that to me rent control is really only one aspect of the federal proposal to fight inflation. While there is a danger of what controls will do in the long run, I agree that there is a necessity of having some forms of control at this particular time. I am in agreement with my fellow colleagues in that I feel that the legislation is too permanent and am worried about the effect that it will have on construction in the future. I am even more worried about the lack of an anti-inflation policy in other areas. I am disturbed about the Government's apparent lack of initiative in developing a comprehensive anti-inflation program of its own.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Government is using guidelines when they negotiate with some of their employees. You have quoted the \$2,400 maximum in negotiations with some of your employees and you have exceeded the federal minimum guidelines in proposals that you have presented.

The Government has indicated that you are not satisfied with Ottawa's guidelines. In fact, I believe I heard one of the Members opposite exclaim one day, "What guidelines?" Well, judging from the noise that is emanating from the Canadian Labour Congress and the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, who are government supporters, there sure must be some form of guidelines around.

Other provinces have recognized the need and seem to be much more willing to co-operate than we are here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Certainly if the Government is not satisfied with Ottawa's guidelines they have had the time and certainly they could have constructed their own set of guidelines. I think they owe it to the people of Saskatchewan to set guidelines and to get them out. Right now neither the employer nor the employee really knows where they stand, everybody is guessing. Certainly after two months of time some sort of guidelines or some sort of a statement of policy could be issued by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, as I read through the legislation I realized the comments that I will make are not going to be those of a legal mind, but that of a lay person. I have tried to read

through the Act and understand what I could out of it. There are a few comments I should like to make. Before that I want to spend a few moments on the effect on future investment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this legislation will have an impact on future investment in apartment and in residential premises for the first five years after construction, I am afraid that the number of investors are going to be limited.

An article which appears in the Saturday edition of the Leader-Post, I feel is an indicator of things to come. It indicates the panic that's evident among apartment owners. I would just like to read. The title of the article from Saturday's paper, "Co-op Housing Group Offered Eleven Buildings." It says:

Co-op Housing, a group formed to encourage tenants to form co-op housing groups has been besieged with phone calls.

Ted Sawchuk, Co-op Housing Information Officer, said Friday afternoon, in a half day the group had received calls offering 11 apartment blocks for sale.

And it goes on to state:

There were further calls and people would be coming back later and talking about putting up their apartments for sale.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just seems to me if we already have this panic situation with apartment blocks being put up for sale and people trying to unload them, we certainly are not going to encourage others to build new apartments.

Mr. Speaker, keeping rents at a justifiable level is one problem. But closely correlated is the problem of having adequate housing. I would hope that this legislation is not the first step of the Government getting into the apartment business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — It is my hope that it is not the Government's intention to create a shortage of rental accommodation to justify the movement into the apartment business. I agree that we need adequate housing for the people of Saskatchewan and I only hope that the Government can create the climate necessary to establish the atmosphere that is necessary.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am skeptical of the Government's motives. It seems to me there are already rumblings coming from the Premier's office about the Government becoming involved in apartment construction. And in the past these initial noises have usually been followed by some form of Government action.

In reading the Act I find the office of rentalsman to be a very demanding and powerful position. I would hope that whoever is chosen as the rentalsman and whoever is chosen as his assistants do not have to come from the West Coast, but can be found here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I presume after last week that there will be a number of people from the Minister's offices in B.C. who will be looking for jobs and

probably Saskatchewan will be a likely spot.

Mr. Speaker, administratively the rentalsman's powers are extreme and I wish to describe a few of them. First of all, he has the power to select his staff, to assign their duties. Secondly, he acts as a collection agency. Third, he assumes the role of a banker. Fourth, he assumes the role of an investigative agency. Finally, he must try and operate within the guidelines that are set by the Act. Judicially he has the power to adjust rent upwards or downwards if requested, provide increases for renovations and to decrease the rent if he feels that some service has not or has been withdrawn.

While many of his judicial decisions are subject to a three man commission, if either the landlord or tenant wishes to appeal, the rentalsman no doubt is going to be the key to this entire operation.

Mr. Speaker, some of the problems he is going to be initially faced with are indeed horrendous. I ask you to consider the landlord who purchased a house in 1975 from a previous owner. No doubt his rents, or the rents he is charging are going to be determined by the amount that he paid for that particular apartment. He now is faced with the prospect that the rents will be rolled back to the 1974 level. A level which was entirely unexpected and could place him in extreme financial difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the retroactivity features of this legislation are very unfair. I know the landlord has the right to appeal his case, but he still is going to be at the mercy of the rentalsman and ultimately the commission. I strongly feel that the disadvantages of the retroactivity clause, particularly that portion prior to October 12, far outweigh any advantages to be gained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude my remarks this evening with a comment or two on one of the sections referred to by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron). One of the problems in following somebody down the line is that you often find some of the things you are going to say yourself being presented before.

The section that I should like to refer to is Section 55(h) of the Act. It outlines the portions that are not applicable to the Crown. I quote what Section 55 (h) says:

All provisions of the Act with the exceptions of Sections 34 A, 34 B, 34 C, 34 D, 34 E, 34 F, 43, 49 A and 53 bind the Crown in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In other words there are certain sections that do not bind the Crown. I should like to take a few moments to outline which provisions of the Act do not apply to rental accommodations that are exempted to the Crown. First of all there is Section 34A which would eliminate the base rent concept. Secondly, the requirement for a refund would not be applicable. Thirdly, the eight per cent increase for 1976 would also not be applicable. Finally, the one-year requirement between increases would not apply.

Moving on to Section 34B. Section 34B removes the power of the Commission to specify what increases will be permitted in 1977 and those years beyond. Exemption of Section 34D would seem to indicate that the Government could reduce services or facilities without a reduction in rent.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a complete list of the areas in which the Government exemption to the guidelines has been removed. I believe the list does though establish the fact that government residential properties leased to tenants are not bound by the guidelines. I should like to ask the Minister in charge a question. I understand that certain properties of the Government, particularly in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, are leased to some of the employees. For these employees, does this mean that their rents and the rents that have been charged to them do not fall under the guidelines? Has the Government got the right to raise and to determine these rents at their own particular will?

If you are talking about some of the boards that are appointed by the Crown - the Premier, made mention of this tonight, the question in the case of some of the senior citizens' homes is do they or don't they apply in these. Certainly the Crown has a degree of influence in selecting the Board. My question is: in the case of these does the Government expect the guidelines will apply? Do they apply for their own civil servants, the people who are renting properties for them, do they apply for these low rental housing projects?

Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments I should like to make later. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

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

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, when 9:30 was called, I had at the outset given an outline of what my comments would be about Bill 2. Basically the concerns that we have is the track record of the Government opposite on political involvement in Crown corporations. I had referred to a paper having been delivered by the now Premier where he endorsed political involvement in the administration of Crown corporations. I had indicated the disadvantages of political control of Crown corporations and the tremendous risk, of course, that he is placing upon the people of Saskatchewan. In particular, because of the size of the venture. I outlined, although not in detail, our concerns of the organizational problems and indicated to the House that the Government opposite had ample opportunity to discover organizational problems to see what problems do exist in nationalized industries in England. I will go into those organizational problems in some detail tonight.

Other concerns are the financial aspects of the proposed venture and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the fact that it is an enterprise of at least \$1 billion. I say at least \$1 billion. The economic interdependence of such an enterprise in the economic development of the Province of

Saskatchewan will be tremendous. The resulting interdependence of course, makes this an even greater gamble than the Government opposite would have us believe, or would have the people believe, through the Dunsky advertising campaign or Struthers or whichever one it may be.

We also set out the fact that we believe as the official Opposition that we have a right, the people have a right, and parliament has a right to vote supplies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — A right which has been denied and which is being denied by the Government opposite.

I should like to turn to some of the organizational problems with nationalized industries. The Government opposite may feel that it is a nice simple exercise to nationalize a competitive industry. I will show that attempts made in Great Britain have failed, that approximately 20 years existed between the time of nationalization of the coal industry and the administrative and organizational structure existing which operates the nationalized industry today. In that time there were at least two major organizational shake-ups because attempts to establish an organizational structure failed and they failed because of the lack of capability in the Government and the fact that individuals were used who were simply not qualified. I want to refer as I said to a paper which I referred to the other day prepared by the British Information Services on Nationalized Industries in Britain, under the heading "Problems and Prospects". I should like to read into the record, some of the known and stated concerns set out in this pamphlet and I should like Hon. Members to keep in mind that when concerns are expressed notwithstanding that it is a government publication and they are trying to paint a healthy glow on a situation that I submit they have failed to do so. It starts out at page 33:

The history of the nationalized industries in Britain has not been one of uninterrupted success and universal acclaim. Some reasons are outlined below together with the steps being taken to improve matters and prospects for the future as at present envisaged. Criticism has been directed for example at failures by some of the corporations to pay their way commercially. Problems of adjustment to technological and social change, instances of labor difficulties, failures to satisfy consumers.

These four areas are to some extent interconnected and to continue the quote:

A further associated question is one of the general structure of the corporations and the co-ordination between them.

Now I should like to go back over the four main criticisms of nationalized industries in Britain. First of all the failures of corporations to pay their way. We have obvious examples in Saskatchewan. We have the admitted failure of SGIO to pay its own way to such an extent that the Government has had to subsidize SGIO through the gasoline tax. And, of course, we can no

longer have an efficient organization when subsidies commence to exist because we are ignoring a simple measure of efficiency and effectiveness, and that is the question of profit and loss.

If the same thing should happen to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan then of course this Legislature by endorsing this legislation is asking future generations of Saskatchewan to pay for the follies and failures of this Legislature and in particular the Government opposite.

What are the chances of the potash corporation failing to pay its own way? First of all we have to take into account that it has been well documented and the Government has the information that there are other readily accessible potash reserves. I refer in particular to New Brunswick which are closer to ports for delivery. Once we have companies starting to look at other reserves the decision is strictly going to be economic. And as long as it is to their economic advantage to use the other reserves, they will certainly do so. Saskatchewan by reason of location, and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in particular will not be able to compete with reserves if they are developed in New Brunswick.

We have the other obvious possibility. Russia has sold one million tons to the United States. There is little doubt, I think, in anyone's mind that strong efforts are being made by the United States and Russia to expand economic ties. There is no doubt that if it is to be the economic advantage of the Soviet Union to sell potash to the United States, that that decision will be made and of course if that decision is made, Saskatchewan again is left holding the bag. The people of Saskatchewan are left holding the bag because we will now basically own the potash industry of Saskatchewan.

The second point and the second major criticism of British nationalization industries is the problem of adjustment to technological and social change. I think that if any Hon. Member would peruse the recent annual report, say of Sask Tel, and it matters not which one is used, that the new technology for communications is not being developed by Sask Tel. All or a vast majority of our new technology in the field of communications is coming from the big bad multinational corporations who lease their patents, their rights to Sask Tel. I think that every member would also agree that if we had to rely on the innovative technology of Sask Tel that we would be still talking with two tin cans only the string would be quite a bit longer. I think that in all fairness the Members will have to accept that criticism and I am not critical of Sask Tel when I say that. I don't think it is within our capabilities as a province to embark on a major technological development program in the communications industry. We will of course be required to take such steps if we nationalize the potash industry through a Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation.

The financial cost of such innovative technological requirements is something again that I think every Member will agree is beyond the capabilities of the Province of Saskatchewan, strictly on a cost factor if nothing else. And that new technology in the potash industry will continue to be developed by the existing potash and mining corporations. If the potash and mining corporations should use the moneys that the Government opposite is purporting to be prepared to spend to develop

reserves elsewhere there is no reason why they would supply their newly developed technology to the Government of Saskatchewan that nationalized them and perhaps even forced them into contracts where they do not get in fact fair market value. I think it is quite clear that what the Government opposite will be doing and what the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will be doing is simply taking over an existing industry without taking into account the tremendous capital demands for new technology which will be required to keep that industry competitive and the industry will become relatively obsolete in an extremely short period of time relative to the mining companies as they move their developments elsewhere.

We take a look at the other major criticism and these are instances of labor difficulties and failures to satisfy consumers. I don't think that by and large there can be criticism of Crown corporations in Saskatchewan with the matter of satisfying the consumers, I think that there can be some very serious criticism with regard to labor difficulties. I think that most Members are well aware of the problems that existed in particular with Sask Tel last winter when union negotiators bargained in good faith with the Government when the Government Minister responsible for the Crown corporation had an understanding with the union negotiating team that an agreement was acceptable. The Minister took that agreement back to his Cabinet colleagues who were prepared to accept the same but Cabinet colleagues raised the agreement with the caucus members opposite who rejected it for partisan political gain and forced the Legislature to come back for an emergency debate to force the workers back to work, demanding, of course the question of free negotiations and destroyed the collective bargaining process with regard to that particular Crown corporation by throwing it strictly into the partisan, political arena of the caucus of the party in power.

I think too that we can take with regard to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation the labor difficulties and the attempts the Government made, in this case, to satisfy them by giving wage settlements at the organized union level and restraining them at the middle management level, which has put a severe strain within the morale of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and has caused many senior management personnel to leave the province because they were not being adequately compensated. That the position is such that people without managerial responsibilities even in Sask Tel are being paid more than the ones who are taking the managerial risks and this, too, has severely injured morale in both these corporations. Any indication in Saskatchewan that there is a happy labor-management environment in some of the Crown corporations are really turning a blind eye to the problem. The morale problems in SGIO with the political appointments again has been documented in the Legislature has been a matter of concern to management in SGIO. The Hon. Member for Shellbrook shakes his empty head. Make no mistake that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Empty like yours, Gary.

MR. LANE: — That's only further proof of just how empty it is. I think that the management morale problems in SGIO are self-evident and have been made clear to Members of the Treasury Benches opposite.

I then related the major criticism of concern with

nationalized industries in England to some examples that have existed in Saskatchewan with other Crown corporations. Again the track record is such that I don't think we could expect anything less with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I did mention the financial problems that existed and I used the phrase, "financial legerdemain". I can't think of a better word or phrase when we refer to such things as "made", "net", "deficits", a totally political phrase and not a justifiable accounting phrase.

Working deficits again is a political phrase and not a private sector accounting phrase. We have situations which have become very common in England, where for example BOAC's capital structure was reorganized when borrowings of 176 million pounds were extinguished. Now again I don't think that anyone would accept that as being anything less than a political decision necessitated by bad management by improperly structured and probably an improperly run Crown corporation. It seems that this great history has documented, the other night, in England, bailing out periodically the nationalized industries by simply extinguishing the debt and then they would start over again. It becomes a periodic process in England whereby they work themselves into a hole, they get a great big debt that they can no longer even finance through revenue to pay the interest and they simply extinguish the debt and start all over again. If that type of thinking were to prevail in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan then obviously the population base and probably the economic base in the Province of Saskatchewan extinguish debts and maintain the operation of the corporation.

If I can revert to the study on Nationalized Industries in great Britain I should like to read into the record some of what has been called fuzzy-headed thinking that exists with regard to nationalized industry. Somehow people involved in nationalized industries feel that they can take the industry and look at it as a corporation sold, for want of a better word, without looking at the ramifications of nationalization and all the other factors that can apply. I will give a few examples, Mr. Speaker, if I may as to this type of thinking that prevailed in England about their nationalized industries and soon failed to realize from obvious other factors the problems that ensued. They have an awful lot of problems with the British rail system, it simply continues to lose money. Now the proponents of nationalization of the British rail system assumed that they could have an efficient working and viable rail system but it didn't work out that way. One of the reasons was they forgot a very simple fact and I'll read this into the record.

In the last century and even more in the last few decades, private road transport in the form of private cars and commercial vehicles is increasingly taking over traffic formerly carried by rail or canal or by road and public service vehicle, this involved loss of fare paying passengers and delays in public services because of traffic.

Now here they nationalized an industry in Great Britain, and didn't even take into account the growth of private vehicle transportation. Again, it is that type of thinking that prevails in people who insist on nationalizing competitive industries. I think, too, that the same thinking applies with regard to nationalization of the potash industry. If we go back to the Attorney General's second reading speech where he gives us an

assurance that markets are adequate and then he says that we have to raid the offices to get information because we really don't know. I think that the Government opposite is making exactly the same mistake as the proponents of nationalizing in England have made, and that is that the Government is taking a very narrow view of nationalization and you are not taking into account the extraneous factors such as markets, other resources, other reserves and the possibility of the international political scene as it applies in particular between Russia and the United States of America.

Another factor that wasn't taken into account when they talked about nationalizing the British Rail System was improved road communication, notably the motorways that have attracted transport from older systems and air services that have drawn away many passengers and some types of freight. Now an obvious situation that was bound to happen, something that anybody with the least iota of common sense could have taken into account and could have foreseen. But it was not taken into account in Great Britain and is now used as one of the excuses for the failure of the system that does now exist.

They talk about nationalization of the coal industry in Britain.

Developments in fuel and power and new sources of energy, new methods of gas manufacture, North Sea oil, electricity from nuclear power stations, as examples, have had their repercussions especially on coal requirements. The fall in demand for coal has run parallel to the working out of easier seams and also greater use of mechanized methods of extraction. Meanwhile demands for energy for both industry and domestic consumers have been rising and the introduction of new household devices and the clean air regulations has put a premium on gas and electricity rather than coal.

Obvious circumstances that anybody with any common sense could have figured out. A situation that they knew existed, they just simply ignored these considerations when the decision to nationalize was made. Again I think this idea of just looking at the industry itself and not the total area, the total ramifications of the fact of nationalization which will undoubtedly lead to failure of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the burden it is going to place on taxpayers of this province and future generations.

There are other examples of situations that exist in Great Britain of just plain stupid, basically political decisions that have led to some of the most inefficient, ineffective nationalized industries anywhere which are a tremendous drain on the economic life of Great Britain to such an extent that it is certainly one of the major factors in its economic troubles of today.

I think, too, that some comments are necessary with regard to the labor situation in Great Britain as it applies to Crown corporations and I am keeping in mind the now Premier's remarks in the previously referred to speech where he indicated that in Saskatchewan labor has shown a desire to not become involved in the management of the Crown corporations. In England, of course, this is not the way, although we are, I think, seeing a move on the part of anyone who opposes the idea of worker involvement in management that this will undoubtedly be the norm

in Saskatchewan in the not too distant future. Rightly or wrongly it will persist. Problems have resulted in Great Britain because of this. I'll refer to some of those problems, Mr. Speaker.

As labor has been partially eliminated from the coal mines and railways and productivity increased, employees have demanded fair terms for those displaced in the interests of progress and better rewards for more productivity. They have also suffered from anxiety, loss of morale . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Is it a filibuster, Gary?

MR. LANE: — No. Obviously the Government is making this decision without adequate forethought and perhaps the Opposition has a duty to start giving some of the concerns back to the Government. The Government that could rush into a decision to nationalize the potash industry on three or four months' thought deserves every bit of advice and information that the Opposition can give it and the Government would be well advised to listen, instead of carping and refusing to participate in the debate itself. I can't hear you, Roy. I'm satisfied, Mr. Attorney General, that the only way we are going to get the Government's position is for some of the Opposition Members to stand on their feet and let the Government Members make their comments across the floor because obviously they are not going to stand up and participate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — And I would hope that the press would pay special attention to the comments of the Attorney General and some of the Treasury Benches because that is the only way they are going to find out what this debate is all about. The Government's side of the case is for the press to listen to their comments across the floor but the press certainly won't get it in any prepared speeches or any speeches by Members opposite standing up and participating in the debate.

MR. SKOBERG: — Let's get back to the coal mines.

MR. LANE: — Now we are going back to the coal mines, thank you. I want to talk a little bit about loss of morale in the coal mines. I have been requested by some of the Members opposite to repeat what I have just said. Obviously they did not understand.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . don't understand.

MR. LANE: — Yes, he just said that he did not understand the problems in the coal industry in Great Britain. I would have thought the Hon. Member would have well researched the nationalized industries in Great Britain before he even approached the door of this Assembly to have the Government place this Bill before the people of this province.

Before I was so rudely interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that labor has been reduced in the coal mines and the railways and productivity increased and the employees have demanded fair terms for those displaced in the interests of

progress and better rewards for more productivity. They have also suffered from anxiety, loss of morale and temptations to working practices which would conserve jobs and distinction between skills and danger is being eroded. I think this is of vital concern to Members opposite as they embark on the nationalization through a Crown corporation for them to look at what happened when nationalization took place in England. Obviously labor was very dissatisfied with being involved in a nationalized industry. And to repeat for Members opposite some of the effects of this dissatisfaction.

Temptation of working practices which would conserve jobs, and I submit to the Hon. Members opposite that this is a vital concern that we embark on a nationalization of an industry in a highly competitive industry. But one thing that we cannot allow is to sacrifice technological innovations and not remain competitive and I have already documented the concerns of political involvement because it will be politically unpopular for the Government to close out obsolete positions and it will be politically unpopular for the Government to lay off employees in areas which would be necessary for the efficiency of operations.

The other activity of course which took place was that distinctions between skills and the danger of their being eroded. Obviously I have already documented what happened at Sask Power with the pressures on middle management who are no longer getting the economic return for the risk position that they are put in, the managerial risk position. That it is considerably better in Sask Power to avoid any management position because you can make as much money without taking the managerial risk in those areas.

These factors help to explain the labor difficulties (including absenteeism among miners, strikes or go-slows by train drivers and airline pilots) which from time to time have harassed the corporation despite the statutory provisions intended to foster good labor relations. We've obviously got the same thing on the national level with regard to the Post Office. This is the same as a nationalized industry which certainly has not worked. I think by and large for the benefit of the people in this province or if it has worked by and large for their benefit, it is not the most efficient and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I could on for some considerable period of time with regard to particular industries and I think I will do that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . because the Members opposite show a total ignorance with regard to problems that have existed elsewhere and seemingly have blinded themselves to precedents which would be of benefit to them when they make the political decision to nationalize the potash industry.

Now one of the other areas I raised about problems in Great Britain was the matter of failing to satisfy consumer demands. In Great Britain, although I have prefaced my comments by saying that in Saskatchewan the supply of consumer demands has certainly not been any problem. Whether the same situation with a Crown corporation in a competitive industry as opposed to merely being a public utility, is valid or not I am certainly

December 15, 1975

not sure and for those reasons I think it would be incumbent upon myself to show to the Members opposite some of the problems that did exist in Great Britain.

Most of the deficiencies from time to time experienced by consumers can be traced ultimately to one of the foregoing factors. Defects such as trains running late because of go-slows.

Which was the slow-down I have referred to earlier,

Services taken off because unremunerative, power cuts when demand has outrun supply because construction of equipment was limited by restricting investment in earlier years. To some extent, however, consumer complaints of rigidity in administering the services and inadequate co-operation between them relate to the further question of organization with and between different industries.

I think that the statement of slow-downs because of restricted investment, I certainly wonder whether the Government opposite in a decision to nationalize has taken into consideration the need for future investment to maintain equipment, maintain operations, maintain research and maintain the technological changes which will be required. And again I should like to take this opportunity to urge the Government Members to give an assurance to the people of this province that they have taken into account these potential capital needs of the future and will supply the studies which set out those potential capital needs, probably capital needs and will table those studies before the Legislature of this province and I would strongly suspect that the Government, if it has taken all reasonable factors into account when it made its decision to nationalize, will have those studies available and could make them available to the people of Saskatchewan within the next few days.

But there have been organizational problems as well. We have already started out with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and no problems have existed. People have quit, senior personnel have quit because they disagree with the Government's decision. People have been put into the management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan with little or no experience in the potash industry and I think it would be fair to say, not being critical personally of the individuals, I think it would be fair to say that organizational problems are going to exist in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for many years to come because of the bad government decision to appoint people to positions of organizations and control in the potash corporation that have little or no experience in the potash industry.

Now reverting back to problems that existed in Great Britain.

Organization with some of the industries have fluctuated over the years, the shift between broadly based directions and small policy-making bodies governing separate executive groups, shifts between centralized control and degrees of delegation to regions, abolition or perpetuation of pre-nationalization, geographical or functional boundaries.

Obviously it's going to be a concern here, as we have already begun to see the political dispute as to where the office

is going to be located. The head office of the corporation . . . I think there is some conflict. Some Members want it in Moose Jaw, some want it . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you think Saskatoon will get the head office?

MR. LANE: — . . . oh, I'm sorry. I don't think that the remarks made by the Attorney General in first reading were really worthy of comment, and didn't contribute too much to the debate other than to get the Bill before the Legislature. I am sure that even John Burton was a little embarrassed by that particular speech. It certainly was not one of his better ones and even the Attorney General fell down with his speech No. 47 dealing with the Opposition being opposed to Crown corporations. We really wish that 47 had been taken as read, but I suppose the Attorney General can be forgiven because there were some new Members who had not yet heard it. Very few, but there were probably a few.

So there were concerns and there were problems with geographical decentralization of various industries in Great Britain. We are going to have, as I say, I predict the same problems in Saskatchewan with the dispute starting already as to the head office. If the mines cannot be developed equally or cannot maintain production equally, are we going to be prepared in the future to make the political decision of being able to say 'close the mine down, it is less efficient in Belle Plaine than the one in Esterhazy'. That is a decision that the people involved in nationalization must be prepared to make. I submit again, based on the political record of the Government opposite, that what in fact would happen is that the inefficient mine would be subsidized and propped up and maintained because of the political ramifications and proper management decisions would be out the window.

Other governments in Great Britain though did attempt to make changes in the structure they found and this is personally a very frightening thought because in four years or three years there will be a Liberal Government which will be saddled with this particular problem . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — . . . and successive governments in Great Britain after a change that didn't agree with the philosophy or the direction of nationalized industries found that they were stuck with these things anyway and so they attempted to bail out to the best of their abilities and no matter what they did unfortunately England is still in the mess that it has been in for some considerable period of time.

Successive governments have sought (and again I'm referring to England) to review sectors in nationalized industry as a whole to decide on their best future development. In fuel and power opinion has fluctuated between regarding commercial competition of the fuel and power corporations, as most helpful to consumer interests, the "competitive" approach and regarding them as parts of a whole the end purpose of which might require subordination of the individual preferences and

convenience of the corporations involved.

In the last few years a new consideration has come to the fore, the management of the changeover from reliance on two fuels, mainly coal supported by oil, to exploitation of several.

In transport, co-ordination was a major aim in the arrangements made by The Transport Act, 1948, reflected in the formation of the British Transport Commission, with duties over a wide range of means of transport.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I should like to express disappointment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the rapt attention so displayed by Members in the official Opposition is not displayed by Government Members on the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Now there was a problem as stated about regarding commercial competition of the fuel and power corporations as to which was most helpful to consumer interest.

We have already asked and the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) has stated that the Government opposite has a duty, or that there is a great problem (I think he tried to attribute the blame to the Federal Government) to deal with the starving millions throughout the world. Are we now going to be faced with the results of the nationalization of the potash industry that it will now become a matter of public debate in the Province of Saskatchewan that the Government subsidize a nationalized industry to supply potash to the countries in need of the same and are we now bringing that debate down to the level of the people of Saskatchewan, and are we by reason of nationalization putting ourselves in the position where we are going to have to make a decision, a political decision, which is really one that should not be in the provincial jurisdiction, but certainly one in the federal jurisdiction? I think that that's a matter of concern to all of Saskatchewan's citizens. One of the many concerns that arises over the nationalization of the potash industry and the establishment of a Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I should like to revert, because I have the feeling that my previous authority has not met with the acceptance of the Members opposite, and there are only about two of them taking notes about the problems of nationalization. Fortunately one of them is the Member for Regina Victoria (Mr. Baker) but I think that more should read the precedents and the problems that existed in Great Britain before they embark on this great risk to the people of Saskatchewan.

I should now like to refer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the book "Nationalization in British Industry". It's one of a series dealing with studies in British industry. The general editor being Sylvia Trench, M.A., of Oxford. This particular one is by one L. J. Tivey, lecturer in public administration at the University of Birmingham, England.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is that Alabama?

MR. LANE: — No, I think that I have already mentioned that it was Birmingham, England, and people in Alabama seem to have a few more brains than people elsewhere because they don't have the problem of nationalized industries. They have successfully avoided the problem and they have used a more logical reasonable approach of allowing the private sector to develop and then taxing them for the benefits of all citizens taxing them to the maximum.

But I should like to quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from this very important and authoritative book on, Nationalization in the British Industry. I'm quoting at page 89:

Controversy about nationalization, even heated controversy, has not been confined to the principle itself. The methods, supervision and objectives of the nationalized industry have been subjected to vigorous criticism.

In this chapter and the two that follow some of the main areas of controversy will be explored. So far this book has been concerned with the facts, historical and structural of nationalization that exist.

The first set of problems to be examined are organization. These are practical matters on which the lines of dispute are not often partisan in the political sense - although the opinions expressed are not less vehement for that reason. The principle of nationalization as distinct from municipalities or selective public ownership, has carried with it the notion of unification on a country-wide . . .

I'm sorry, perhaps we do have a speech from the Member's opposite as to what their position is in this, and would he identify himself because I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan would like to know who the Member opposite was who did speak on the potash debate. Just for public records. We could be playing 37 or 38 questions to guess who is the one that is saddled with the job of trying to justify this position to the people of Saskatchewan and the Legislature instead of relying on Dunskey and Struthers propaganda to take the debate to the people of this province.

I'll repeat for the Member opposite . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — I'm not really interested.

MR. LANE: — Well you should be interested. And I'm disappointed that you take this attitude when you are prepared to gamble a billion dollars of the people of Saskatchewan's money, and you are not even interested and you're not even prepared to stand up in this debate and participate in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I think it is unbelievably poor government that Members opposite would be shouting from their seats instead of standing up and giving prepared statements, be prepared to give to the

people of Saskatchewan the information that we have requested and to be able to give to the people of Saskatchewan their true personal stand on this nationalization of the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Oh! I don't think that that Member has the courage to identify himself. I repeat.

The principle of nationalization as distinct from municipalities or selective public ownership, had carried with it the notion of unification on a country-wide scale. Usually a single general organization has been set up for each industry. Since the industries are major ones the size of each organization tends to be very large.

Oh! He asked for me to repeat what I have just said. I am sorry the Hon. Member is leaving. I'll save it for this return.

Two of the nationalized industries, nationalized undertakings, coal mining and the railways are much larger than any other industrial enterprise in Great Britain. The National Coal Board employed about 605,000 people in 1963; the British Railways 460,000; at its peak in the early 1950s the British Transport Commission had nearly 1,000,000 employees. The other main industries are smaller than these, but still of considerable magnitude by any industrial standards.

The electricity industry at 210,000 employees in 1960, and gas employed 123,000, large operational units included the Central Electricity Generating Board and several other boards.

I won't bother the Members with the statistics as to the number of employees, but let me assure them that it was substantial. Now there are obvious organization problems in Great Britain and I am passing over an awful lot of this, I hope the Hon. Members won't mind. I know they took notes and can refer to it on their own. I will just skip various parts of the article. I won't read it all for the Members opposite.

Two channels of intellectual enquiry were available for examining the problems of organization in nationalized industries. The study of public administration and that of industrial management. These had traditionally been kept apart. It cannot be said that anything approaching unification has been achieved in face of common problems. Clearly each approach has valuable contributions to make.

The study of public administration, some understanding of the concepts of responsibility, accountability and political policy making had been achieved by 1945. From industrial management, ideas about the authority of boards, decentralization and standard tests of performance were obtained.

Obviously the two areas have to be kept in mind when we are dealing with the matter of the nationalization of the potash industry and the form and structure of that nationalization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We have the . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Are you reading from Grimm's Fairy Tales?

MR. LANE: — I am sorry, perhaps the Hon. Member is ready to give a speech. No, I am trying to give you something to think about, not something you can understand. I thought perhaps it would even be something new for the Member, not something that he reads on a pretty regular basis.

I think that the matter of public administration and that of industrial management particularly industrial management, is an area that has been totally lacking by indications from the Government opposite, about its first steps on nationalization of the industry.

We take a look at the matter of concepts of responsibility and accountability and policy making in the field of public administration, all of those problems have been well documented for the Members opposite. Seemingly they, and regrettably the concepts of responsibility, accountability and political policy making have been ignored by the Government opposite. The only thing that has been brought to the forefront is the matter of political policy making, policy making which has been done without giving the people of Saskatchewan the necessary information that they have requested, which includes that extremely dangerous practice of political involvement in the administration, the actual day to day administration of Crown corporations.

I think that when one gets into the matter of organization, Mr. Speaker, that - I apologize, it may begin to get a little tedious for Members opposite - I would hope they would bear with me. They had great problems in England with regard to organization in nationalized industries. Although it may be somewhat esoteric for the Members opposite, in fact the organizational problems were one of the major detriments for want of a better word in the operation of Crown or nationalized industries in Great Britain.

I think because it would be in order to have some Opposition input into this particular project of the Government opposite that I gave some consideration and some of the thoughts of this particular writer, L. J. Tivey of Great Britain. He starts with a basic overview and what is implicit in the concept of the public corporation is that:

There should be a board or council of some sort in charge of affairs within the organization. This body has full authority and its composition is clearly crucial for the success of the whole enterprise.

I state that very pointedly to the Members opposite because, and I think the Premier is well aware, that the composition of the board is crucial to the success of the enterprise. Look what happened with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, already senior personnel have quit. We have had to go to people with, as I say, little or no experience to put them in charge of the operation. It is well documented in Great Britain that it is crucial to the success of the enterprise that the organization be competent and it be experienced and that it be of such management capabilities that it can manage a competitive enterprise in an area of international markets and an industry with a high degree of technological change. Obviously we are off to a bad start in Saskatchewan with the activities and events

that have happened with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to date and the Bill has not even passed the House.

There are two areas we can have the representative board and that basically is more subject, and I think the Premier would agree, is more subject to political control. Then we have an area which allows more independence of management without outside connections or responsibilities. I think again, based on the Premier's previous statements and the track record of the Government opposite that the management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will not be independent and will in fact be subject to the political controls of the Government opposite.

There are certain variations.

I should like to refer to the rejection of the representative board of the Port of London Authority . . .

Interrupted by Speaker.

MR. ROMANOW: — I believe on Friday at the time of the early adjournment, the Premier mentioned an agreement as between the Party Leaders, to make up some of the time. I am wondering if the Opposition would agree to making up at least a half an hour of that time. For tonight, I suggest that at great risk, but if we could perhaps make up some of that lost time, and work in another half hour. Would the Opposition agree to this?

MR. MALONE: — No, we wouldn't, Mr. Speaker, first of all it is Private Members' day and that time was lost, we might consider it at another Private Members' day to make up the time. Secondly, the Attorney General has given notice of a certain motion that he intends on moving Wednesday next that will add considerable time to the debate. I think that will more than make up for the time we lost on Friday.

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