

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Eighteenth Legislature
24th Day

Wednesday, December 17, 1975.

The Assembly met at 3:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

WILL LUMBER MARKET BE IMPAIRED BECAUSE OF POTASH NATIONALIZATION

MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question - I was going to direct it to the Hon. Mr. Messer, but I notice he is not here, the Hon. Mr. Bowerman isn't here, as a matter of fact there aren't very many Cabinet Ministers here, but I shall direct it to the Attorney General.

I have reason to believe, and I can't disclose my source, but I wonder if the Attorney General could confirm that there is a concern in the Saskatchewan lumber industry that the Government's nationalization of the potash industry is likely to impair, and seriously impair our lumber market which is largely American?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, and that of the Government's, we've not received any such notification of any such concern. Nor to the best of my knowledge, again I must confess that I am not as familiar on this on a day-to-day basis as perhaps I should be, nor do we perceive of any such difficulty. In any event, if such difficulty were to arise there is no indication that it would be as a consequence of any action taken, or about to be taken, in the area of potash.

MR. PENNER: — By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I recognize the Attorney General may be at a bit of disadvantage here. But I wonder if in view of recent diplomatic concerns expressed in Washington and in Ottawa by the departing American Ambassador and the recent change in government in British Columbia, has the Attorney General heard or is he aware of any concern from any one in the industry that Saskatchewan markets may be impaired because of your proposed action with the potash industry?

MR. ROMANOW: — No, I'm not familiar with that. And as far as I know the Government is not aware of any such situation. I don't want to go quite as far as labelling that type of rumor as being unfounded, but it would come about as close I suppose to labelling it unfounded as I have by way of knowledge. The Premier has indicated to earlier questions and in his answers that it is not a provincial government's business to be involved

in international relations but certainly I think I can make this comment that very recent statements from authorities and officials at a much higher level than myself have indicated that there has been no serious impairment of US-Canadian relationships. And certainly not as any direct consequence of anything that the Government may or may not be contemplating to do in the potash area.

MR. PENNER: — By way of a second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Because I have information that the industry could in fact be in considerable difficulty within a 90-day period could I ask whether or not your Government is prepared to make inquiries and forestall any possible loss or damage to our lumber industry?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will appreciate how difficult it is for me or for anybody from the Government to respond to that type of question. Because the Hon. Member says that he has information that there might be some difficulty. All I can say is that certainly - I stand to be corrected on a day-to-day basis - but certainly there has been no such communication of those difficulties to the duly elected Government and the appropriate Ministers. If such communications are received or if indeed they have been received as a result of the last two or three days or so, the Government will give as much attention to trying to overcome that as is possible. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, it doesn't help the Government, the lumber industry or for that matter the House very much to act on information which the Hon. Member apparently has, but is not prepared to divulge, and which apparently the Government does not have. So to simply answer your question, when and if we get that type of a plea, or we thought that type of a difficulty, I am sure that the Ministers of the Crown responsible will do all that they can to make sure that no permanent or serious damage occurs.

IS HIGHWAY SPEED LIMIT TO BE REDUCED TO 55.

MR. D. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, is this Government planning to reduce the speed limit on Saskatchewan highways to 55 miles per hour? Would the real Minister Responsible for the highways please answer this question.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, any change in the policy of the Government with respect to highway speed limits will be announced in due course. It will be announced by the Government. May I say in passing that I think there is nothing inappropriate for two or three Ministers of the Crown to express opinions on a subject of public importance as long as they do not each of them purport to be stating settled government policy. I think the matter of the highway speed limit is a matter for appropriate public discussion. I think it is in no sense inappropriate for Ministers of the Crown to comment thereon and at least in our Government, Ministers of the Crown occasionally have different views.

**IS MEMBER FOR REGINA CENTRE TO BE APPOINTED TO MEDIATION BOARD RE
RENT CONTROL**

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I had wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operatives (Mr. Shillington) but in his absence I shall direct my question either to the Premier or the Attorney General.

I should like to know if the Hon. Member for Regina Centre has, or is going to be appointed to the mediation board, involving differences between landlords and tenants?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I am not quite sure whether I understood the question. Did I understand the Hon. Member to ask whether or not the MLA for Regina Centre and the Minister of Co-operation was going to be appointed to a board, either the mediation board or rentalsman. The answer to that is, No.

SNOWMOBILE LEGISLATION

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General.

In light of the confusion and the mounting opposition to the snowmobile legislation, we should like to renew our demand to have this legislation withdrawn. Is the Attorney General at this time prepared to advise the House and the people of Saskatchewan that that legislation will be withdrawn?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to make that statement today. As I indicated in earlier questions directed to me by my learned friend for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) we are taking into consideration the representations being made not only by Members opposite but by others.

I would simply want to reiterate again for the Legislature that the withdrawal of the legislation is not free of difficulty, mainly because what the purported legislation tries to do is to cut down on what has been up to now the traditional responsibility of the farmer, or what might be the traditional responsibility of the farmers in the case of a snowmobile trespasser and damage to that snowmobile. To withdraw the legislation might very well mean that the farmers of Saskatchewan have an exposed risk, an increased risk over and above what they might have had prior to the Vienot versus Kerr Addison case which I had mentioned before. What we sought to do was to limit what we thought was negative aspects of that Kerr Addison - Vienot case by this amendment and restore the liability of relationships to what they were prior to this common law decision. If we withdraw it this could be very difficult.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Attorney General is getting into the debate which is possibly reciprocated on the other side of the House. I think the Attorney General had answered the question at the beginning but there is a danger that we may get into a debate on the Bill now.

MR. WIEBE: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and I am sure the Attorney General is aware, are now supporting our position that the Bill be withdrawn, and I would ask that the Attorney General give serious consideration to this and that it be withdrawn prior to the Christmas recess to enable many of us who will be going home to our constituencies to assure our constituents that the Bill has been withdrawn. And might I as well suggest for the consideration of the Attorney General that this Bill be put before the Standing Agricultural Committee of this Legislature and we have an opportunity to study that legislation and in turn come back with recommendations that are acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan shortly after the New Year.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again, without trying to answer in a debating manner, I believe that the first call for a withdrawal came only yesterday from the Members opposite. The position of the SFA certainly was formulated before yesterday. I am not sure whether the SFA is following the Liberal party or vice a versa, that doesn't matter particularly, other than the fact that the Government has to consider whether or not we want to withdraw legislation which, as I have said the effect of which will be to add far greater legal risks on the farmers than they have up to now. If I might say so, I thought there was a pretty good story in the Regina Leader-Post a day or so ago, explaining in layman's language what the laws have been and what we seek to do by this amendment. I think if the SFA and other farming people get to know and understand that position there may not be such a clarion call in some quarters for the withdrawal. So to answer the question, we are considering the question of withdrawal, we are considering the question of referring it to a committee and an appropriate announcement will be made in due course.

MR. WIEBE: — A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then give us the assurance today that his announcement as to the withdrawal could be given prior to the Christmas recess.

MR. ROMANOW: — I can give the assurance that the moment that the Government decides what to do with the legislation and all of the consequences on farming people, which I think could hurt a lot of the farming people, once we make that decision, we will announce it as soon as possible through the Legislature. It may be before the Christmas break. It may not. A lot depends on when the Legislature recesses.

GOVERNMENT POLICY RE POTASH HEADQUARTERS IN SASKATOON

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day. I realize there have been four questions asked but since there were no supplementaries to two of them could I beg the indulgence of the House to ask a brief question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Is the Member attempting to ask a supplementary

question about the speed limit, or about the landlord-tenant question that was placed by the Member?

MR. COLLVER: — It is a separate question, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if I could beg leave to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I am in the hands of the House. We have had four questions. One more.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Premier. During the question period yesterday the Attorney General outlined an answer pertaining to government policy, I would ask the Premier whether he and the Government of Saskatchewan back that outline of the way government reaches a decision as it relates to the head office in Saskatoon of the Potash Corporation and so on. Does the Government of Saskatchewan and the Premier stand behind the Attorney General in his answer to the question of yesterday?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is 'yes'. We stand behind the answer and our interpretation of the answer. We certainly don't stand behind some of the interpretations of the answer given by the Members opposite. So long as I am permitted to give my interpretation of what the Attorney General said, indeed I do stand behind it.

MR. COLLVER: — By way of supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I would just read a part of the answer of yesterday. In the first answer:

The Government, when it comes to the final decision as to where the PCS headquarters should or should not be located, we will obviously have to take a look at all of the factors, one of which is the atmosphere of the business community.

And further in the second answer:

It is a factor, and I repeat, something that the Government really has to take into account

And in the third answer:

It is a factor in a variety of factors that the Government must take into account when it ultimately decides where the head office of the PCS should be located.

My supplementary question then is: Does the Premier and the Government of Saskatchewan stand behind that answer that it will take into account the political involvement of organizations within a community before it decides to establish either a head office or a benefit for that community?

MR. BLAKENEY: — That, Mr. Speaker, is the sort of problem. The Member read out what the Attorney General had said, i.e. that we will take into account the attitude of the business community. The answer to that is, 'yes'. The Member then says: Will we

then take into the account the political opposition of the Board of Trade or some organization? The answer to that is, 'no'. I am not prepared to accept the particular interpretation the Member puts on this.

Let me put this proposition. If the Board of Trade of Yorkton comes and says we want you to do something, we want you to put the head office of the Power Corporation in Yorkton. Should we ignore that representation? I think the answer to that is, we should not ignore the representation. We should consider that representation for what it may be worth. Similarly, if the Board of Trade of Yorkton comes in and says, either directly or indirectly, that it does not want the head office of the Potash Corporation in Yorkton, presumably we should consider that too. They can say either of those yes's or no's in different ways.

On the point of whether or not we should consider the climate of the business community, it is obviously one factor, not an overwhelming factor, but it is clearly one factor. We have employees whom we ask to live in the community. If the atmosphere is going to be hostile, it is going to be more difficult to get employees to live there. That is a fact of life.

I don't know whether businessmen in Saskatoon would be hostile to employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I don't know that. But it is a legitimate question to be considered by a government. I am not in any sense assessing whether or not they would be. But it is a legitimate question to be considered, a factor to be considered among others and to the extent I have indicated, but not the question of whether or not somebody is or is not free to put ads in the paper. The Attorney General made his position clear on that. So with respect to the precise words of the Attorney General the answer is 'yes'.

MR. STEUART: — You should have been a lawyer.

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to some of the remarkable interpretations put on those words by Members who wish they were lawyers, the answer is, 'no'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, by way of a second supplementary. I certainly don't wish I was a lawyer. By way of second supplementary, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier talks about the Board of Trade either asking for a head office or against the head office, one can certainly understand that position. But does the Premier believe that by suggesting that the Government of Saskatchewan is wrong in a particular act that any organization of any community is communicating that it does not want certain benefits? For example, if the SFL were to criticize the Government and the SFL's headquarters were in Regina, would the Government take that factor into account deciding that the labor community of that particular community was opposed to the establishment of that benefit in the community?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think, Mr. Speaker, the question casts a fairly wide

net in itself. I don't think that the fact that any organization expresses an opinion in opposition to the Government's policy is relevant in itself. I think this doesn't, this simply shows opposition and that's fair game. This is the sort of society we live in.

If in fact it appears, that the nature of the criticism is such as to put in the minds of some people the idea that there would be general hostility to that organization, then of course, the answer is the other way. You make your own assessment of the particular style of opposition and whether or not, in your judgment, the business community in Saskatoon is reflecting a point of view which you would say that they would be hostile to the organization there.

If the answer is yes, then we should obviously take it into account. If the answer is no, we shouldn't. I believe there is perhaps a legitimate area of difference of opinion here, but the Attorney General has given his personal view and I take it he's as entitled to have personal views as are Members opposite.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would answer a question just by way of clarification on this business of head office?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that Members are trying something new on the Speaker, and it's called clarification. I've detected it before and if the Assembly feels they want to have a clarification period I'd be quite willing to go along with it. But I may be offending some of the Members in the House who do not feel that we need that and they feel it should be done under the supplementaries, which are for the purpose of seeking clarification of the answer that is given. I would suggest that if the Members want to proceed with a clarification period I am quite in agreement.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BACKBENCHERS

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, it's wonderful to finally be recognized. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to make a representation to you on behalf of all backbenchers in this Assembly. Granted, being in the back benches may indicate the esteem that you're held within your own party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — However, this afternoon I have attempted to get on my feet on four and I think five different occasions and with the exception of the last case a frontbencher has been recognized in every single instance, with the exception of once in the middle bench.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I'm sure you are not deliberately attempting to discriminate against all backbenchers, may I beg leave to ask the Government a question on behalf of . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — That is a lengthy preamble to asking a question which has not yet been asked and I really can't give you permission to ask the question. I will attempt at all times to get a sprinkling of backbenchers and frontbenchers, but occasionally I see frontbenchers who go like this . . . and that indicates something to me. I think we should proceed with the next order of business, which is Orders of the Day.

ANNOUNCEMENT

DEATH OF FORMER MEMBER - ALEXANDER D. CONNON

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, if I may, I'm rising to recognize the passing of a former MLA and a personal friend. Before I do, I wonder if I could have permission to comment on a question that was raised by the Member for Eastview, Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner)?

MR. SPEAKER: — No.

MR. KRAMER: — Fine. It's with some sorrow and regret, Mr. Speaker, that I inform the House of the passing of the now late Alec Connon, former Member of the Legislature from 1944 to 1948 for the Battlefords.

Alec Connon was a Canadian National Railroad conductor for many years. He originated from Scotland and pioneered with his family in Manitoba. He married a Brandon girl who was the daughter of pioneers that fought in the early days with Woodsworth during the Winnipeg strike.

Alec Connon had a colorful career. He was a very humane person. During the four years that he sat in this House, many of the people who sat with him can regale you with stories of his wit and occasional practical jokes enlivening the somewhat dull procedure that is part of the House at times.

Alec made notable contributions during the period that he was in the Battlefords. He sponsored two particular projects, one, the renovation of what was in 1944 the shambles of what had been Fort Battleford. Alec Connon secured at the request of the late Campbell Innis who was a school inspector at that time and very, very interested in the artifacts and history of the Battlefords, secured the first grants from the Hon. Joe Phelps who was the Minister in charge of historic sites at that time.

The money that was secured at that time was provided for the renovation and the rebuilding of what is now the national historic museum at Fort Battleford. This is now a national landmark and a credit to the Battlefords and certainly a credit now to the National Government, which took it over from the province in the mid-fifties.

Secondly, he sponsored several Acts that had to do with the improvement of trade unions and the first Psychiatric Nurses Act for Saskatchewan. Prior to this the psychiatric nurses were not recognized as a group and were simply a group of people who were known as mental hospital nurses, guards, etc.

Alec Connon retired from the railroad in 1962 and was appointed labor representative on the Workmen's Compensation Board throughout the early '60s. He retired to Saskatoon in 1965. I'm sure his many friends and acquaintances will be sad to learn that Alec has passed from the scene.

He leaves a wonderful family scattered throughout western Canada. He has been one of Saskatchewan's great pioneers and certainly a great legislator and a great human being.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a number of Members would want to add a note, a word of tribute on the passing of Alec Connon, whom I knew well and perhaps some others knew well. I think it perhaps can be more properly done on a formal condolence motion and with the consent of the House I will undertake, along with the Clerk to prepare the appropriate motion and bring it in in the next day or two, so that Hon. Members may have an opportunity to express a word of tribute.

GOVERNMENT MOTION

SITTING OF THE HOUSE

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw South):

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Thursday, December 18, 1975, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m., and that this order shall expire on December 31, 1975.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at the conclusion of my brief remarks, move a motion which all Members will know seeks to extend the hours of sitting of the Legislature. I do so, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that quite obviously we are here in a situation where there are no committees meeting like Crown Corporations committee or Public Accounts committee. No major work of the House is going on in the morning, unlike the situation that exists when the House reconvenes in the spring and we have Crown Corporations committee and so forth meeting. It seemed to the Government that this was an appropriate time to make good use of some of the mornings available to get on with the pressing business of the House. It is tendered, the motion, in the hope that we could accommodate not only the Government and its work schedule, but also to accommodate the Opposition, who I know will have a great deal to say about various matters which are on the Order Paper. This will allow both Government and Opposition to have additional innings, to have additional time to submit their respective positions. I have the feeling that perhaps this is a personal view that we've certainly had a good airing of some of the issues, almost to the point where we are repeating each other, but nevertheless that's the right of all Members. I hope that with this motion and with this increased sitting time, we shall be able to, as I say, accommodate the plan of the Government work schedule and also to accommodate the Opposition.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) this resolution.

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly to this motion. The Attorney General gave every appearance of being very reasonable and plausible in his introduction of this motion. He will find us in turn reasonable and plausible in response. We want, probably contrary to his expectations, to support his resolution if he in turn will give some recognition to the particular problem that it creates for us.

I can't help but note in the way in which the Attorney General introduced his motion, that he used words of much softer note than the words he used in the corridor the other day speaking to the Press about the resolution. I'm not going to let it go by without commenting briefly on those words. Because you will recall, and we know very well over here, that the Attorney General, when he spoke to the Press about introducing this resolution, said that he was doing it to put an end to the Liberals' delaying tactics in respect to the potash bills; he said to put an end to the Liberal filibuster of the bills, to stop the Liberal obstruction of the bills, is what he said.

Now, he in that sense, outside the House in the corridor in introducing the motion, pretty freely admitted that his intention with this resolution and this motion is to cut the Liberals down in their opposition. If I was prone to exaggerate in the way the Attorney General is occasionally prone to exaggerate, I guess I would say he is bringing forward this resolution as a guillotine kind of measure on the opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — But, of course, not being given to that kind of exaggeration I won't make the suggestion.

But I will say this. We don't much care what words the Attorney General or anyone else uses to describe what we are doing in respect to these bills. What we are doing is we are fighting and opposing legislation that we consider, implicitly and passionately, bad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — We have opposed it vigorously in debate and we will go on opposing it as vigorously as we can in the debate that follows. In respect to Bill 2 we have quite a number of speakers yet to speak and they will be speaking, I assure you, in very vigorous terms.

I want, as I said, to be reasonable and plausible in the same way the Attorney General was and I said that we would be prepared to support you in your resolution if you in turn would be prepared to recognize the problem it poses for us and in turn support us in that problem.

The problem is, that as you know we will be sitting, if the resolution goes through, both morning, afternoon and evening and sometimes, occasionally late into the night. Now the morning period is taken by most Members to make telephone calls, to and from constituents, to make enquiries of government departments, to handle their correspondence, to peruse bills, do their research and generally prepare for the sitting to come the next

day.

I say we are quite prepared to sit in the morning. Indeed, we would be prepared to commence morning sittings at 9:00 o'clock or even 9:30 in the morning, instead of at 10:00, if in turn you will free us in the evenings to do the kind of work that we have been doing in the mornings.

We have been sitting, as you know, from 7:00 to 9:30 and occasionally from 7:00 to 10:00, as we did last night, leaving us no time to do the kind of work to which I have alluded to. So if you will support us in this concern, and relieve us of sitting in the evenings, we in turn, will be prepared to support your motion that we sit in the morning.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to the resolution of the Attorney General, seconded by the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone):

That Government Resolution No. 2 be amended by adding in the fourth line thereof after the words P.M. that: The Assembly shall adjourn each sitting day at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The debate continues concurrently.

MR. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted a few brief remarks to address to this. I think the amendment offered by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) adds very little time in terms of a week, to the amount of sitting of this Chamber. I appreciate some of the arguments of the Member opposite. Some of them, it seems to me, do not quite follow - contacting government departments and so on. I know most of the civil service work long hours, but most of them don't answer the phone in the evening. However, I can appreciate the workload. I think the Member should appreciate that the Government in moving this motion, including the Attorney General who is a very busy individual outside this House as well as inside this House, has a very heavy workload and is prepared, as I am and as are other members of the Executive Council who have other duties outside the House also to fill, to sit morning, afternoon and evening. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of both giving the Opposition ample time to state their case on the legislation, but also with a view to advancing in terms of days, if not in terms of hours, the debate on these particular items, I will oppose the amendment and support the resolution as it originally stood.

MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, if I could address some very brief remarks to the amendment. I didn't hear the remarks made by my colleague for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) but I hope that Members understand that the amendment does in fact allow for some increased time, in that we would pick up five mornings and take away three evenings. So there is a net increase in the amount of time available for debate, albeit not as much as had been proposed in the original motion.

I think the other point that I wish to make is that the workload that Members of our caucus have, is the kind of workload where we have to do a great deal of it on our own. I'm sure that all Members of the House realize we don't have large research staffs, and I'm not saying that critically because the Government has, but we do not have large research staff and it means that we are in the Library and having to dig out material and we need to have a little bit of time to do that.

I think also, with regard to the point made by the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and a statement that I read in the Press the other day from the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), that the intent was to allow more time for debate on the potash motions because we had asked for it. Please understand that the kind of time we have asked for is time in an elongated sense, so that the implications of the bills can be fully appreciated, not only by us, but by the public at large.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PENNER: — And we feel that rather than compressing the time in terms of days, under which this debate would continue, that we ought to be stretching it out in terms of months, that time should be allowed for people to come to grips with understanding, and that time is becoming important because daily there is more and more feedback from people within the province, more and more questions being asked, and I submit that that's the kind of time that we need, and the kind of time that surely the Members opposite would not object to, particularly in view of their repeated statements that they represent the people of the province, it's a good deal for the people of the province, and there is no reason why we ought not to have this whole matter tabled and dealt with sometime after the New Year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. PENNER: — I'm sorry, I will support the amendment, and if it's approved, I shall support the Motion.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, the Conservative caucus will not be supporting the amendment. We do not mind sitting morning, afternoon and evening. We hope that there will be something more productive out of the debate, and we will not be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to get into the debate on the resolution and the amendment.

I am, as you know, an MLA representing a rural constituency. I don't know about other MLAs, but I have asked my constituents to contact me with problems when they feel I may be of help.

Since the opening of this legislation, I have had hundreds of calls from citizens in my area, with particular problems and asking me to give assistance.

MR. CAMERON: — You should hear his phone ring. It rings constantly.

MR. NELSON: — That's a fact. I have asked these people to contact me either by letter and phone, and with the mail strike, they seem to have chosen the phone. There isn't a morning that I am able to answer all the calls that have been taken in the Legislature, the afternoon or the evening, let alone answering those that are calling in. Possibly, Mr. Speaker, as the fellows chuckle on the other side, it may be because there was an NDP Member, or Members representing the area I now represent, and there is certainly a big backlog of problems that they did not look after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — I would certainly invite them to come down and give me a hand on the phone. I would appreciate that.

MR. CAMERON: — Spend a morning in his office!

MR. NELSON: — I, unlike some of the NDP Members, have continued answering my phone, and I have accepted calls. I might say at this time, any of my phone calls are from people expressing concern over the uncalled for rush of this Government by ramming through the legislation for the takeover of the potash industry.

At this particular time of year, many people on the farm and in the rural areas are not as busy as during the farming season and they want their thoughts expressed through their elected representative, their MLA. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Government is denying the citizens of Saskatchewan their democratic right by keeping Members in this Assembly during the morning hours, when they are busy in their offices. I believe this is their exact intention. Not only does the Premier, the Attorney General and the Government not want to answer their phones, now they want to deny all the Members on this side of the House that right as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — It is also perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is using the same tactics in this House as he did with the City of Saskatoon. He has told the Board of Trade they do not have the right to even think different than this Government and now he is holding the same threat over this Assembly.

I can understand why many of the Members opposite do not mind sitting in the mornings, and similarly, the Members to my left. They are not in their seats in the present hours we are using. Some Members wouldn't be recognized if they came in that door over there. That seat hasn't been filled since this Assembly started. Those opposite take their responsibilities very lightly. We, in the Liberal caucus intend to give good representation to our constituents, and we are doing that in the morning hours.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Attorney General on behalf of this Government is only attempting to rush the potash bills through because he, and the Premier, know people in the province are getting upset, they are asking to be heard, he is afraid of having a commission appointed to hear them, and now he wants the MLAs in this Assembly so they cannot be contacted by their constituents. He is wrong in the potash gamble, he is wrong in this Resolution. I think he is trying to give a Christmas present to those sheep in the back benches on the far side.

AN HON. MEMBER (from Government side): — Baa! Baa!

MR. NELSON: — I will support the amendment and if approved, I will support the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, when we first saw this Motion on the Order Paper we should have known that it would turn into a political discussion and some speeches. We have in fact, through my colleague from Estevan (Mr. Larter) stated our position, but upon hearing Members on both sides of this House, I must confess frankly, that I'm afraid what is happening is they are taking a resolution or a motion before this House, designed to, I would hope, create some productivity in this House, and once again they have turned it into a political battle. I should like to assure the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that no group of people have a better record of sitting in this House during debate than the Conservative Party has. I would challenge him on that very issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the resolution and the amendment to the resolution. If I read this correctly, what is happening here is that the Government and the official Opposition are now taking this and using it as a double threat. It's a double threat. The Government is saying this - look you people, you sit here, you sit here during the longest fall session in Saskatchewan's history, no doubt. They are saying to all MLAs, the Government is saying to all MLAs in this House, you sit here until Christmas Eve, and if you don't, then we'll ram this Bill through anyway. Deny MLAs in this House on both sides, the opportunity of this family season of the year to go home and to be with their loved ones. That's the threat. And then we turn around and the Opposition, in attempting to make a deal, if in fact I read them correctly, the official Opposition is saying, we'll keep you here longer than that, as long as we can continue the filibustering with no productive activity.

So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support the amendment, and I don't know at this particular time if the Government is sincere in the accusations they have thrown back. We are quite prepared to sit and debate in this House, but we are not prepared to go into next week, and into the Christmas season with no productivity coming forth in this House, where we are in exactly the same position as we are today.

MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Motion and the amendment.

It would to me on reading the rule books, that before such a request to change general rule No. 3 would be made, that there would have to be a very good reason. I can appreciate such a request coming before this Assembly in the spring, when those elected Members, by reason of their occupations, wish to complete their duties in this House so they can return to the farm and spring seeding. However, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see a similar urgency at this time, and I fail to appreciate the request that we hold extra sittings before Christmas.

It was interesting to hear Members of the Progressive Conservative caucus say they don't mind sitting morning, noon or night. And I would say to that, they certainly have lots of experience sitting. I would be more interested to know when they are going to get up and do some speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — We too, would like to be home with our loved ones at Christmas, but the issue before us is a very urgent one and we were elected to carry out our responsibilities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — If indeed, the extra time requested is to rush through Bill 1 and Bill 2, I cannot accept that as a legitimate and valid reason. In fact, I am of the opinion that the people of Saskatchewan, and indeed the Members of this House, should be given more time to consider both Bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — At this time of the year we hear much about the Christmas rush, and I say this is a kind of a Christmas rush which we don't need and we don't like. And I'm not prepared to support it.

I shall support the amendment, if it's approved and support the Motion as amended.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise and speak against this amendment.

It's an amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, that Members to my right do not seem to understand that it takes twice as much, or perhaps ten times as much work and effort and energy to sit and listen to drivel as it does to speak that drivel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — And the Members to my right might possibly be commended for their drivel. It's amazing.

MR. CAMERON: — He's got the most awkward way to justify things that I've ever seen.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Very convoluted!

MR. COLLVER: — If I knew what convoluted meant, Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly be able to reply to that particular catcall. I would have to look it up in a legal dictionary.

It is our opinion that both the Members opposite and the Members to our right have taken this potash issue and are attempting to build it into a political football, in order that they can replenish their sagging troops and to replenish their sagging efforts politically. We believe that the Government has introduced this legislation and attempted to ram it down the throats of the people of this province in order to build an issue against, and to which, the left wing of their party, can suddenly get active again. The Members to our right are dragging out the debate with filibustering tactics . . .

MR. PENNER: — That's your term. What does it mean?

MR. COLLVER: — You read it in the dictionary. You look it up in the dictionary . . . with filibustering tactics, dragging out the debate in order to attempt to build up their sagging fortunes. Surely, this is too much of a gamble. Members opposite - a billion dollar gamble to play politics. And Members to my right, surely, surely, we drag this on and on and on to no obvious avail when there are 38 Members across and 22 Members here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why don't you go home, then?

MR. COLLVER: — We will continue, Mr. Speaker, to sit and listen. We will continue to attempt to learn something from the debate, but I sincerely wish that it was more meaningful and more learning full.

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, frankly I have had enough of this sanctimonious hypocrisy coming from my left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — You reach a point when suddenly I guess you say, 'enough is enough'. About the third or fourth day we were in this Legislature as rookies; all of a sudden we get this great lecture on what we shouldn't do, what we should do. Coming from a veteran of the House like Mr. Thibault, or Mr. Kramer, who are deans of this House, I could probably accept it, but now when the same gentleman stands up and tells me how I'm going to fulfil my legislative responsibility, or how this party is going to fulfil its legislative responsibility, that's too much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — I think one thing that has been demonstrated in the past few weeks of this Legislature is that there is only one Opposition Party in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — There's one that is an Opposition Party and there

is one that pretends to be. You have a choice when you come into this House in Opposition, you can either sit back and watch things go, or when something comes up that you are unalterably opposed to, that within your innermost convictions it is repulsive to you, and you fight it.

MR. ROMANOW: — Filibuster!

MR. THATCHER: — That is your word, and frankly I could care less if you do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Attorney General, I haven't even had an opportunity to speak on Bill 2 yet. Now you call that a filibuster. All that we are suggesting over here, you have a Bill there that we find totally repugnant, and if it is a filibuster, to fight that thing with every means that is available in the Legislative Handbook, then we are doing it, and boy, I'm proud to be a part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I have always had a lot of respect for the Conservative Party, but you know I really don't know what the Conservative Party is in this Legislature any more, because they really haven't stated it. All we have had is sermons, well I don't know what else you would call them. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes that a political party cannot find something in this Legislature with everything that the rules and the handbook made available to them, I suggest that it is a very, very sorry situation. One thing which I sincerely hope, that that last speech that that Member of the other party here, I sincerely hope that circulates in this province. I think very definitely that the voters, the people of Saskatchewan, will have some comment at some future date on that attitude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — There isn't one of you Members; I wouldn't want us to shut anyone off . . .

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to begin by putting the matter back in some amount of perspective, because some of the things that I will be saying about an arrogant government may sound as if they are off the point, but they are not, they are very much on the point. Because the point of this Motion, and the way this Government has been handling the House is that we have a very arrogant Government, a Government that I suggest, perhaps is on its last legs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — And a Government that is frightened, not only frightened of Liberals that they understand, but Conservatives that, frankly, I don't understand either. We started off with a potash Bill that we believe, and I think the people of Saskatchewan believe, was planned by the Government before an election and the Government decided they would bring in that Bill

as quickly as they could, and they would get it out of the way, and they would hang on and pray that in the next 42 or 45 months they might be able to make the people forget that they went through an election and didn't say anything in that election, and then jammed a Bill down the throats of the people.

We were told through the Press that the potash legislation was to go through by Christmas, and of course, that dictate by the Government is a part of their manoeuvre now to make that dictate come true. When the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) talks about a political football, and they say he is not a political man, you have to look back at the way he reacted to the dictate by the Government that they were going to pass the Bill by Christmas. He said he wanted them to pass it. He was going to oppose it, but he would give his tacit approval to its passage, he would let that Bill through the House . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, at no time did I ever say I wanted them to pass it.

MR. MERCHANT: — What's the Point of Order?

MR. COLLVER: — That's the Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that I am entitled to clarify a glaring error in fact, if the Member says it. At no time did I ever say I wanted them to pass it.

MR. SPEAKER: — From the understanding of what the Member has said, I believe the point is well taken.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, just exactly how is that a Point of Order? He is getting up to say that something this Member says about isn't true. Now if that is a Point of Order, I have never heard of it. It might be a Point of Privilege, I don't even think it is, but it's certainly not a Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I understood that the Member for Nipawin was getting up to correct an impression that the, not in fact an impression, but as I understand it, a statement that the Member for Regina Wascana made with regard to what the Member for Nipawin, or his party wanted to see a certain Bill passed. The Member for Nipawin clarified the statement. He is entitled to a clarification. If there is an outright contradiction of what he had said or his position.

MR. STEUART: — I wonder if the Speaker, not today maybe, would give us the quotation from May or Beauséjour, exactly where that is a Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll certainly take that under advisement.

MR. MERCHANT: — I wonder if I may speak to the Point of Order. Because I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take that under advisement about the Point

of Order and the Member may continue with his remarks on the Motion that is before us.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, what I said was, if I may go on with my remarks in speaking to the amendment and to the Motion. What I said was, that the Member for Nipawin wanted the Bill to go through, and if I may, may I quote the Star-Phoenix of November 27, 1975:

Mr. Collver said that since the Government had more representatives than the PCs and Liberals combined, and since it appears determined to pass the potash Bills, he suggested it would be better to have the legislation in the law books, rather than using Liberal stalling tactics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that, that, which was a direct quotation incidentally, of the Hon. Member for Nipawin, is again an example of the fact that they decided as a political football to get this Bill through, and he decided that he would be better to draw some distinctions between the Liberals who are a legitimate hard-working Opposition, and the way his party would react in this House. And that they would sit here and watch those Bills go through, first because they didn't know how to stop them, and didn't really know how to handle themselves in the House, and they have proven they were right in that regard. And secondly, because the Member thought that in four years, somehow he would be able to use that as good politics against the NDP Government. One can't help but note that the only speeches that we ever hear from the Hon. Member for Nipawin are on points of procedure and on the fifth or sixth question, but when it comes to a matter of substance, he is curiously silent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — He shouts and he screams, he comes into this House, and every time he tries to go through a four-paragraph remark, he seems to lose his temper as though having successfully dealt with the chambermaids in the Bessborough that way, this is a good way to deal with this House.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I have asked before, and I will ask again, I do not believe it is customary for Members to raise personal business of other Members.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Hon. Member has a good Point of Privilege, and if the Members wish, I will get a citation for them on that. All right, then the Member may continue, but I think the Member has a Point of Privilege, and I think the Member for Wascana should retract the statement that he made about the Member for Nipawin. You are referring to the Member's personal actions in this House, I think, in an exaggerated fashion.

MR. MALONE: — . . . ask the Member to retract the position, you could give it some consideration. I am not sure that the Member for Nipawin has a good point. If he does, and if you so rule, I would be very glad to accept your ruling, but a moment ago you indicated that you were going to check into another Point of Order by the

Member for Nipawin, I would ask you on this particular case, because you have asked the Member to retract something, that you also take the time to give it the consideration that it deserves before asking him to retract those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: — I was prepared to give consideration to that particular point, and I said I will get you a citation on it. I distinctly heard one of your seatmates say, No, you are right. So then I said, the Member for Wascana should withdraw his remarks. Since apparently, a citation is not necessary in this case. However, if you are suggesting that I should have a citation, I will bring one in and make a decision later on.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask then in making that decision you decide whether I should retract reference to the fact that he has some connection with the Bessborough, or the reference to the fact that he treats this House like a bunch of chambermaids.

MR. SPEAKER: — . . . I'll make the decision that I make, on what is in the record of the House. I will examine that later.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, now what does the Hon. Member for Nipawin say in nub and substance. He says that because we have 22 Members on this side of the House, and they have 39 Members on that side of the House, that we should lie down and roll over, that we should allow the 60 per cent that we represent to go unheard in this House and unheard in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Now what does the Government say with their 40 per cent? What does the 40 per cent that the Government side represents say when they come into this House? We have one of the most arrogant Governments probably in Canada today. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to watch a government in decay. Maybe I shouldn't say these things because it may start to smarten you up. I suggest that we are viewing a government that is sort of losing its touch. Just look around, Mr. Attorney General, you were the best-looking guy when you got elected some years ago, and you still are. Look around at the bald heads and the white hair. Look around at the Members with whom you are going to have to go back and try to be re-elected. Look around at the attendance, your Party's attendance in the House. The Conservatives are always here and we are always here. When the House opened, you had sixteen Members in the House, and we outnumbered you. The other night for the first time in the memory of Members of our side, the Government was defeated on a voice vote in the House, for the first time in the memory of our side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — A fact, incidentally, which was ignored for some obscure reason by the Press, which I suggest was of great significance. I see the Whip with his back turned, and well he might, after that. You go out, you have a look, and you will find that where the former Opposition were the card players and the cookie eaters, you've got them all now, and those are the things that sort of

smell of defeat. If you had asked me whether the Liberals were going to form the Government in 1975, I wouldn't have been very sure, but I know now, that we will form a government in 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — I say to you particularly, the Hon. Member for Riversdale, or the Member for Melfort, they are not in the House, and I say it to the Premier, you're the nub of the front bench, certainly the political base, do you remember the smell of a government going out. The oldest Premier in Canada, now how does that relate, Mr. Speaker, to what that Government is doing now. This Government is coming to us in a very arrogant way. First, they announce when they'll pass it, and now we are to have our seats spanked because we didn't pass it when they wanted us to pass it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Ted Malone, at 37, is our oldest leadership candidate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — We figured out to take the photographs from down low. The average age of our caucus and the average of the Conservative caucus, 39 years.

MR. STEUART: — Yeah, and that's counting me . . .

MR. MERCHANT: — He blew the statistic. You know shortly after the Government came in, the Premier was good enough to come on the air with me, I was doing a radio program. You may not remember, Mr. Premier. A woman called and she was the last caller, and she said, "You know, Tony, I didn't support the NDP, but you've got to give them this; they've got the best darn looking Cabinet in the whole country". And they did, and those were the kinds of things that sort of gave the smell of your victory. You now have the smell of defeat, the stink from defeat. In so many ways, the vitality is gone from your side of the House. Supported by arrogance out of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — A question came today. The Hon. Member asked a question about lumber. Who wasn't here? The Minister responsible wasn't here and he still isn't. The Minister of Northern Affairs wasn't here then, but he wandered in after the House began, an hour later. The Premier wasn't here, although in fairness to the Premier, I suggest that with his heavy workload he attends the House very, very well. But you on your side ignore this House, and it is shocking to hear a man from John Diefenbaker's party get up and say we'll roll over and let this Bill, or any other Bill, go through without . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — I tell you, a John Diefenbaker would take the way you treat

this House, and beat you into the ground with it.

John Diefenbaker, when Members opposite get up to lecture the Speaker, a Speaker, who in my opinion, has been eminently fair, and incidentally right on every decision, including the decision whether I am abusing the Member for Nipawin; a Speaker who has been right about every decision and two or three times both the Hon. Attorney General and the Premier have gotten up and literally lectured the Speaker, because they are perhaps used to lecturing the people in their back bench or perhaps used to lecturing their Cabinet. Those are the smells of defeat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Your arrogance, you are demonstrating your loss of respect for this House, and through this House, the people of Saskatchewan. The very man, Mr. Speaker, who over a \$50 million expenditure, rightly said to the Liberals when they were in power, put on the table all of the information about the proposal that you make, then sit there smugly and giggle and smile and play cards, and do whatever they do, and ignore the right of the people of this province to know what is going on in this potash debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — You are starting to feel that you don't need the House and I'll tell you when you decide you don't need the House, and you don't care what the 60 per cent that we represent have to say, when you start to fall into the trap that the Hon. Member for Nipawin is in because you have 39 members, you don't have to explain yourself to this House, then those are the seeds that will bring you down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to punish us. We have been told by the Hon. Attorney General that we may sit until 4:00 o'clock on Christmas Eve, that we will be here between Christmas and New Year's. That, if we are going to be naughty little boys and not pass his Bills when he wants them passed, then they will do something about it, that they will wheel in their 39 and they will vote it through and 20 perhaps of our 22 will sit here. We'll sit here day after day, and they will have 14 or 15 sit on their side, and the rest will play cards or do whatever they do, and they will wheel them in for a vote. You know, it is easy, I suggest, for the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) to say what you don't need, you can't handle mornings, evenings and nights. Well so could I if I had an office staff, so could I, if I had an executive assistant or two, and so could I, if I didn't feel that I had to be in this House every minute that the House is sitting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — We are in this House, I am not suggesting, I am not singling out the Minister, the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) just because his potash bills are going through and never speaks to them. I am not singling him out as someone who is a bad attender in the House, he is not particularly. He is an average

attender from a Cabinet that are bad attenders. To then say to us, that we don't need the mornings, not just to deal with constituency problems, but to prepare and think about what we are going to say, is ludicrous. If I had a speech writer and an executive assistant, I might not be so concerned about the extra time either. The people of this province forget that we sit evenings, and the people of this province forget that the Cabinet are paid as a full time position, while Members on this side are not. I am not suggesting that that should be changed, but I do suggest that it is not very appropriate for the Minister for Biggar to say, I can handle mornings, afternoons and evenings, and it won't be any problem for me, and therefore, you should defeat the amendment.

What this resolution and what the attempt of the Government really amounts to, is sort of lashing out at the democratic system, the democratic system that allows us to be heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Why did they want it through by Christmas? First, because the Attorney General sort of gave his pledge that he would, and he wouldn't want to embarrass his wife by not coming good on his promises, and second, because they know that there is a mounting concern about this legislation, the same mounting concern . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — . . . that made the Premier decide with others that they would spring this legislation after the election and not pass it before.

Mr. Speaker, you have noticed that basically we have been brief; I have been a little more lengthy than some of the others. I think it is important for the Press to note that we could easily, if all we were doing was delaying the House needlessly and improperly, we could have filibustered this resolution. We could easily have come back day after day with amendments which we don't believe in. We could have spoken for very long periods of time and ignored the whole problem. We have amendments which we think are appropriate and we believe that probably this resolution will be passed this afternoon. I don't now about the response of Hon. Members opposite. I do know, and I suggest to you, Mr. Premier, and to the people of this province, that governments that ignore the right of the people to be heard through their Members, aren't governments for long, and that you have within you, all of the seeds to pull you down, and I hope you pull yourselves down, I am not trying to give you any friendly advice.

This resolution and the way you have handled us and the people in the potash debate is a demonstration of an arrogant government at its extreme, an arrogant government that I suspect will shortly be imposing closure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Souris Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend to be an expert in rules or procedures. As I understand it, the way the thing is going here could be, if every Member in the Opposition was to make an amendment and every Member speaks to that amendment, we could

conceivably sit 365 days a year and go on and on and there would be no business done in the House.

The next point I should like to make is that I think Members opposite were very unfair, they totally ignored the wishes of 60 per cent of Saskatchewan at least when they brought this Bill in. They ignored, probably more than 60 per cent of the wishes, if the truth were to be known. To bring the Bill in a short session before Christmas was unfair to everyone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — The wives and families of MLAs and of staff in this Legislature as well. As for who is going to win the election in 1979, any group that would ignore 60 per cent doesn't stand much of a chance. Any group that would ignore 30 per cent, as did the Liberals in their amendment to Bill 1 the other day, I wouldn't think would stand much of a chance either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to the amendment. I can understand the wish of the Government to want to extend the length of the sitting hours. I wish to say that as a rural Member, it is very difficult for me to lose my morning sitting time. This is a time of the year in the area that I am in that the problems of lease allocations come up, in community pasture, government pastures and on private leases for one problem. This is the time they are being decided. I get a lot of delegations coming in, a lot of phone calls. If I am sitting in the morning we caucus about 9:15, the office don't open until 9:00. I can't get in touch with any of the Ministers, any of the deputy ministers. I now have two cases of welfare from home, they are mixed up in their payments. If I were sitting in the House I could in no way get through and get this solved. Believe me, before Christmas they need their money. I am not arguing about the sitting, but when you sit in the morning, you cut a person away from that. I can't be in the House and I can't be up there in my office at the same time. The morning is the only time the offices are open.

I don't disagree with you wanting long sittings, probably if there was a way that you could open your government offices at 6:00 a.m., or leave them open 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, fine. The hours are from 9:00 to 5:00 and if you are in the House from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., you can't do the work. I believe, as an elected representative, I am sure as you do, that our constituency problems are important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — If you don't believe your constituency problems are important, that is your privilege, but I do. When they call me up, they want to be represented. What do you think it looks like if they call every day of the week, and they say the Member is not in his office? They can't get in touch with you. It must be awfully embarrassing for you people when they finally get hold of you and say you are never in your office. We can't get you on the phone, you can't do your work; what are you doing?

If we were going into a spring season, into seeding time, with farmer Members like myself, I could see the urgency. You also find that your constituency problems in an agricultural seat drop off because this is a time when you have your meetings, leases are set up, this is when your problems come up, because rural people have time to come in, they haven't in the spring and summer. Maybe the city Members who live in urban seats don't have this problem, but we do in a rural area. This is a problem.

I can't support a Resolution that asks me to take away the only time I have when I am in Regina, during the week when the offices are open, to represent my constituents. If we must sit, let's go on until 2:00 - 3:00 a.m., if you must, if you are hell fire bent to keep us in the House, but don't take away my time so that I can serve my constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS - 11

Steuart	Cameron	Clifford
Wiebe	Edwards	Anderson
Malone	Nelson (Assiniboia Gravelbourg)	Merchant
Penner		Thatcher

NAYS - 35

Blakeney	Robbins	Allen
Pepper	MacMurchy	Koskie
Thibault	Mostoway	Johnson
Bowerman	Larson	Banda
Romanow	Whelan	Collver
Snyder	Dyck	Larter
Byers	Feschuk	Bailey
Kramer	Shillington	Berntson
Baker	Rolfes	Ham
Lange	Cowley	Katzman
Faris	Tchorzewski	Birkbeck
Kowalchuk	Skoberg	

The debate continues on the motion.

MISS L. B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate on the amendment and the motion and listening very carefully. I feel for a number of reasons that the amendment that has been defeated was a very sincere effort on our part and at the end of my remarks, I will propose another amendment.

In the first place, there are two main reasons which have adequately been stated and I should like to try to shed some more light on the fact. In the news today, the Premier has stated that he would like to get this legislation through by Christmas . . .

MR. LANE: — That he would get it through!

MISS CLIFFORD: — . . . Well I don't use strong terms like that. This is the term that was used in the news. I feel indeed, as it has been stated, it is a definite move so that it will pressure us into getting this legislation through. Beside the fact that we oppose the principle of the Bill and resent being pushed into this type of legislation, the main reason as we have stated is because we cannot sacrifice the time that is so needed in the morning for our constituencies, and some people have laughed when Members have suggested that there have been hundreds of telephone calls. I think that you cannot, either on this side, or anywhere in this House, disagree with the fact that we are a hard-working caucus, no matter whether we are opposing your legislation or not, at least we are preparing speeches and we are participating in the House. I think this has to be recognized.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — It is fact. We are also very sincere in our endeavors, whether or not you believe that, when we propose our resolutions. In my first speech in the House I stated that if you find that Members are not in the House you cannot criticize it, because perhaps they are making calls to their constituents. I was very sincere in that observation, and I would respectfully like to outline some of the problems that I have to tackle this week, I don't mean it to be lengthy discussion, but I should like to point this out to this House because I don't think perhaps some of you who do have people to look after your problems do realize the number of calls, because you don't get the calls personally, not because you don't answer the phone for whatever reason, but you don't get the personal calls. I do get a number of calls every day, believe it or not. If I could outline a number of them, very briefly. On this page I have 23 calls and situations which I have to call on your departments or Ministers. That is no easy job, I am sure it is no easy job to get your Ministers on the phone at all times. For an Opposition Member, or a member of the public, it is even harder.

I have a call about a job that someone needs in a small town, and in a small town it is not easy to get somebody to listen to you to try to find you a job. In my area we have many small hamlets. To find a job or to get unemployment insurance is not an easy matter. I have a call about grants for community work. I have a call about provincial old age benefits, because this woman is only getting \$12. I am not trying to make this a miniature throne speech, I am just trying to tell you, that these are the problems that I have to look after this week and next week. There will be many more coming in.

I have a call about the rural telephone lines. They have been told by the department that they have to bury their telephone lines, at their own expense. Not only is upkeep of telephones in a rural area impossible because you can't get people to do it, it is impossible because they don't have the money. I have a call on low rental problems. I have a call by a person who has polio and is trying to get a housekeeper. He is 71 years old. He needs a housekeeper, he needs special assistance. Special assistance has been granted by your department, but you can't find a housekeeper and I am trying to find one for him. There is a call for children's allowance, because

of the mail strike. This is just one of the many types of programs we have to look at.

There is a call on grants for new rental accommodations to be brought in; there is the problem of this pioneer haven that I mentioned. I have to advise them of the avenue which they have to follow for some reprimand to union officials if they want to do that. I need to find out about a grant for a handicapped person. I need to find out about NIP grants, about whether the Government is going to give grants to a small town. I need to find out about a pipeline settlement. I need to find out through the fire commissioner whether or not we can propose in my town to get the curling rink opened, because we need to get the fire commissioner's approval. This is a problem for a small town. I need to find out about pension cheques; I need to find out about assistance for a blind person. I need to find out about a recreation grant for a senior citizens' program. I have to try to find a job for a person who is qualified in northern affairs. These may seem like trivial things, these are the problems that I have to answer for my constituents.

I put out an ad telling my constituents to call me, my executive is trying to keep in contact with the constituency. These are real problems we have to face, these are the problems which I look after in the morning. I really would like you to consider the fact that we are very sincere in asking you that this time is needed to respond to these calls.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I proposed a resolution that was very sincere. I felt that, although the Government has done some good things in education, which I wholly supported in my speech, I felt there was need for other avenues through a board of enquiry. I feel this resolution was defeated because it was proposed by an Opposition Member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — I think that I had a sincere resolution to try to do all we could. I am sure Members opposite want to do all they can for education.

I should like them to consider that just because an Opposition Member has put up this resolution, I would ask that they don't totally disregard it because it is put in this light. Surely when a reasonable resolution is put forth, it shouldn't be shrugged off in that manner.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put forth this amendment, which I hope the Members of this House will consider, with the sincerity with which it was made. I move, seconded by Mr. Wiebe:

That the following words be added to the motion:

and that this Assembly provides the Opposition Members of the House with a one and a half hour period of each morning of each sitting day, in which to direct to Government Ministers and departments, any questions or problems their constituents might have relating to such Ministers and departments as the mornings are usually reserved and occupied by constituency work by such MLAs.

MR. SPEAKER: — With regard to the amendment, I believe the amendment is out of order. I will read the citation which relates to the order of the motion.

The law on the relevancy of amendments (Beauchesne's 203) is that if they are on the same subject-matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

And it continues on in another section:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

I, therefore, declare the amendment out of order and debate continues on the main motion.

MR. MALONE: — I wonder if I could speak to your ruling, to the amendment.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the motion before us deals with the time of the Legislature, that is, the sitting time, the guts of the motion is to have us now sit mornings, commencing tomorrow morning. The amendment, Mr. Speaker, I believe deals with that sitting time as well, in that it refers to the mornings and asks that the mornings be used for a specific purpose, or a portion of that morning period be used for a specific purpose. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to reconsider your decision. I believe the amendment to be in order for the reasons that I have given, and that if you will consider it you will see that it does deal with the morning period of time which the Government wants the House to sit.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would agree that the amendment has relevancy to a question period. I do not agree that it has relevancy to the motion which is before the House. It is very vague and indirect, if in fact there is relevancy there. I would maintain the ruling that I made.

MR. MALONE: — Again, Mr. Speaker, you say question period. The question period has been a matter of comment in this House for some time. I don't think the Member is referring to the question period which we normally have before the Orders of the Day. The Member is referring to a period of time in which Ministers would make themselves available for questions dealing with constituent's business, not of a matter of urgent public importance, as we have before the Orders of the Day. That is what the question period refers to, not the period before the Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the only way in which it refers to the motion which is before us is that it is tacked on the end of the original motion. I do not understand the relevancy of the Member's comments and, therefore, maintain the ruling. If Members are dissatisfied with the ruling, they are free to challenge my decision.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I

might speak briefly to the ruling. I don't think that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I won't accept any further comments on the ruling. I will permit a challenge, if the Members wish to challenge it, that is up to the Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I would agree with this motion, the motion is a relatively simple one and that is to extend the hours by some two and a half hours every morning for the next 7, 8 or 10 sitting days. If I honestly thought that this extra length of time would be taken by the Government, especially by Cabinet Ministers, by government supporters, MLAs to really make a debate on Bill 1 and Bill 2, I would agree.

What has happened to date, in this so-called debate, is that the Government has brought before this Legislative Assembly two of the most momentous Bills that we have ever seen in the history of the province, there is no question about that. I think they rank with famous Bills, like Medicare and Hospitalization, way back to the late 1940s, the pulp mill debate, that was another one, because this is a departure if we pass these, from anything that has really ever been done in the history of this province. I don't think any one can deny, whether they support the Bill or they oppose, that what we are engaged in is most serious and holds for the future of Saskatchewan a great many unanswered questions. The very amount of money that is involved, anywhere from \$500 million to \$1 billion, and that is just the beginning. We recognize that that is just the beginning, because we are talking about expansion and we are talking about taking all of the potash industry eventually. We could be well talking about \$2 billion, or \$3 billion. Now for a province containing less than a million people, this by itself, just the amount of money, is staggering. It is so large that it boggles the mind. I don't think anyone then will question the importance of these two Bills.

What, surely, is the job, what is the responsibility of the 61 elected representatives in this House? It is to consider the legislation placed before it by the Government. Of course, it is to suggest other pieces of legislation, Private Members' Bills, resolutions, attempts to get the Government to embark in new policies, to change direction. Essentially the main thrust of the Legislative Assembly, the business put before the Legislative Assembly comes from the Government, it must come from the Government. They are elected to govern, they have a mandate to govern, no one questions that. One questions whether they had a mandate to do this, or do that. They may say that they only represent 39 per cent of the vote with a multi-party democracy like we have, that gets to be the rule and not the exception. So no one questions that I am sure, no serious person, they have a mandate to rule and a mandate to govern. But along with that mandate I say goes a very serious responsibility to proceed, where possible, with caution. Now there are times when the Government must act quickly, when it is expedient for the Government to act quickly. With a problem before the Legislative Assembly and before the people of Saskatchewan that is a fairly open and shut and there is a time factor. I think rent control is maybe not the best example, but is an example. It is an example of where the Government

says all right, a nation is engaged in a fight against inflation, we all recognize how serious it is. The National Government has asked the Provincial Governments to do many things, one of which is to bring rents under some kind of a control, along with wages and incomes, and so the Government introduced in this fall Session Bill 16, a Bill to control rents.

Now we recognize there is some urgency because having introduced the Bill there is a great deal of uncertainty and there will remain a great deal of uncertainty until this Bill is passed. So that Bill, had it been brought up today for example, would have been (from my point of view) - we have one more speaker to speak on it - it would have, I presume, then passed in second reading and put over into committee where maybe the other Members of the Conservative caucus have some amendments, sensible amendments, which we hope will be considered. It would be passed out of Committee and there is no question in my mind that it will be the law of the land; amended I hope, and changed I hope, it would be the law of the land within the next few days. No one can accuse the Liberal caucus of unnecessarily holding up that Bill because we recognize, while we don't agree with every aspect, we recognize that it is serious and there are some time factors.

But let's get back to Bill 42. I think the only Bill that was almost as abhorrent to us as this Bill, that we have seen in recent times put forward by this Government, was Bill 42. Now we fought Bill 42 but the Premier said when he came in that he needed Bill 42, he needed the powers in Bill 42 to go down on behalf of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to negotiate at that very vital energy conference the first one that was held in Ottawa. Now we didn't agree with the powers he was asking for but I don't think the record was so that we questioned that he needed to have some direction. We disagreed with the direction he took and we fought the Bill. But again, the record shows very clearly that we did not mount any so-called filibuster, or any lengthy debate. We argued this matter, we debated, we attempted to get it amended and then it was passed.

All right, we now come to Bill 1 and Bill 2, we come to this resolution. This is even a more important Bill, this is even a more drastic Bill than Bill 42. After all, Bill 42 took some possession of some oil rights, but it mostly left intact the oil industry. Now they may have decided to leave as a result of it and they did and it hurt the oil industry and it hurt the people of Saskatchewan. The results are clear if anybody wants to look at them. But it didn't, by the very stroke of the pen signing, drive them out and change forever the complexion of the development of the oil industry. The harm that has been done is great and it is deep, but it can be undone. But once we pass Bill 1 and Bill 2 I say that we can break this egg, but we can never put it back together again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Once we pass Bill 1 and Bill 2 and the Government opposite seizes, takes over, confiscates, nationalizes all or part of the potash industry, whether anyone likes it or not, the economic face and the economic future of Saskatchewan is changed forever.

Now, Government Members opposite may say changed for the

better. We say changed for the worse. However, that is the debate. But again, I want to try and make my point as strongly and as clearly as I can, the absolute total importance of these two Bills. All right, what is the rush? That has to be the question. The Government has the right, whether they have the full mandate or not, they have the right and no one argues that. All right, what is the rush? We admit that it is of vital importance, we admit the stakes are so high that they boggle the mind, we admit that it is going to change the future of the province for all time without a doubt. The Premier and other Members opposite at their own convention said something like this is the battle of the 1970s. So they recognize the tremendous importance of these two Bills. What's the rush? Is the potash market growing and increasing and the price going up? Do we have to get in at the right time? No. As a matter of fact the potash market is going down and the price is softening. Well, someone may say that is a good time to get in. I think it is kind of a bad time to get in. However, is the potash going away? Is it like oil and it is going to be gone if we didn't step in and do something; that we face an end to potash for one, two, three, maybe four thousand years. Is the market going to disappear? Well, I say that our market does stand in jeopardy because of the action of that Government. But if we take a month or two months or three months it is going to make no difference to the markets of the world. It is going to make little or no difference to the opposition to Saskatchewan potash, by that I mean the possibility of New Brunswick, the possible rival of New Mexico or the entrance in a major way of Russia into the world potash market. So the potash is here for a thousand years and that Government, unless some of its backbenchers turn to us, is here for a legal term of five years. What's the rush?

Well, the rush has to be political. The rush has to be political, if it isn't political then I can't understand it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — The Government clearly wants to get this Bill out of the way, get this act done, get it behind them so they can start healing the wounds and so people will start forgetting. And in this regard I suggest very seriously that the Conservative Opposition are playing into their hands. I said from the beginning that if we are talking strictly politics, yes, I would much sooner go into a political campaign facing a government that had legislation on the books in place, that had confiscated an industry against their will. I would sooner have on the books and in place and on the record, the sight and the witness by the people of a government who had used its unbelievable powers to walk in, seize and take over. But I have also said from the beginning that we have a more serious responsibility than that, that we cannot play politics, looking forward to the next election with every piece of legislation that comes into the House. And I have also said and I think it is true, that if the NDP Government don't want to pass this legislation, in fact if they are just going to use it as a gun to put to the heads of the potash industry, then no amount of shenanigans or filibusters or collapsing and calling for the question will change their mind, because they can pass the legislation but they don't have to proclaim it. The Premier can pass the legislation and let it sit there as a threat, a threat hanging over the heads of the potash industry, if that is their intent.

Now I can't read their minds. I am sure if they could buy a couple of potash mines at their own price they wouldn't pass this Bill and some of us have already said that and I don't doubt but that would be true. I say this, it is our responsibility as an Opposition when we think bad legislation is going to hurt the people of Saskatchewan, the future of Saskatchewan, and it is brought before the Legislative Assembly, it is our responsibility to fight that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I believe the Government has a responsibility too. And that is in legislation as vital and as important as this to give all the time necessary to allow public opinion for and against to be marshalled. To give all the time necessary and all the information necessary; to give us time alone, without giving us the information on which to base our judgment, is almost meaningless. One of the reasons, one of the reasons that we are continuing this debate as long and as hard as we can is to bring the Government to its senses, to recognize its responsibility and lay on the table before this House and before the public some evidence that they have seriously studied all the aspects of the potash industry, of the potash industry takeover, the financial implications, the market implications, what it will do or not do to the future of investment in this province. What it will do to the political climate, not just in 1975 and 1976, but on into the 80s and 90s as well. Because what you are doing Premier Blakeney (and your Government is going to live in this province for good or bad long after you and I and the Members of this House have passed by and passed out of this House, long after that), you are putting on the books a piece of legislation that for good or bad, for bad I would say, will haunt the people of this province for a long, long time to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — And yet how many people over there have even bothered to enter the debate. Mr. Speaker, I say the Government's performance in this debate is nothing short of disgraceful. We have heard from how many? We have heard from one, two, three, four, five, six Cabinet Ministers, that's all. We have yet to hear in this debate, we have yet to hear from the Hon. E. Cowley, the man who is going to be the Minister in charge, the chairman, of the board of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. In fact, he should be the man piloting the Bills through. Under any normal circumstances the man responsible should be putting the Bills through. Why isn't he? I say for the same reason that at the last session when a Bill was brought forward to force the Saskatchewan Power Corporation workers back to work. It wasn't the Minister who was chairman of the board of the Power Corporation, it was the Attorney General. Why? I'll tell you why. Because the Minister in charge who is no longer here, Kim Thorson, had given verbal and I think honest commitments to that union, and if we got into Committee of the Whole we could have asked that man questions.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Order. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is going to relate to this particular resolution the question of what would have been said

on the Committee of the Whole two sessions ago on the debate of Bill 28, but it is a little tenuous and perhaps he could help us a bit as to just how this is relevant to the debate under discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have been contemplating that matter as well, how the Leader of the Opposition is intending to relate his remarks to the extension of hours in this Assembly. Now I admit I was with him for a while, but I've lost him, or he has lost me. If he could relate his remarks to the extension of the hours, I think it would accommodate everybody.

MR. MALONE: — On the Point of Order, I believe the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake made very clear when talking about this Bill he was saying that if we could expect to hear from some of those Members opposite we may consider voting in favor of this motion. He used the example of the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan who has said nothing in this debate. He used that example and compared it to the ex-Minister of Industry, Mr. Thorson, who took a similar position under Bill 42. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member is perfectly in order in the remarks that he was making as he set the ground work for those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: — I don't think that I accept the Member's comments. I think that every Member in this House has the complete freedom to express his remarks early in the debate, late in the debate, or not at all, and that's not a point that the Leader of the Opposition can make in speaking to this Resolution that he is trying to make time available for them to speak. They will speak if they want to speak, I don't care what side of the House they are on. Consequently, I don't think that is a legitimate point. I think the point is well taken that the Member should relate to the motion before us.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, surely it's a point to make in a debate involving potash - I'm speaking to the Point of Order - it's a point to make in speaking to this debate which involves potash which the Member tied in, the point is that the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has yet to speak. Surely that is something for the House to consider.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think there are some assumptions being made in this particular debate that don't necessarily have to be true. Those assumptions are that you want more time so that people can consider the potash bills, but potash bills are not the only bills before the House. There are other bills before the House.

MR. MALONE: — One.

MR. SPEAKER: — Oh, no, there are a number of Bills if you will check the Blues, you will find them there. Agreed, there is only one more on adjourned debates, but there are a number on second readings or are about to begin second readings. I suggest to the Members that it is the general work of the House that this

particular motion is brought forward for. I think the Members should agree that they address themselves to the motion.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I will make the connection immediately. The connection is simply this, that we are convinced that the motive behind this motion to extend the hours is to force the Opposition, to force us to collapse our opposition, our legitimate opposition to this Bill in a matter of a few days so they can arrive at their goal, so they can achieve their stated boasted goal, first by the Attorney General and then by the Premier and as recently by the Premier as of today, as he was quoted - "we'll get this Bill through by Christmas".

Now, I don't know what Christmas he was talking about. Is it Ukrainian Christmas, Roy? Maybe you got a point. But Irish Christmas, you'll never make it, believe me.

But the point I . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — It's an objective!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make here is that it is unbelievable to me that at this stage of the debate of these Bills, have we heard from the Minister who will be in charge of this very large and tremendously important corporation, the Hon. Member for Biggar? I am convinced that part of the motive in early sittings, elongated hours, is to try and force us to collapse so that he won't have to, it is beginning to be embarrassing for him, he won't have to enter this debate. It goes back to the point I made as to question why he isn't (a) in the debate and; (b) he isn't leading the debate by taking the Bills to the House. The reason I am convinced is that when we get into Committee and we ask the Attorney General direct questions, which would have to be answered by the Minister, who is the chairman of the Potash Corporation and has been involved a great deal, he would have to answer those questions truthfully. The same thing in that famous debate forcing the Power workers back to work, we have the precedent, the Attorney General, I don't know. I guess he forgot to ask the other Minister. So there will be a cover-up, they will force the Bill through Committee stage, without us having a chance to ask proper questions - at least we'll ask proper questions without having a chance to get proper answers.

If I thought, and if we thought that the lengthening of hours would in fact bring those Members out and if the Members opposite will stand up and say, 'yes I intend to enter fully in this debate; I intend to present facts and figures and studies that have been done, that I have been involved, I know about', I would say we would pass this motion, we would support it immediately and we would welcome morning sittings, because that is the kind of debate we want, we want information. The people of the province want information about this important move and they are not getting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — The debate about where the headquarters will be, there is no debate about where the potash capital of Saskatchewan is.

It is in Saskatoon, it is in the centre, the hub of the potash industry. Yet I find the Members for Saskatoon, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes), now a Minister of the Crown, according to my records, he has yet to enter debate on either Bill 1 or Bill 2. How will he face the thousands of people who depend on the potash industry in Saskatoon? Having not even had the courtesy, decency, or the responsibility to stand up and offer his viewpoint to this debate in this House. What about the other Members, Mr. Dyck? I am having great difficulty finding where they are from - we hope not from there for long.

MR. DYCK: — Saskatoon Mayfair!

MR. STEUART: — He may have entered in this debate, yes he did, he entered in this debate, which is more than some of the other Members for Saskatoon. The Member for Humboldt has he entered in the debate yet? Again, Humboldt, very close, adjacent to the potash area. I would think he would have something to say, both as the Minister of the Crown and as a Member from an area that is very dependent on the potash industry.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Members of the Government opposite, as I say, is a disgrace to the serious debate in this House and it indicates, as the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) pointed out, the arrogance of the Government opposite. It indicates the sort of sheep-like followers they have unfortunately, in the back benches who won't get up and speak and won't demand that they make public the facts and figures and studies to back up the decision to risk up to \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — It says a great deal about the Conservative MLAs just elected who in effect are supporting the Government, they are going to oppose the Bill. I am sure of this. I am sure Bill 1 and Bill 2 are as abhorrent to their basic philosophy as it is to ours, as it is to any decent and free thinking person in this province or in this country. But by their tactics and that is exactly what they are engaged in, just as we are engaged in, just as the Government is engaged in, and there is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with engaging or planning - plotting I was going to say, plotting is a good word - the tactics that you are going to use in this House. The Government has done that, they have said we are going to push this through, get it through, so people will forget, so we can get on with the job. We have said that we are going to do our job which is to oppose this and hope that the Government, because of the pressure of public opinion and because they have come to their senses, would slow down and taken another course.

The Conservatives have decided to take neither one of these courses. By refusing to put up any sensible opposition, by refusing to face the responsibility for which I say they were elected, they are playing into the hands of the Government, they are in fact going to lie down, let the Government roll over them, pass this legislation. I say if they do, they have seriously damaged any reputation they might have had. I say they are falling down seriously in their responsibility as elected Members. One or two of them have entered into the debate.

The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck), we haven't heard from him and we have potash in that area. The Member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham), he may not have any potash in that area, but they have oil. Make no mistake, if the Government gets away with this then all resources will fall in line next. So, Mr. Speaker, I find it unbelievable the Conservatives are taking the attitude they are taking and then stand up, as one of our Members said, for the Leader sanctimoniously to read us all a little lecture about our responsibilities in this House.

Now I'll quote for him a couple of pretty fair parliamentarians and one of them was Winston Churchill. Winston Churchill said that when the Opposition thinks the Government is wrong, their duty is to oppose, oppose, oppose. I'll point out the life story of John Diefenbaker, who has been without a doubt the outstanding Opposition Member. Some people might argue whether he has been the most outstanding Prime Minister this country ever had, but I don't think you will find many arguments in any quarter, from any side of the political fence, that he has been the most outstanding Member of the Opposition you have ever seen sit in the House of Commons on any side of the fence.

Can you imagine John Diefenbaker lying down on this Bill? Can you imagine John Diefenbaker sitting silent while the Government used its steamroller tactics to do what they are doing here? To jeopardize the very future of resource development in this province. To use their powers to go in and seize and take over, giving themselves more power over one segment of our industry, one segment of society, one group of people, than they give the police when they try to track down criminals. Do you think John Diefenbaker would sit silently by? Of course he wouldn't. He would be on his feet and he would be pointing the finger of scorn and I am sure he is pointing the finger of scorn at his namesakes here in this Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROMANOW: — He would oppose, but he wouldn't obstruct.

MR. STEUART: — Well, let's get on to that whether he would oppose or whether he would obstruct. What is the responsibility of an Opposition. Well, surely the responsibility of an Opposition is to support the Government when they think they are right and we do that.

Bill 16 is a rent control Bill and we think at this time it is necessary, it is repugnant, but it is necessary and we have already indicated that we intend to support it. The job of the Opposition, that when they think that a Bill or a policy can be improved, is to bring in amendments. Surely we are doing that. Again, I will use Bill 16 as an example. We are going to, and we intend to bring in amendments to try and make it a better Bill. Already the Premier and other Members of the Government have indicated that they have been impressed by some of the suggestions that have been made with regard to that very Bill.

But the final responsibility of an Opposition is when they think the Government is wrong is to oppose them and oppose them with everything they have got and that is exactly what we are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — What is the responsibility of the Government? Well, surely it is to bring forth legislation, bring about reforms of changes that they think are in the best interests of the people. And I don't deny, won't deny for one moment that if Bill 1 and Bill 2 and this motion in front of the Legislative Assembly to force these Bills through quickly, the Government is sincerely doing what they think is in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. I don't doubt that. But what I do doubt, and what I do object to, is the cynical manner in which they are attempting to do it and I object. The Government's responsibility is to govern. The Government has got a greater responsibility than that, or coupled with that they have a very serious responsibility and that is to make sure, to be positive, that they use their majority properly, that they do not use the majority they have got to bulldoze Opposition, to frighten Opposition, to withhold solid, sensible, necessary information from either the Opposition and through them to the public when they are contemplating or bringing before the Legislative Assembly very serious and very vital changes.

Now what implements does the Government have? What implements does Government have when they are given a mandate by the people? Of course, the greatest implement they have, the greatest weapon they have is the majority. They have a majority of Members in this Legislative Assembly. So eventually, sooner or later, they will have their way. That's proper. But they have some other weapons that aren't quite so savoury. The majority and their final vote is a weapon, is a power given to them under the democratic system and as long as they use it sensibly and with responsibility everyone recognizes that it's good and necessary. But they have some other weapons. One of them is closure. Now they don't want to use that weapon. They don't want to use that weapon because it's naked power at its worst and only should be used and only must be used in very extreme circumstances and the track record of governments who have used closure, have resorted to closure in this country as a parliamentary device to shut off proper opposition, their track record in getting re-elected is pretty sad. So this Government doesn't want to use closure unless it's forced to the wall.

But there is another form, another weapon they have and that is the one they are engaged in right now. That is to lengthen the hours of debate.

Now this isn't the first government that has done this, not the first time they have done this. Lengthen the hours of debate to wear down, to push down, to wear out the Opposition. To sit there and refuse to take part in debate and just put their bills on the table and say, okay boys go to it, talk yourselves to death and when you have finally used up all 15, and you have used up any amendments that can be passed by the Speaker as in order, we will calmly sit here and listen you out and then we'll use our huge majority to steamroller and vote you down.

Now that's a form of closure. We've seen it, it's a subtle form and it's a form of closure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I charge this Government already, this Session with that.

What we are talking about is Christmas recess and getting home for Christmas. As far as I'm aware most people who work in this province work up until 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock on the 24th of December and then they get off and they have December 25 and December 26 and December 27 and 28th, they have a holiday. They go home to their families, if that's what turns them on. We haven't got any problem there. I'm sure the Government isn't going to introduce legislation that we sit on Christmas Day or Christmas Eve, or Boxing Day, I'm sure they won't. They would even outdo Scrooge in that regard and I'm sure they will not go to that length.

No matter how long it takes in this Legislative Assembly, we've only begun this Session of the Assembly. We've only begun it. We haven't even, how many days have we sat? Twenty-four days, twenty-four sitting days. Now that's not very long. Twenty-four sitting days, we've considered a Speech from the Throne, we have considered some legislation, we've heard private Members' resolutions debated. I think it's been very lovely.

MR. ROMANOW: — Half of a session!

MR. STEUART: — He said half of a session. There is some limit? I wasn't aware of that Mr. Attorney General. The Attorney General informs the House from his seat, that there is some limit, 48 days. I'm not aware that there is any limit. In fact, I'm quoting the Premier, when he said on another occasion, we said, you know you are bringing in some legislation at the end of the session. I recall the Premier saying, what's the end of session? Nothing wrong with us going to June, July, August, there is no limit on the session.

However, there can be a limit to how long Members in the Opposition, with a relatively few numbers, can keep up opposition to a bill. We know that. So lengthening of hours . . . Well, some of us older virile ones are not doing too badly either. I'm not sure what virile means, but I'll look it up. If it means what I think it does, thank you very much. Eunice will be glad to hear about it.

These are the powers of the Government, make no mistake. Lengthening of hours, I've seen that Government opposite keep us at night. Now not only in the morning, but the next step, Mr. Speaker, if this debate continues will be, say, to extend the hours until one, until two, until three o'clock in the morning. It has happened in the history of this House. So make no mistake. Lengthening hours is a not so subtle form of closure. When the Hon. Member who introduced this motion stood up, very calmly and said, you know, why do we want this motion? We want it so all the Members will have the opportunity to speak and somebody said, you know, we know he's a lawyer, but he should have been an actor. The stage lost a great actor. because we know what he said in the corridors, I'll drive those . . . to the wall. I'll push this Bill through.

Now if he can extend the hours in the morning and that doesn't sound unreasonable, what's to prevent him from extending them on in the evening. It's been done before. So make no mistake, make no mistake. Lengthening of hours is a form of closure and that's exactly what that Government is engaged in, in this Motion, if it passes in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned powers of the Government and the responsibility of the Government and the responsibility of the Opposition. Now what weapons does the Opposition have? Well, the Opposition doesn't have very many weapons where you have a majority government, but they have some. They have debate, where if they make good debating points, it's possible to convince the Members of the Government, or MLAs who are supporters of the Government, so that they will go into caucus and convince their colleagues in the Cabinet to change direction or change a bill. If you can make good points the Government recognizes that the amendment you are proposing will strengthen any bill or any act and in that way the Opposition makes a very positive contribution. And we have seen this happen, and again in this Session, this short Session so far. Bill 16, we have said and I think the Conservatives have said the same thing that they support the principle of this Bill 16, but they are going to introduce some amendments. So we've already had the word of the Government that they intend to look seriously at these amendments. This is another weapon that is given to the Opposition to carry out their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest single weapon that is given is put in the hands of the ordinary Members, whether they be Opposition Members or whether they be Government Members, supporters of the Government, and that is public opinion. The final analysis, the only things really in the final analysis that keep government on the straight and narrow, that keeps them democratic, that keeps them open, that keeps them honest, is public opinion. They know if they ignore it long enough they do it at their peril and they will be defeated at the polls. Now public opinion must be roused if the Opposition is convinced the course of action being followed by the Government is wrong, they have a very serious responsibility to try and rouse public opinion. Now public opinion is slow. Public opinion takes time to arouse. To begin with, the Government introduces a piece of legislation, it is reported in the daily Press, it is reported on the television, it is in competition with all other news events, it's in competition with everything else that happens. It goes unnoticed by and large in the first instance, except by those people who are vitally interested.

Now we have Bills 1 and 2 introduced by the Government and the Government hopes that they'd pass with little or no debate, get lost in the general shuffle and happiness of Christmas, and be forgotten, except by the potash industry and a few other concerned people in the New Year and the NDP would have accomplished their purpose. We say our responsibility is when we think the Bill is wrong. If we don't think it's wrong, if we don't think what the Government's doing is not in the best interest of the public, then of course, opposition of any kind would be wrong, whether it's short, difficult or long. But when we are convinced, as we are now, that what we are doing is right, what we are doing is just, what we are doing is in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan, then we not only have the right, but we have the responsibility to fight and fight as hard as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — So, Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest single weapon that the Opposition has and that is to arouse public opinion. And I say under this Motion, by literally reducing the number of

days that this debate would normally take if we follow the normal hours, they are in fact attempting to quell opposition, they are attempting to stifle opposition, they are attempting to push this Bill rapidly through so that opposition that is already mounting to the Bill will not have a chance to grow any further.

I am going to tell them about opposition that's already mounting, and how we are succeeding in what we set out to do, and I make no apologies. In fact, I'm proud of it.

The Attorney General undertook to threaten the Chamber of Commerce, the people of Saskatoon, because he said the Chamber of Commerce, who basically are believers in freedom of enterprise, that's their reason for being, had the gall from his point of view and temerity to oppose the Government so he spanked them.

Well now, very interesting. I've learned today that the Regina Chamber of Commerce, who came out as opposed to this idea, because it wasn't a Bill then when it was brought out in the Throne Speech, have now gone further and they have written to the Government, and they will receive it today or tomorrow (it's no secret - they have written to the Government) strongly opposing the actions the Government is contemplating in pushing through Bill 1 and Bill 2.

Just as an aside, which I will connect with this Motion very quickly, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be very interesting when all these Boards of Trade decide that they are going to stand up and be counted and show a little intestinal fortitude, which I think most of them will. They are going to have a very interesting time if all of the Chambers of Commerce decide to oppose, as I hope they will, and it is their responsibility. I don't know where they will put the head office. I suggest that they will put it exactly where it is now, in Regina, on Scarth Street, and they have no intention of changing it, and Henry can rest content because that's where it is and that's where it will stay. However, the point I want to make, because there has been some time taken, opposition is beginning to mount and that's healthy and it's democratic and that's why we are doing this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, one of the catcalls, one of the charges we get continually is that we are filibustering, as if filibustering by its very nature was something un-Canadian, immoral, slightly tainted and always bad. Yes, American.

MR. ROMANOW: — Purely American!

MR. STEUART: — Well, purely American. Let us not take the attitude that all things American are bad - my mother was an American and I have a very fond remembrance of her. So there are many things that are American that are great wonderful institutions, including apple pie and motherhood. Now filibustering is a name given when people in an elected assembly, whether it's the Congress, the Senate or the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly in Regina undertake to hold up legislation for a great length of time. Now I don't think that anyone in honesty can

say that holding up legislation, when we have considered the Throne Speech and Private Members' Day and we have only sat not even fully 24 days, can be really termed a first-class filibuster. But even if it is, even if it is, I'm quite prepared to have it termed a first-class filibuster, because there's nothing I'd rather filibuster against than these two Bills.

When we said we would hold up Bill 2 until you gave us the figures, you gave us the figures, or you promised to give them. You have given some vague figures and the Premier has made a sort of Philadelphia lawyer's promise that he will give us some more. (I say Philadelphia lawyer because I think they are famous or infamous for the weasel-words that they put in the promises they make, the number of doors they leave so they can scuttle back out of if they find they have painted themselves into a corner). However, we've got about as strong a commitment as you ever get from Premier Blakeney that we'll get a firm figure. We've made some headway. Not as much as we intend to make, not as much as satisfies us, because there are just a whole host of things that an honest, open, sincere, government would be laying on the table, would have already laid on the table, studies, feasibility studies, cost studies, analysis of markets, and so on. The studies they must have taken as a responsible government before they arrived at the decision to launch on this multimillion course, this fantastic risk.

MR. ROMANOW: — How many studies did you have on prorationing? Tell us that.

MR. STEUART: — We discussed prorationing, we discussed prorationing as long as anybody wanted to discuss it, and as a matter of fact, it is a far cry, Mr. Attorney General, from prorationing to seizing and taking over and confiscating an industry. Now if you don't know the difference then God help the people of Saskatchewan. You are the Number One law enforcer in this province, supposed to be, and if you don't know the difference between those two Acts, then I say that you are a pretty, pretty bad choice for Attorney General and you have a very peculiar outlook on the role of government.

Now to return, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that the question before the House is whether the debate is in order with the Resolution that's before us. I'm having increasing difficulty with the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in relating what he is saying to the subject in the Resolution, which deals exclusively with the extension of the hours of the sitting of this House. I have brought this to the attention of the Member before and I do it again in the hope that he will relate closely to the Resolution that is before us.

I would admit that a lot of your remarks may be relevant to Bill 1, and are not relevant to this.

MR. STEUART: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will return immediately to the point and stay there, unswervingly from now on.

As I was saying, one of the reasons that we oppose this Resolution in its present form is that we are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it will cut off debate in the final analysis. We are really seriously convinced of this, thoroughly convinced. And we think that debate, elongated debate, has a place in this Legislative Assembly when the Opposition is sincerely, firmly, wholeheartedly convinced that what the Government is doing is wrong, just as we are, and I mean that very seriously. I can't be more serious, I can't be more sincere when I say that we are not opposing this, we are not staying in this Legislative Assembly because we like to sit here or we like to obstruct. We are doing this because we feel with every fibre in our being, and I mean this, that this is wrong and we must oppose it and we must oppose by every possible legal means. That's what we are doing, every possible legal and moral means to persuade the Government to change its mind and change its course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Let me give you . . . this has happened before. If I thought, Mr. Speaker, that by opposing this Motion in a larger sense, attempting to get the Government to let the debate go on in the normal way, if I thought that what we are doing is of no purpose, I wouldn't do it, neither would the Members on this side of the House. I will use a couple of examples. One in the United States, one that stands out in my mind very clearly when the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt attempted to back the Supreme Court, went before the Senate and the Senate filibustered that Bill and held it up for weeks. Public opinion roused up and convinced that very reasonable President that he should not embark on this course and shouldn't have done in a fit of pique because they had thrown out some of the legislation he had put on the books. That filibuster, I say, was a milestone in the political history at that time in the United States.

Now I shall go to Canada - the famous or infamous pipeline debate. The Government of that day, a Liberal Government, bringing in a pipeline that has been one of the blessings of Canada, no one argues that the pipeline hasn't been a great thing for Canada. But attempting to do exactly what you are attempting to do, ram it through the House, set themselves deadlines, their own deadlines, no deadlines were set by anyone else, the late C.D. Howe, a great Canadian, too much in a hurry in his latter days, set himself an artificial deadline and attempted to override the Opposition. The Conservatives of that day, I would point out to the Conservative Members here, and the NDP Members of that day, filibustered and they did it honorably, and they brought down the Government of that day. Now we might on this side think it wasn't a good thing, I wasn't all that convinced that it wasn't a good thing at the time, but I will say that those Canadians as they voted very shortly after, obviously thought it was a good thing. I point those two classic examples out for both Members, . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Flag debate, this debate is the same kind.

MR. STEUART: — Well, again, Mr. Speaker, with all deference the Attorney General has shown his priority. He has shown the depth of this intellect, or the lack of depth. If he can compare

a debate on what kind of flag we'll have flying, as serious as it is, to a debate that is going to seize and take over a potash industry and gamble hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, and I say to help to destroy the political climate, then I have real questions about his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Mr. Leader of the Opposition, what you are discussing here has no relevance to the Motion that's before the House and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to deal with the extension of the hours for sitting of the House. And reciting the attendance record of the House, or the SPC, or Bill 42, or obstruction, or filibustering, really has very little to do with this Resolution which is extension of the hours.

I agree, some of your remarks have been in order, but in the majority they have been out of order, not in relation to the Resolution.

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak, if I may, to that Point of Order, please.

Mr. Speaker, what was happening at the moment you ruled the Leader of the Opposition out of order, is that he was responding to a continuous verbal barrage from the Attorney General while he was making his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — All right - tear it up, tear it up, he's entitled to do it. Except that he directs them occasionally to the members of the Press and except that he gets reported when he makes those comments, and here is one from yesterday to illustrate my point:

On occasion during the speech Mr. Romanow had called on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! That is not the Point of Order. I ask the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake to continue if he intends to.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Hon. Attorney General admits that he is ashamed of his performance. He should be ashamed of his performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Contempt of Parliament!

MR. STEUART: — There is no Member on any side of the House who tries to get more cheap shots for publicity than the Hon. Member for Saskatoon and he's very good at it too. He shouldn't try to be sort of stand up and say . . . back to the Motion, Mr. Speaker, back to the Motion.

I just want to say in conclusion, that this Government's move of attempting to lengthen the hours and they will eventually

use their great majority to lengthen the hours, and I want to . . . no! I won't say that, I just thought of something that was out of order and I decided not to say it, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to reply to that - contempt of Parliament, if there is any man on any side that has contempt of Parliament and the democratic process, it's the Attorney General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Twisted speeches, threatening speeches, ramrod things, ramrod things through this House. If you didn't have the safest seat in Saskatoon, where anybody could be elected as an NDP, they could run a two-headed cow in your seat and get him elected NDP, you would have been defeated years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, the Government's move to lengthen the hours, (they almost did in that other seat), the Government's move is for only one purpose and they stand condemned. They stand out clearly to every thinking person to see, naked in their power, they stand for everyone to see, that they are forcing the Members on this side, attempting to force their will, their huge majority, their unthinking majority by lengthening the hours and shutting off normal, honest, democratic debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Shut him off!

MR. STEUART: — They say that we are attempting to obstruct. Again, I go back, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that we are quite prepared for morning sittings, we are quite prepared to lengthen the hours of sittings, if they can show us that they need to get this Bill through, as they do need to for Bill 16. Bill 16 we recognize that there is some merit in getting that on the books to end the uncertainty. We are prepared to let it go through, get into Committee, and get it through and get it on the law books so that people can accustom themselves to it and it can be at least one small step by the Government in joining the rest of Canadians, thinking Canadians, in the fight against inflation. But where hundreds and millions of dollars are concerned, where the rights of citizens are concerned, where the freedom and the basic rights of citizens are being trampled on when they lengthen these hours and they force this Bill on the public, in cases like that I say it is our responsibility to fight and fight as long as we can. And I ask the Government, I ask the Government if they are sincere. If they are sincere in wanting to give open, public debate to take this Bill, this motion, stand it or vote themselves against it, or have the Attorney General stand and withdraw and then let their Members rise in their place, all afternoon, the Ministers who haven't spoken, the Member for Saskatoon and take part in this debate. Let the Premier, or the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley), or the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), who is piloting the Bill through, as the reason we are lengthening these hours. Let them lay on the table the studies, and the facts and the figures. We still won't agree with what they are doing. Mr. Speaker, I say very clearly that we couldn't hold those Bills up any longer than it was necessary to finish this debate, put the Bills in Committee, attempt to get them amended and then pass them. I say if you

would move what we legitimately asked from day one in this debate and what the Press is asking for and what the public is asking for and that is open up, be honest, play fair, come clean. Take the gloves off if you have nothing to hide. What have you got to hide? Put the facts on the table. If you put the facts on the table, we can judge your motives, we can judge the clarity of your reason, we can judge whether it is or is not a good economic deal and a good business deal. Then debate, I guarantee a debate will proceed very briskly and we will proceed to pass the necessary stages of these two Bills and get on with the business of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this Motion that was presented by the Attorney General. I came here this afternoon hoping that the Attorney General would be in one of his more rational moments and give us an explanation as to why these added hours are required.

The Attorney General rose at about 3:30 o'clock, unfortunately with tongue set firmly in cheek and gave us an explanation as to why this Motion was required that was completely against the statement he made to the Press and the media that had been reported to me yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I feel like the other Members on this side of the House that there is only one reason for this Motion to be before us and that is to assist the Government to ram Bill 1 and Bill 2 down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — I think that my opinion, Mr. Speaker, has been confirmed by the Premier's remarks as reported on radio today when he indicated that he wanted these Bills through by Christmas. Mr. Speaker, if the Premier denies, if he denies that is what he said, or if any of the Members opposite feel that that is not true, they have had more than ample opportunity to rise today and dispute it. They have sat there and said nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for this Motion if I had had an assurance from the Attorney General that with the extra hours of debate that the Motion provided that we would have heard from a few people, that we would have heard from the Premier on these two debates, which we have not yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — I would have voted for this Motion if the Attorney General had assured me that the Premier was going to rise on either Bill 1 or Bill 2 to try and justify his slander of the potash companies. The Premier has called them in effect liars, he has brought no evidence before this Chamber to justify those remarks. I would have voted for this Motion if I had known that the Premier was going to give us evidence of the truth of what

he said, or in the alternative, withdrawn those statements.

Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for this Motion if I had had assurance from the Attorney General or the Members opposite that we may have had had the Minister of Finance rise in the extra hours we would be voting for, to explain where the money was going to come from to finance the takeover of the potash companies. To explain where \$1 billion was going to be raised. To be explained the amount of interest that had to be paid on that money. To explain where the money was coming from, what banks, what countries. We have not heard from the Minister of Finance.

MR. B. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Point of Order. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have sat here for three hours this afternoon and perhaps ten minutes of that three hours the Hon. Members opposite have spoken to the question. They are filibustering by making a mockery of the rules of this House and I think you should jump . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the observations of the Member tends to be accurate because I have drawn attention to the fact several times during the afternoon that the Members have strayed from the topic before us and I would ask the Member who is speaking now to adhere closely to the resolution which deals with the extension of the sitting hours in this Assembly.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the Motion precisely and exactly. Everything I have said today I have prefaced with an explanation as to why I'm saying it. I am telling this House and I am telling you, Sir, why I would have voted for this resolution if we would just receive some explanation from the Attorney General.

I would have voted for this resolution, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General had assured us when he rose that the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was going to enter the debate in the extra hours or at any other time to explain the risk, explain where the markets are if the potash is going to be mined in the years ahead.

I would have voted for this Motion, Mr. Speaker, if during the extra hours that this Motion deals with, if we had assurance the Minister of Industry would have risen in this debate and told us about the future development in the Province of Saskatchewan. If he would tell us about what effect this would have on the future industry of the Province of Saskatchewan. We have not heard from him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for this Motion if I had had some indication that the Minister of Education was going to rise in this debate to tell us what those people in his constituency who work for potash corporations, who work in potash mines would think about this legislation.

I would have also voted for this Motion, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour had taken part in this debate, or was going to take part in this debate and tell this House what the trade union people in the potash mines think about this

legislation. We have not heard from him, Mr. Speaker.

I would also have voted for this Motion, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who did rise, I acknowledge that he rose the other night, but he rose and told us what the tax situation was going to be in rural municipalities once the Government takes over the potash mines. We haven't heard from him either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — I also would have been voting for this Motion if we had heard from the Minister of Health and the Minister of Social Services in this extra time that we are considering to state their opinion as to the Attorney General's threats to the Board of Trade in Saskatoon. I wonder what they think of what the Attorney General says. We haven't heard from them either.

And this is most important, Mr. Speaker, most important. I would be voting for this Motion if we had an assurance that the Minister of Mineral Resources was going to enter this debate. And, Mr. Speaker, to tell us what is going to happen to the Energy Fund in this province, an energy fund that was to be used for the exploration for oil, uranium, coal, natural gas. We have not heard from him either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the Motion after I propose an amendment to it, an amendment that will not change the substance of the Motion in any manner whatsoever, an amendment that will, I am sure, be greeted by the Members opposite with some consideration because it does not in any way suggest that we are going to be sitting any less hours than suggested by the Attorney General. The amendment, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — You wouldn't put a closure on!

MR. MALONE: — Did you want to say something, Roy?

MR. ROMANOW: — You wouldn't put a closure on us, would you, you would allow us to respond to that?

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, there are several other speakers to follow me on the amendment. Now if the Attorney General wants to call that closure, let him call it closure. But I'll tell the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, that we are opposed to Bill 1 and Bill 2 and we are going to fight Bill 1 and Bill 2 as long as we can and in any manner we can. If they want to call that filibuster, that is fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, if it had not been for the interruptions of the Attorney General and the Members opposite I would have had time to put my amendment to you. However, I see that it is now 6:30 o'clock and I call it 6:30 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, interrupted the proceedings and the Assembly adjourned at 6:30 o'clock p.m.