

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session - Eighteenth Legislature**  
**25th Day**

**Tuesday, December 18, 1975.**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the House, approximately 18 Grade Twelve students from Sheldon Williams high school seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are led here today by their teacher, Mr. Cochrane. I hope they will find the proceedings this afternoon both enjoyable and informative.

I hope to meet with them later in the day to try and answer any questions they may have.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**STATEMENT**

**REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF REMARKS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I have a statement which I should like to make.

A point of Order was raised by the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to the effect that he had been misquoted during the debate. I have checked the unofficial verbatim record and do not feel that either the Rules or the Privileges of the Assembly were broken. I might add that the Member could have risen on a point of correction at the end of the remarks of the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant).

The Hon. Member for Nipawin rose on a further Point of Order to the effect that the Member for Regina Wascana made a personal attack during his remarks. I have checked the record and feel that a personal attack was made when the Member for Regina Wascana mentioned:

"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."

I refer all Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, cit. 149 (f), page 127, which states that a Member should not refer to the personal conduct of Members. I therefore request the Member for Regina Wascana to withdraw his remarks and avoid any personal attacks in the future.

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to abide by your ruling. Only for purposes of clarification, am I to withdraw

the remark that he was connected with the Bessborough or am I to withdraw the allusion that he treats the House in the manner that one might treat a chambermaid. I think quite clearly the allusion to the Bessborough may be improper and I don't know from your Honour's ruling whether I am to withdraw both or simply the reference to the Bessborough Hotel.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the House would probably be quite prepared to accept an unconditional withdrawal. If the Member wishes to make a connection with the Bessborough at a later date, he may make it, if he thinks it is in order.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — I withdraw the remarks, Mr. Speaker.

## QUESTIONS

### HAS GOVERNMENT PURCHASED INTEREST IN NOVAPHARM

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. Is it true that the Government of Saskatchewan or one of its agencies, or Crown corporations has purchased a 25 per cent interest in an Ontario corporation known as NovaPharm, a generic drug house? And is it further true that other generic drug houses which have been submitting confidential tenders for the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan are now concerned that they will no longer be able to submit tenders on a confidential basis since they will be in competition with the tender opener, thereby, alienating or eliminating the tender practice of gaining drugs for the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan which will in turn substantially increase the costs for the citizens of Saskatchewan?

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has asked me two questions. One, has a government agency acquired an interest in NovaPharm, and the second question was, is it true that other drug companies are concerned and alarmed, however he phrases it.

May I say with respect to the second question that that is not within the purview of the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't know whether other drug companies are concerned or alarmed and what they may be concerned or alarmed about.

With respect to question number one, I have no knowledge whatever of the purchase of any interest in NovaPharm or so far as I am aware in another prescription drug company by an agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then is the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies or Crown corporations presently negotiating with the owners of NovaPharm or in any way discussing the possibility of obtaining an interest in NovaPharm?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any negotiations but if

I were I would not advise the Hon. Member.

I think it is reasonably clear that if there are negotiations which are still in the negotiation stage for the purchase of an enterprise, and I don't know anything about NovaPharm, but I want to make the point with respect to other enterprises, it will rarely be in the public interest to report the day to day status of the negotiations. I make that point. With respect to NovaPharm I am aware of none.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, a second supplementary then. It is our information that these negotiations are underway or that they have been concluded. My second supplementary is; what possible justification could the Government of Saskatchewan have in using money belonging to the people of Saskatchewan to invest in Ontario corporations or in fact in any corporation whose place of business, job creation possibility and so on, are outside the boundaries of the Province of Saskatchewan? And further is it possible that the Members opposite in keeping with the Premier's interest in high stake poker have introduced the potash nationalization scheme as an elaborate smoke screen to cloud the Government's activities in these other areas?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on whether that is an appropriate supplementary.

I am not aware of any current negotiations with respect to NovaPharm. I am not in a position to say whether or not at some time in the past there have been negotiations on NovaPharm. I am not thoroughly acquainted with every negotiation that might have been carried on in the past. With respect to whether or not it would be appropriate for the Government of Saskatchewan to invest in an organization which has substantial holdings outside the province, I don't know whether there would be reasons for that. It may be that the Hon. Member would like to direct his question to Premier Davis who will probably tell him why Ontario Hydro is investing in a substantial way in Saskatchewan. Or to Premier Lougheed who will tell him why the Government of Alberta is investing substantially in Pacific Western Airlines with major holdings in British Columbia.

### **REGINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONCERNED RE POTASH TAKEOVER**

**MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, would the Premier confirm that he has received a letter from Regina Chamber of Commerce which reads in part:

The Board of Directors of the Regina Chamber of Commerce would like to register with you and through you to your Cabinet and the Government our deep concern with respect to the current potash controversy.

It is obvious that the Chamber cannot agree with this public enterprise philosophy in the development of any particular resource or undertaking. It is this aspect of the controversy that is most distressing for it may be potentially damaging to our economy.

That is the first paragraph. Also enclosed is a photostat of a

newspaper clipping, Thursday, November 13, which also registers the Regina Chamber of Commerce opposition to the potash nationalization.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I am sorry that I cannot confirm that. I certainly don't deny it, but I cannot confirm it since I don't recall that particular piece of correspondence. I would be happy to check up to see whether we received a piece of correspondence along that line.

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Regina Chamber of Commerce has spoken out against the proposed nationalization of the potash industry, will the Government and the Attorney General now be threatening to move the head office of the potash corporation out of Regina because the climate of the business community is as unfavorable to government action as is Saskatoon's?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I don't know how the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland measures climate, but at least in our judgment a simple letter which had not been made public before the Member for Saskatoon made it public, that I was aware of, does not quite fall into the same category, and would not probably influence the employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to the same extent as the activities of the Saskatoon Board of Trade.

I don't know whether anyone feels any great hostility with respect to the potash decisions in Regina. I don't feel any and the Mayor of Regina has been kind enough to say that he doesn't feel any.

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

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — It may well be therefore that the general climate of opinion in Regina is much more favorable to this than in Saskatoon.

#### **COMMERCIAL TOURIST FISHING CAMP ON DEWDNEY ISLAND**

**MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. What is the name of the commercial tourist fishing camp operated on Dewdney Island in Reindeer Lake in northern Saskatchewan?

**HON. T. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):** — Arctic Lodges Limited.

**MR. NELSON:** — A supplementary question. Are they licensed to operate a camp with the Government of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — I am not sure that I understood the question, but I think it was asking whether or not the Government or that Arctic Lodges were operating a joint camp on Dewdney Island. The answer to that question is No.

**MR. NELSON:** — The question Hon. Member is; have they a licence or lease to operate a camp from the Government of Saskatchewan or with the Government of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Arctic Lodges have a lease on Dewdney Island and are licensed as an outfitter.

**MR. NELSON:** — Second supplementary. Has the licence been renewed for 1976?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — I am not able to answer that question. I will certainly take it under advisement and let the Hon. Member know.

### **SEVEN CENT TAX REBATE ON FARM FUEL**

**MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance who is not in his chair so I will therefore address it to the Minister of Agriculture. Formerly there has been a rebate of seven cents per gallon to farmers and ranchers and agricultural people on the agricultural fuel consumed in their operations. I note that for this year, 1975, a maximum amount of \$200 has been placed as the top of the rebate. Could the Minister comment as to exactly what the thinking of the Government is in this measure?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the rebate has a limit of \$200 per farmer on it. We don't apologize for that for we feel that what we want to do in Saskatchewan is maintain the largest possible number of viable farmers. We are not interested in subsidizing large enterprises. As a result we have put a ceiling on the amount of dollars each farmer can get. We extended the number of dollars that goes to the smaller farm sector.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the seven cent rebate is still available at the pumps for commercial or pleasure vehicles etc., would the Minister care to comment as to why, in view of the fact that I would venture to say that probably 60 per cent of the farm fuel would exceed this \$200 level, why this discrimination against agriculture when it is available to the general public at the pumps?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't view this as discrimination. I think it is a decision on the part of the Government to spread the available funds that we have for that program to the best advantage of the small farm community. I don't apologize for that.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that the Minister by his lack of answer has almost admitted discrimination, may I then ask the Minister that in view of this very obvious discrimination against agriculture when it is available to the general public, will the Minister of the Government consider

restoring the same privilege to agricultural people?

**MR. KAEDING:** — I am sure that that is a better question directed to the Minister of Finance but all I can say to you is that we are not enamored with the idea of paying extended benefits to large farm operations. We don't think that is particularly of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. STEUART:** — What's a large farm?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, I think when you look at \$200 per unit that covers just about every average size farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan and those are the people whom we are attempting to protect. I think that our decision is a good one.

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **CHIEF ELECTOR REPORT OF EIGHTEENTH GENERAL ELECTION**

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to advise Hon. Members that I have received the report of the Chief Electoral Officer covering the 18th general election in 1975. I ask that reports be distributed on the desks of the Members. For the records of the House, I will table this copy.

## **QUESTION**

### **REGINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONCERNED RE POTASH TAKEOVER**

**MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder in view of the fact that I didn't get the opportunity to get a second supplementary question put, may I do that before we begin the Orders of the Day?

I address this to the Attorney General and the Premier that from the answers received to my question and the first supplementary that obviously the Government has a double standard in dealing with the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. I wonder if I could have the assurance that Saskatoon would receive equal consideration with Regina with respect to the location of the head office?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think the answer to that is, Yes. No one should for a moment think that equal consideration would not be given, and equal consideration means the consideration of all factors. Certainly one of the factors will be the general business climate and the likely acceptance of the organization in that city, but again as I said on earlier occasions, this is unlikely to be a major factor since it is likely that in the short time any community in Saskatchewan would welcome the head office of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

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

**MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to rise in debate of Bill 16, an opportunity that I thought I was going to have yesterday. However, we had a great day in the House yesterday and the opportunity to get at Bill 16 wasn't there.

The first thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government has taken a glaringly weak and a totally indefensible position which borders on irresponsibility in that it has not yet introduced in this House a comprehensive program to supplement the federal anti-inflation program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Despite the fact that inflation is the disease which most threatens the citizens of Saskatchewan and citizens of Canada, despite the fact that it is now two months since Prime Minister Trudeau announced the Government of Canada's intention to introduce an anti-inflation program, despite the fact that this Legislature has now been sitting for one month, there has been absolutely no indication that this Government has any overall anti-inflation program for Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — It is my considered view, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of evidence of any planning in this regard is paralleled only by the obvious lack of studies, feasibility studies in marketing or the economies of purchasing for the nationalization of the potash industry. The Government has waffled, and I indicate that term to indicate who, in my view, is calling the tune on this tissue. It has used every excuse it can find to do nothing. It has said that the federal program is now law. Why should we act when there is no law and yet other provinces have acted. It is said that there were no regulations, yet other provinces act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — It is argued that the duration of the program was too long, yet in the beginning a piecemeal approach to the inflation problem in Saskatchewan it introduces in its first piece of legislation a Bill which has no time limit and which can exist in perpetuity.

Mr. Speaker, I referred in an earlier debate to a lack of logic in the thinking of this Government. You will recall that in that instance I was suggesting that on the one hand Members opposite told this House how significant the potash takeover was and how it deserved long, long debate. We were told that the Government should not be expected to take the word of the

potash companies for the tax rate they are forced to accept and yet on the other hand the Government expects us to pass legislation quickly with no monetary restraints. Now I point that out as an indication of a lack of logic; the same kind of logic, Mr. Speaker, is being shown in this instance in Bill 16. The Provincial Government criticizes the Federal Government because the federal program is too long, and yet it introduces in this Bill proposed legislation with no time limit.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, attacks the problem of inflation in about the same manner that a toy water pistol would attack a forest fire. It's totally ineffective.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — We can only hope, along with thousands of Saskatchewan citizens that a comprehensive plan will eventually appear, and the best thing that can be said about the Government anti-inflation program is - better late than never.

I think one further point needs to be raised, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Government's inability to state a comprehensive anti-inflation program. In debate the other day with regard to a resolution introduced to suggest a study on the teachers' supply matter, questions were raised regarding our position on teachers' salaries. Our position is clear. Since the teacher collective bargaining legislation introduced by this Government forced the teachers into a compulsory two-year agreement and since during that time Saskatchewan teachers' salaries fell sharply behind neighboring provinces we contend that some catchup provision must be incorporated into the present round of bargaining. And we have accepted the principle of prairie averaging as stated by the former Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). A realistic analysis of that situation is such that common sense suggests the need for teachers' salaries to be competitive and one need not be a genius to see that.

One further point is clear, Mr. Speaker, it's the responsibility of the Government to introduce a comprehensive program, and in this responsibility the Government has failed and failed miserably. I suggest with respect, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite could for a change spend their time productively by dealing with the inflation problem in an all-encompassing way and for a change be of some service to the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Turning specifically to the Bill, an Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act, 1973, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I support the general intent of this piece of legislation. I think most Members of the House recognize that it is largely a motherhood issue and a few Members, if any, will object to the intent and most of the Members will agree with the Minister who introduced the Bill (Mr. Shillington) that at least it is a short-term solution to the problem. Not the best solution, however, as it could have been more fairly accomplished through a rent review board, with power to move against specific circumstances and specific people which could get at the gougers without attacking as well those who have been fair. Most of the Members will accept the principle of the Bill because they can likely state cases like this one.

I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker, from a Saskatoon renter who quotes the following rent increases on behalf of fellow renters in a particular apartment. These rent changes were proposed in early October and were to become effective January 1st. Rents that went from \$82.50 to \$165; from \$77.50 to \$165; from \$72.50 to \$150; from \$77.50 to \$190. These rent increases represent percentage rates of between 100 and 145 per cent. There is one thermostat to control the heat in all the apartments. Coin operated washing facilities, no dryer and no inside entrance from the suites to the basement. Clearly a case which demonstrates the need for some controls with regard to rent.

At the same time that we can cite examples of that sort, Mr. Speaker, we must also say, and I think say fairly, that there are many landlords who have treated their tenants fairly, who have not gouged their rents and who see to it that adequate services are provided. It is likely very fair to say that the latter represents the actions and the attitudes of most landlords in this province.

Section 55 (h) disturbs me, Mr. Speaker. This Section provides that all provisions of the Act, with the exceptions of Section 34 (a); 34 (b); 34 (c); 34 (d); 34 (e); 34 (f); Section 43; Section 49 (a); Section 53; and Section 55 (g) bind the Crown in right of Saskatchewan.

When we examine Section 34, it is obvious that the rent increases do not apply to the province. I am disturbed by this, Mr. Speaker, because of a situation, again from Saskatoon, where Government restraint is absolutely necessary. In one nursing home in my constituency where Level III care is provided, residents have been faced with the following types of rent increases. Rent in May, 1972 was \$300 a month and in October of 1975, \$795 per month. The increase over the past six months was \$85 per month last spring and \$120 per month this past October - an increase of \$205 a month in rent over the past six months.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If the Government expects the private sector to accept rent increases for landlords of ten per cent in 1975 and eight per cent in 1976, then the Government should accept them as well. I submit that not to do so detracts from the credibility of the Government in this specific piece of legislation and in this Government's overall attempt (if there is one) to fight inflation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — When he introduced the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister indicated the long-term solution to the problem of rents was further construction. The Premier later indicated that this Government has no desire to get into the construction industry and I want it known, Mr. Speaker, that I'm pleased with the statements of both the Hon. Members. The Minister in charge recognizes the need for construction and the Premier recognizes the best way for this to happen is to have the Government keep its nose out of the construction industry.

On the point of construction, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government realizes that there are signs that we are already on the road to recovery. In Saskatoon, for example, the

number of multi-dwelling starts in 1975 will be close to 1,000 which is just about double what it was in 1974. I dare say that the Member for Regina Victoria (Mr. Baker) if he were here would be able to confirm the same for the city of Regina.

I point this out, Mr. Speaker, because clearly the long-term solution to the problem is increasing the number of building starts so that the supply of apartment units will exceed the demand. We must, therefore, make certain that this Bill will not act as a deterrent to this trend. And I submit that the best way to do that is to amend Section 27 so that termination of the legislation is an integral part of its passage. In my view the termination should be 18 months from the day of assent.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives too much power to the Cabinet, and that causes me some considerable concern.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Sweeping powers like those detailed in Section 3, Section 2 (d) and Section 55 (g) are cause for concern because these powers rightfully belong to the Legislature; they are too easily abused if they are kept the way they are; they invest considerable power in the rentalsman and the commission; they don't allow recourse to the courts, a provision which in my view and contrary to the view of the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway), should definitely be present. Section 2(d) and Section 3, Section 55 (g) give total operative power in this Act to the Cabinet. This matter was raised earlier by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and the Premier indicated they would take a look at these powers. I raise the matter again, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize our concern and to indicate that we are anxious to receive a response from the Premier in this regard.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Government, and particularly the Minister in charge will take note of these concerns and these questions, in addition to the questions and concerns raised by my colleagues. While we can be expected to support the Bill in principle, there are a number of matters that require clarification and amendment in committee.

For example, we want some detail about the size of the staff the Minister expects will be required to administer the Act, and further we expect to know the job specification of the staff that will be employed. We will also be placing amendments pending the reaction of the Premier limiting the power of the Cabinet. We expect a specific time limit to be placed on this legislation, and if the Government takes no initiative in this regard we will place an amendment to place the proposed legislation into a realistic time frame so that future construction will go forward and so that this Act does not become one which exists forever.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Bill in second reading.

**HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I just have a very few remarks I should like to make in closing the debate.

There has been a good deal said about the fact that this is sort of the only anti-inflation legislation so far which has come before this House. I am not sure how strictly relevant that is, but suffice to say that we still await the definitive word from the Federal Government.

The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons was quite correct when he said that the Act did not contain what the White Paper contained. The White Paper set out a fairly specific set of recommendations and a fairly specific proposal. The Act as introduced into the House of Commons left most of it to regulation. I'm not being particularly critical of the Federal Government for doing it by regulation. They are moving in a new area, an area in which they are somewhat unsure of themselves and they want flexibility to meet the day-to-day situations as they come up. But until the announcements are made this evening we are not going to know precisely what the federal program is and we have to have that before we can bring in a comprehensive anti-inflation program.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with a very large number of landlords, and some tenants, and when I said initially that I expected that the Act would meet with more enthusiasm from tenants than landlords, certainly my meetings bore that out. The landlords have made a number of suggestions and I want to deal somewhat briefly with the suggestions which they have made and how I think we ought to respond to them.

It has been suggested that there should be some form of minimum return guaranteed to the landlord. I want to deal with that because I think it's not as broad a problem as it might appear. I want to deal with it in just a bit of detail.

The Act, as you know, and the regulations which are passed there under will give a landlord the higher of his costs or ten per cent. The problem that might arise is if the landlord was suffering and was experiencing an actual operating loss in December, 1974, then presumably the higher of this cost or ten per cent would still leave him in the situation that would knock him into an operating loss and presumably might drive him into bankruptcy. And I think all we can say at this time is that I am attracted to that notion. The section that gives the Government power to pass regulations under the Act, those are grounds upon which the ten per cent ceiling can be waived and be broad enough to include that. And, as I say, we will give its fairness consideration, the last thing we want to do is drive any landlord into bankruptcy and it seems to be a fairly important argument. However, I discussed it with other people who say that it might be an administrative nightmare to try and do it.

Quite a number of people including many Members opposite have mentioned the exclusion of the right to appeal and that has been given some consideration too, and I have some sympathy for that as a lawyer. I suspect some of my colleagues and perhaps some Members opposite who aren't lawyers find that criticism less potent. But I do and the Premier mentioned the other night that we were prepared to give earnest consideration

to a right of appeal.

Now there are two avenues we might go. We simply repeal the section which prohibits the right of appeal. That would allow an appeal by what is known as a prerogative writ by errors on the fact of the record. I see certain problems in that and the thinking at the moment is that we might provide a right of appeal on a question of law to the Court of Appeal. It is a somewhat broader sort of appeal.

One rather difficult problem was the question of the limitations on the Act. Quite a number of landlords mentioned that to me and it has been mentioned by a fair number of speakers opposite. Suffice it to say that I believe that to place a limitation in the Act is to try and deal with a very complex problem with a simple solution and I just don't think it will work. There are a number of problems in it, the Premier mentioned one the other night.

Another one that concerns me is simply the mechanics of it. We are not sure at this point in time how long the Federal Government's anti-inflation program is going to last. The provinces are being allowed to sign up for 18 months and then you review it. If there is an 18 month limitation and the province decides to renew it all they have to do is sign the agreement. But if we place a limitation on the Act we have to deal with it by legislation and 18 months down the road puts us somewhere in the middle of June. The Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) suggested 22 months and that puts us in October and doesn't seem to me to solve very much. To place a limitation in the Act is awkward in a mechanical sort of a way.

I have said when I gave my speech moving this that it is a short term solution. It is not a long term solution. A long term solution would be a sufficient number of apartments. The Member for Nipawin said it was a temporary solution to a temporary problem. I hope he is right about it being a temporary problem. But a number of others have said the same thing and we recognize that, that the legislation locks in inequities, it preserves and in fact aggravates distortions that are already on the market and we believe that as soon as there is a sufficient number of apartments we will probably want to look at the Act with a view to repealing it or converting it into a rent review situation or something. To place a limitation on the Act I suggest to Members opposite simply won't work.

It was suggested by one Member, I believe it was the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) that the Government might be getting into the construction industry. That was dealt with by the Premier. I only echo that because we have no desire to get into the construction industry. Indeed, we may have our hands full with the potash industry without getting into the construction industry as well.

The question of future investment has been raised by a number of Members and I think at this point in time we are reviewing the question of how long the exemptions should last, whether it should be five years or whether or not that is a House amendment that might be brought in. I'll tell the Hon. Members and I can tell them no more that the five-year limitation is being reconsidered at this time. The matter will be dealt with further in Committee of the Whole on third reading.

I just want to deal with one or two other matters. The Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) suggested that a more appropriate approach might have been a rent review board. And I suggest to all Members of the House that in an age of wage and price controls that simply won't do. What the Member opposite who I think has supported wage and price controls is saying is that when you are looking at wages you control them, but rent you only review it. I said in my speech in reply to the Throne Speech that if the wage and price control is going to work it has got to be fair to all concerned and everyone has to be treated equally. I suggest that control the wages, review the rents is not treating people equally. That is one reason why we don't feel in the present situation a rent review board would be adequate.

I don't want to cover in great detail the question of why the Crown isn't bound, it was dealt with the other day on a question from another Member for Saskatoon. Suffice it to say that we feel that within the literal definition of a Residential Tenancies there are things that the Act was never designed to deal with. It was not designed to deal with YMCAs and hotels as I said. I say to the Member for Saskatoon Eastview, it wasn't designed to deal with nursing homes. And it wasn't designed to deal with the kind of tenancies that the Crown is involved in which might come within the definition.

One other question was raised and that question is the question of the size of the staff. I said outside the House and I have no objection to repeating it inside the House that our preliminary estimates are a staff of around 30 people. That, I think, is generally in line with the experience of the only other province which has had rent control, B.C. They apparently have about three times the number of apartments we do and they have about 90 people on staff. We are sort of in that ball park. I think a more appropriate time to get into that in detail might be in Estimates but I give you that information now if it is of interest to you.

In conclusion let me say, Mr. Speaker, as I said when I moved the Bill that we have tried to be fair to all concerned. I have met with a lot of people. I suggested to the Hon. Members some of the amendments we think we are going to be making to try to make the Bill as fair as possible and some of the things we might be doing later in regulations. I think this Bill when the dust settles will be regarded by other provinces as a model of fair legislation in the area of rent control. I urge all Members to vote for it in second reading.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Before the Member takes his seat I wonder if I could direct a couple of questions to him or at least one question to him. There may be others who would want to do the same.

I don't understand the statement that you made in your remarks just now that you have to treat everyone fairly and therefore there has to be this rent control legislation instead of a rent review board? That assumes it seems to me that all of the landlords of the province are operating from the same base which I think clearly is not the case. I say, therefore, that under this type of legislation you, in fact, cannot treat everyone fairly. Would you comment?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I will comment. We have said that the Federal Government should be requiring the prices of big companies to be approved in advance and not afterwards and consistent with that statement that is what we are doing in this Act. We believe the federal legislation would work a lot better if companies had to get approval for price increases in advance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would like to remind Members especially newer Members to the Chamber that they will have plenty of opportunity for questioning in Committee of the Whole and rather than put an argumentative point at this time if they could confine their questions to strictly questions if the Minister wants to permit more.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Just another question if I'm permitted, to get clarity in order to know our position in terms of how we would vote on second reading. Am I correct in my assumption that the Minister has suggested that he is prepared to amend this legislation to allow an appeal to the courts. Second, he is prepared to amend this legislation to ensure that landlords won't go bankrupt over the legislation but he is not prepared to amend the legislation as to the length of time. Am I correct in those three statements?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I don't mean to be difficult to get along with in rising on this but surely the rules of the House are clear. These kinds of questions are asked during the time of Committee of the Whole and I know that from time to time we bend those rules a bit and if a Member gets up and asks for a clarification from the Minister after he has made a speech, or from any Member after the Member has made a speech, at times those rules are relaxed. But we are getting in a situation here where one Member has asked a question and the Minister has been good enough to provide a clarification. Now another Member has asked a question and a third Member has been getting up to ask a question also. I am thinking that in order to be able to maintain the procedures of the House in a normal and uniform pattern that maybe those questions should wait until we get into Committee of the Whole.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the point is well taken, I think the Members should confine their comments at this time to the briefest of clarifications on single points. If the Minister wants to take it and the Minister has the right at any point to have the rest of the material shifted to Committee of the Whole.

**MR. COLLVER:** — If I could speak to that Point of Order. The Minister did agree to take my question and I have posed a question and would appreciate an answer if it was possible.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The first and the third statements were correct. The second statement was not entirely correct. I did not say we were prepared to amend the legislation to guarantee a landlord a minimum rate of return. I said I was attracted to the notion and we could do it by regulation. If we would do it at all it would be by regulation. I think I went on to explain

that there are apparently administrative problems with it, we want flexibility in dealing with it. We would therefore prefer to do it, if at all, by regulation.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, before we get to Committee of the Whole, I wonder if the Minister would consider particularly - I want to do this in a very helpful way because I am concerned particularly about these sections . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Is the Member asking a question or a clarification?

**MR. CAMERON:** — I am asking him if he will take under consideration particularly Sections 2(d), 3(4) and 55 (g) before we get to Committee of the Whole. The question being whether we will have to move amendments or whether he will consider them in advance.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I will take it under consideration but that's a short answer to the question.

Motion agreed and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 53**

Blakeney	Dyck	Wiebe
Pepper	McNeill	Malone
Thibault	Feschuk	MacDonald
Bowerman	Shillington	Penner
Romanow	Rolfes	Cameron
Snyder	Cowley	Edwards
Byers	Tchorzewski	Clifford
Kramer	Matsalla	Anderson
Baker	Skoberg	Merchant
Lange	Vickar	McMillan
Faris	Allen	Collver
Kowalchuk	Koskie	Larter
Robbins	Johnson	Bailey
MacMurchy	Thompson	Berntson
Mostoway	Banda	Ham
Larson	Steuart	Katzman
Whelan	Stodalka	Birkbeck
Kaeding	Lane	

**NAYS - Nil**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**GOVERNMENT MOTION - SITTING OF THE HOUSE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Romanow (Attorney General):

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 until 2:30 o'clock p.m., and

that this order shall expire on December 31, 1975.

**MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, before I start my remarks on this particular motion I should like to raise a Point of Order about the motion itself. My suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that the motion is now out of order and as such should not be further considered by this House. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that it is quite clear from the motion that it cannot be given effect to by this House if it is indeed passed by the House in a vote later on. That is, it is impossible now for this House to commence, "commencing Thursday, December 18, 1975 meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m.", and that is a part of the motion, a significant part of the motion and it is impossible now for effect to be given to this part. I would submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of this happening because of the effluxion of time that part of the motion is irregular, the part I have referred to, and is out of order and is null and void, that is that if part of a motion is irregular or out of order that, therefore, the whole motion is out of order. I refer you, Sir, to Beauchesne, I am not sure what volume you have there, but page 167 under paragraph number 199, which says:

Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular and in turn cites Smith's Digest, 7th edition, page 223.

So what I am putting to you, Mr. Speaker, is because of the way the motion was worded, that is the business about commencing on Thursday at 10:00 o'clock, that cannot be done. The motion therefore cannot be given effect to by this Assembly if it passes it, if it should pass the motion, therefore it is out of order and the whole motion is out of order.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — May I just speak to the Point of Order very briefly. The submission that I would make to your honor is that your honor look at the substance of the motion. The substance of the motion in a nutshell can be summarized to extend or to try to extend the sitting hours of the Legislature. That's the substance. The question is whether or not the substance of the motion is out of order or not out of order. My learned friend opposite is trying to argue that a part of the motion if it is out of order invalidates the substance of the motion. With all due respect I just can't buy that. In courts of law, in criminal proceedings, in civil proceedings, parts of motions, parts of statements of claim, parts of documents are very often out of order but the substance is permitted to continue and the substance is the issue here. The substance really is additional sitting hours and in all due respect we may not be able to fulfil the Thursday morning operation that is true, but the substance of it we still are able to fulfil and I would argue, with respect, that it is in order.

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I would remind the Attorney General that this is not a court of law, this is the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan. Therefore the rules of the Legislative Assembly do not follow a court of

law. The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is how can we accept a motion and vote on a motion that is impossible to carry out its intent. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, because, 10:00 a.m. in the morning, is now gone. It is impossible if we pass this to carry out the intent of the motion and, therefore, the only alternative that is open to the House as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that the Attorney General or the Government withdraw the motion and resubmit another motion, making it possible then for it to have meaning and making it possible for the Legislative Assembly to carry out the intent of the motion itself.

**MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the Point of Order. I think this is the proper course for the Government to follow, they should withdraw and submit the proper motion. I'm sure we would be prepared to consider giving them leave, we would certainly consider that.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might briefly address myself to the Point of Order. There are two matters, I know that Mr. Speaker was advised by my friend the Member for Lakeview, I hope that if Mr. Speaker has not as yet had an opportunity to look at that particular page, you might look at page 376 of Erskine May, which deals with proceedings that are null and void. I, secondly, hope that you might look at the definitions contained in the shorter Oxford English Dictionary and in Black's Law Dictionary and if I may read them to you, I don't think there is any doubt about the fact that you may go back to and look at the words, nullity or null and void and decide whether those words fit the circumstance that you have now. Nullity, in the shorter Oxford Dictionary is, amongst other things, defined as a situation, an instance where a fact or circumstance causes invalidity. And I think that clearly that situation exists here. And nullity in Black's Law Dictionary is defined as an act or proceeding in a cause where the opposite party may treat as though it had not taken place or which has absolutely no legal force or effect.

Now, my friend, the Hon. Attorney General has suggested to you that you can distinguish between the intent and the opening words, seeming to imply that the opening words constitute something in the nature of preamble, when clearly the opening words go far beyond that and in that regard suggest to your honor that Beauchesne on an amendment is an important area by analogy to consider, because as no doubt your honor has seen in dealing and in discussing amendments yesterday, one of the precepts laid down by Beauchesne, page 171 and 172 and elsewhere, is that an amendment is only allowable if it allows for proper reading with the main motion. Now I suggest to you by analogy here, removal of a severance would not be appropriate and that the rules with an amendment apply. That you can't in short breathe into this resolution life which by the effluxion of time has deserted the resolution. I don't think that there is any doubt about the fact but that the Government is either faced with having the matter ruled null and void or withdrawing and bringing in the motion again.

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Further on the Point of Order, my colleague has referred to Erskine May on page 376 where it specifically sets

out the House's procedure when the proceedings are null and void. It makes it clear than an order declaring proceedings to be null and void where there has been an inadvertence or some form of irregularity in procedure. If I can, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to refer to the same text on page 489 where proceedings on a bill were declared null and void and it says again quite pointedly that if a bill has been read a second or third time by mistake or inadvertence the proceedings have been declared null and void and another day has been appointed for second reading. It makes it quite clear and there are several other references I am sure that have been called to Mr. Speaker's attention that inadvertence is grounds for declaring a particular matter null and void. It means and in all cases through Erskine May the proposer of the motion or the bill was required to withdraw and simply start again the next day. I think obviously that the Attorney General's arguments that all motions from now on be dealt with intent and not with the substance of the motion, I think is clearly not acceptable to the House and I am sure Mr. Speaker doesn't take it seriously. It would lead to totally ridiculous situations in all future dealings in the House if everything was to take the intent of the Member speaking and not his words as put down in the motion and in the Blues. I am sure that that argument of the Attorney General's is specious to say the least and I am sure it would establish an unworkable precedent for this House if it was taken. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would consider the precedence set out in Erskine May that a matter can be declared null and void by reason of inadvertence and inadvertence seemingly through the text is the ground for declaring motions and bills null and void. It is certainly inadvertence in this case, the proper procedure for the Attorney General is simply to withdraw the motion and present it again perhaps tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I wish to thank all the Members for their comments on the Point of Order. I believe there is not too much in the rule book to rely on in this particular case and Members will have to make a judgment as to my ruling after I have made it.

The Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) when raising the point cited Beauchesne 199 on page 167, subsection 4, wherein it states.

It is the Speaker's duty to call the attention of the mover and of the House to the irregularity of a motion whereupon the motion is usually withdrawn or so modified as to be no longer objectionable. If the motion is of such a nature that the objection cannot be removed the Speaker may refuse to receive or put the motion in the House. He treats it as a nullity. Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular.

Now it is clear that the passage of time has had something to do with this and if I may just cite an example prior to this in this Session where the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) had Resolution No. 10 on the Order Paper dealing with the resumption of the postal services which he withdrew. Had he not withdrawn that at that time I think that might have been a Point of Order and Resolution No. 10 would have had to be withdrawn.

The Government Motion to which we are addressing ourselves now was moved by the Attorney General with regard to the extension of the sitting hours of the Chamber, was in order when the debate began. Now due to the passage of time an anomaly has occurred and I would, consequently, rule that since the motion was in order when the debate began and the substance of the motion, in part, can still be carried out, I would consequently rule that the motion is in order. Further, I would suggest that the dates that are specified in the motion can be interpreted in different ways. But one interpretation which has to be put on the dates is that it cannot take effect before December 18th and it cannot exist after December 31st. I suggest that if it cannot be carried out in full that it can be carried out in part if the motion is in order.

Therefore, I would rule that the motion is in order for those reasons.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, if you would hear me on your ruling. I think, with respect, I don't think you can read into a motion what the substance is of it or what it isn't. You have to take the motion as is presented to you. The motion quite clearly says that on today at 10:00 o'clock a certain thing was to occur. I don't think you can ignore that and say that the substance of the motion is really what's happening later on between now and December 31st. That it, the motion, has to be read in its entirety and as I say, with respect, you can't go to the motion say, well, it really doesn't matter whether it is the 31st or the 18th, the substance is morning sittings. I suggest that is incorrect and that you have to regard the whole motion before you and not take parts of it and you indicated I think in your remarks that part of the motion was in order. Well, I go back, Mr. Speaker, to my other comments that if part of the motion is in order by inference part of it isn't in order and if part of it isn't in order Beauchesne is quite clear that the whole motion must fall. And I would ask you to reconsider your decision in view of those remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think I began my statement, or near the beginning of my statement I said that the motion was entirely in order at the time the debate began but due to the passage of time this situation has occurred. I suggest at this time that the ruling in Beauchesne states that it is the Speaker's duty to call the attention of the mover and the House, which implies to me that the mover still has control of it, but in this case the mover does not have control of the motion, it is the property of the House at this time. I am not prepared on that basis to change my ruling. I think it is the property of the House and this is the only practical way to solve the problem.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, if I could comment, you pointedly ignore the rules in Erskine May and I would appreciate receiving your comments for my own interests - if I can make one more comment. Seemingly the mover of the motion has put Mr. Speaker in a very embarrassing position in this and, with all respect and with all deference, that the proper procedure and the practical solution is for the mover of the motion to withdraw it and make sure that proceedings in the House are done in a proper manner and that the motion is operative and is working and does what he intended. Certainly, all that the mover had to do was

introduce a motion that morning sittings commence in the House the day after passage of the motion and that would have been the very simple thing and the obvious thing for the Attorney General to do. Inadvertence has pointedly, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, made it clear that grounds are present for Mr. Speaker to rule the matter null and void and simply it can be started all over again. I would think and I would hope that the Attorney General would show the required respect for the rules of the House and the precedents and show the courtesy to Mr. Speaker by withdrawing the motion and giving the only true and reasonable alternative, and that is to introduce a new motion with a new effective date.

**MR. M. J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes):** — Mr. Speaker, I think you and as the Attorney General indicated, must look at the substance of the motion. When we commenced it was as you indicated in order. Now what I say is that certainly the Opposition have in no way been prejudiced in this instance because by their own actions they have delayed it over to a subsequent date. But in no way have they been prejudiced whether it started yesterday or not because the Opposition were the ones who decided that they didn't want it to start yesterday. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, you have to read the intent of the motion and I certainly would support your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I am not prepared at this time to accept any more comments. I thank the Members for the comments that have been given to me. The Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) asked why I did not make reference to May's citation that he listed when he was speaking. The reason I didn't make reference to it at that time is because I didn't think it had application to the item before us. The citation there deals with an order. No order has been issued at this time. The matter is under debate. Any further comments will have to be in the form of a challenge or a continuation of the debate.

**MR. MALONE:** — Just a comment, I intend with deference to challenge your ruling, if you would allow me first . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Order!

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, would you tell that Member to be quiet. As I indicated I am not making a comment, I intend to challenge your ruling. Before doing so, I wonder if the mover of the motion would withdraw it as you, Mr. Speaker, have certainly indicated should be done.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I am in order, but speaking to the Point of Order, because I am not sure that the Member for Lakeview was in order when he got up. The position of myself as a Member of this House is that I abide by Mr. Speaker's rulings, with all respect, sometimes I agree with, sometimes I don't agree with him. Sometimes I win, sometimes I lose as a Member of the House. In this case you as Speaker have found that the motion is in order. Accordingly, it being in order, there is nothing for me to withdraw, or nothing to act on that basis. Thank you, your Honour, for your ruling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the Attorney General is right. I didn't ask the Attorney General to withdraw it, or imply it. I implied here that I ruled the matter is in order and consequently if the Member wishes he can challenge it or debate it.

**MR. MALONE:** — With deference, Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling. I think we have to because of the situation.

Ruling of the Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 37**

Pepper	Larson	Vickar
Thibault	Whelan	Allen
Bowerman	Kaeding	Koskie
Romanow	Dyck	Johnson
Snyder	McNeill	Thompson
Byers	Feschuk	Banda
Kramer	Shillington	Collver
Lange	Rolfes	Bailey
Faris	Cowley	Berntson
Kowalchuk	Tchorzewski	Ham
Robbins	Matsalla	Katzman
MacMurphy	Skoberg	Birkbeck
Mostoway		

**NAYS - 15**

Steuart	MacDonald	Clifford
Stodalka	Penner	Anderson
Lane	Cameron	Merchant
Wiebe	Edwards	McMillan
Malone	Nelson (Assinboia-Gravelbourg)	Thatcher

The debate continues on the Motion.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Obviously the argument that the Hon. Attorney General presented and another lawyer, the Member for Quill Lakes presented, was of some consequence to you. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in light of your decision whether you would also accept that the resolution is so changed in nature that it would now be possible for all Members whether they have spoken to the original resolution or not, to address this now changed resolution. In short, Mr. Speaker, having breathed new life in the resolution, it appears to me appropriate that Members who have spoken might be able to speak again. Indeed when the Attorney General and the Hon. Member for Quill Lakes suggests the comparison to the way a court operates, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is the sort of ruling that would come in a court that where a technicality is overcome to the benefit of the party that had made the error, then the courts bend over backwards to allow in fairness that the other side receive every benefit that is available to them.

I wonder on a Point of Order whether you would consider that and whether I for instance having spoken in the original

debate might be able to speak again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Unfortunately, my only experience in court was with regard to a traffic violation. I would say that the Member's Point of Order is not well taken because the words I see before me are the words I saw before me yesterday. The debate continues on the motion as it stands before us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, about your ruling, we did challenge it because we felt it was a very serious situation and that it was something that should be regarded as such. We abide by your ruling now that it has been upheld.

As I was saying yesterday before we ground to a halt, I was attempting to make an amendment to the motion and was unable to do so because of certain activities of the Attorney General and his colleagues opposite, that we were prepared to vote for the motion as proposed by the Attorney General if certain things had been guaranteed us as to who was going to participate in the debate in these extra hours. It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite are not prepared to give us such an undertaking, as I understand their lack of interest in this debate, it would appear that they are not prepared to indicate that they will speak on the potash Bill during these extra hours of sittings.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to propose an amendment to the motion that may ensure that while the Members opposite may not participate in the debate that it will allow them to be questioned by the Members on this side of the House and particularly the Members in the Liberal caucus. The amendment that I am going to propose, Mr. Speaker, does not cut down the hours of sitting, it, in fact, enhances the hours of sitting because it will at least ensure that during extra hours of sitting that the Treasury Benches will participate and that we will hopefully find out from the Members opposite their views of the implications of Bill 1 and Bill 2 and indeed any other Government business. I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Wiebe:

That the words "and that between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. Members shall be permitted to ask questions of the Government" be added after the words "each sitting day" in the second line.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — With regard to the order of this motion that is before me, I am going to rule, the same as I did yesterday when a motion that had some similar parts to it was offered as an amendment. At that time I ruled, on the ground of relevancy, I quoted from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth edition, page 171, citation 203 as follows:

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that they are on the same subject matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

And further, 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 might suggest to the Members that if the matter of a question period is of concern to the Members, I have no way of judging at this time whether a motion could be put on the Order Paper. I would cite Beauchesne, page 171, citation 203 (5) in this case, an amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice. I would suggest that a motion could be submitted with regard to a question period after the proper notice and would be quite in order. But in this particular case, I hark back to the ruling that I just made, which I repeat from yesterday. I declare the amendment out of order.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, again we abide by your ruling. I think it is apparent that we on this side are prepared to sit the hours the Government has suggested. But when we sit during those hours we want some assurance from the Government and from the Attorney General that their Members will participate. The Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) has indicated to me that perhaps a proper amendment that we will sit any time that the Government is prepared to put a Cabinet Minister to talk about Bill 1 and Bill 2. They have not been prepared to do that as yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would ask the Member if you are rising on a Point of Order. The Member had to sit down in order to move the motion. Just permit me a moment, I want to check something.

Let me just clarify for a moment, the Member had he moved for adjournment and lost the adjournment could continue to speak. But having moved an amendment, has lost the right to continue further in the debate.

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this particular Motion as presented by the Attorney General I should like briefly to state my objection and my opposition to this Motion as presented and why I feel that as an MLA representing over 8,100 constituents, that I cannot support this particular Motion.

First of all I feel that my responsibility as an MLA is not only to debate the various proceedings in this Legislature, but my responsibility as well is to answer and look after the concerns of the people whom I represent whether it be while I am here in Regina participating in the Assembly, or whether it be when I am on my farm or in my constituency office.

By asking us to sit from 10:00 o'clock in the morning until 9:30 at night does not allow an MLA to carry out that responsibility or that duty. Let me explain. We sit in the morning starting at 10:00 o'clock. I, as caucus chairman, must call our caucus together prior to the day's proceedings, one hour before the Session starts each and every day. Which then means that each and every one of our caucus members from 9:00 o'clock on will not have the opportunity either to answer the calls of their constituents nor will they have an opportunity to phone various government departments on behalf of their constituents. That then means that the entire morning is taken

away from the needs and concerns of our constituents.

The majority of government departments do not return to work until 1:30 and again from 1:30 to 2:30 it does not give you that much time to accomplish any work.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — With the result that in the evenings as well you, of course, cannot contact or get a hold of any of the government departments.

Secondly, I think I have a responsibility to my constituents to oppose legislation which I feel is not in the best interest of this province and of my constituents. It's on that basis that I oppose various pieces of legislation that are introduced. If I have made an error in that opposition to particular legislation then it is up to my constituents to voice their opinions the next time I go to the polls and ask for their support.

I think one of the reasons, as stated in the Press, that this resolution was introduced was because the Attorney General wanted to muzzle or slow down or wear out the Opposition Members in their discussion on Bills 1 and 2.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am unequivocally opposed to Bills 1 and 2 and it is for this reason too that I am opposed to this Motion. In effect this Government is not allowing the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to fully understand and realize the vastness of the great effect that Bills 1 and 2 will have on the people of Saskatchewan.

Let me, too for a moment, point out to the seven Members sitting to my left who in turn are not favoring this Motion and seem to be indicating that they, too, are in support of the quick passage of Bills 1 and 2. Each one of this side of the House can stand up and speak to the 38 Government Members opposite. Regardless of how long we speak, regardless of what arguments we present, when the final vote comes down there is no way that we are going to change anyone's mind on that side of the House. They have made up their minds prior to the introduction of this Bill and there is no way that they are going to change. So the only way that I as an MLA have an opportunity hopefully to convince the Government that they are following the wrong approach is to make the people of Saskatchewan aware of what they are doing, and let the people of Saskatchewan judge.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — Now how do they do this? One only has to go back three years ago to the Foreign Ownership of Land Bill, in which the Liberal Opposition at that time did much the same as what they are doing now. We on this side of the House did not convince the Government to withdraw that piece of legislation. But the people of Saskatchewan convinced the Government to withdraw that piece of legislation. People throughout Saskatchewan, it took over a month and a half, but when they started to understand what was happening they voiced their concerns to their individual MLAs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — And they did that, Mr. Speaker, through the means of letters to their MLAs, through the means of a phone call to their MLAs. And MLAs regardless of what political party they belong to or what side of the House that they may sit on hopefully respond to what their constituents say. If the majority of their constituents say that they are against or opposed to such legislation MLAs will normally change their minds. Members on that side of the House when we were dealing with the Foreign Ownership of Land legislation realized from the views that were expressed to them by their constituents that it was bad legislation, they finally agreed to withdraw that particular piece of legislation and set up a legislative committee to study that legislation.

What was the result of that opposition, which we as the official Opposition at that time voiced on the Foreign Ownership of Land legislation? A legislative committee was set up, that committee reported back to this Assembly, this Assembly accepted the recommendations of that committee and a new Foreign Ownership of Land Bill was introduced the following year that was acceptable to each and every person in this province.

So this is why I say it is vitally important, Mr. Speaker, that we hold Bills 1 and 2 as long as we possibly can.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — That we allow not only my constituents, but the constituents of each and every Member sitting on that side of the House an opportunity to understand what is happening. An opportunity to reply to their MLAs and hopefully the MLAs will see the errors of their ways and say, look this legislation is unpopular, if we go ahead with it I have a chance of not being re-elected in the next election and hopefully that legislation will be withdrawn the same way it was . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WIEBE:** — Because of my opposition, not only to Bills 1 and 2 but in my opposition to this Motion and my concern as well for my constituents, I feel it's important that I move an amendment to this particular Motion.

I move, seconded by the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan):

That the Government Motion to extend sitting hours be amended by striking out the words '10:00 o'clock a.m.' where such words appear in line two and that the words '11:00 o'clock a.m.' be substituted therefor.

I so move.

The debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment. I can understand the concerns particularly of the Member

for the constituency of Morse (Mr. Wiebe) in looking after his constituency since it's very, very tight down there. I'd be sweating myself if I were he. However, I lose his arguments with respect to the time necessary to carry on the work as an MLA. Part of the work as an ML during a Session is not merely confined, as he well knows, merely confined to the hours of 2:30 to 5:30 and 7:00 to 9:30. The pattern of the work of an MLA is committee meetings, Crown Corporation Committee, Public Accounts Committee, which have a normal starting time, if not 10:00, earlier than 10:00. The normal pattern includes that kind of work. In addition it is not an unusual procedure for MLAs during the latter part of a session, in order to clean up the business to get out on the land, to start at 10:00 o'clock, particularly if committee work is complete.

So I find it difficult to see the argument of the Hon. Member for Morse, with respect to the necessary time for MLA work in the constituency. Part of the work of the MLA is filling his responsibility in this Legislature and fulfilling the responsibility in this Legislature is under normal circumstances a 9:00 or 9:30 start with respect to committee work and with respect to legislative work. I, therefore, don't really follow his arguments and cannot support his arguments and I ask all Members to vote against the amendment.

**HON. N. E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments that has been . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What percentage . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — I got 50 per cent of the vote, 51 per cent in my riding. How does that compare with you?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the arguments advanced by the Opposition that we should not extend hours because of the great load they are bearing is certainly not justified. We hear appeals that they would like Ministers to speak on the Bill. May I say that there are now 15 or 16 Bills on the Order Paper that have been there for many days. I think this Government has been most charitable to the Opposition Members and particularly considerate and charitable to the new Members because all of us know the difficulties and the frustrations that new Members sometimes go through in their early years and weeks in this Chamber. I have some pressing legislation that I should like to introduce in this House and I want to say that I have the speeches here ready to give and I've had them in my desk for several days.

One of the bills is to assist the rural telephone companies in the province who are in the process of preparing their capital budgets for next year. There is proposed legislation on the Order Paper that will help them do that. By refusing to sit longer hours the official Opposition is really running interference and preventing this Government from introducing additional legislation.

I want to say to some of the new Members, particularly those who are learning about new government programs, that you

are now serviced with a grant to your caucus research office to provide staff. I sat as a young Member in this Chamber for three sessions when we had no such allocation from the public purse. I want to say that when I came into this Chamber in 1969 eleven MLAs had one stenographer to do all of their clerical work and we had no additional help.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think he strayed. The Point of Order is he is not speaking to the Motion at all and I just can't sit here and hear anybody wander from the Motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the point is well taken by the Leader of the Opposition, that Members will stick to the subject under discussion and I will count on the Leader of the Opposition's support when I rise at a later point if necessary to mention people straying from the point.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well, one of the arguments advanced by the Opposition to oppose the Motion was that it would cut into the time that Members need to serve their constituents. I think that that point bears answering because of the claim that has been made.

The point I was attempting to make before the Leader of the Opposition rose was that Members now have services that were not known to Members in previous sessions. A good deal more support help is available than was available at previous sessions.

With respect to dealing with constituents' problems, I have certainly had enquiries from Members on both sides of the House and those are being handled. The Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and I, I think, correspond regularly. I'm sure that the Member for Qu'Appelle will tell you that enquiries to my office get answered fairly expeditiously. I think most Ministers are prepared to offer that service to Members if proper communications are made to their offices.

Therefore, I think in view of the fact that we have been very gracious with Members of this House in not flooding them with bills in the second reading stage, that they can deal with one or two or three bills at a time. I think we have been very charitable with them and, therefore, I will not support the amendment.

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this amendment, let me just point out to the Minister from Kelvington-Wadena (Mr. Byers) that not only do the Members of this Opposition not live by the charity of this Government nor do the 60 per cent of the people in this province that voted against them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Now the Minister who has just completed speaking says that he has much legislation he wants passed in this Session and I should like to remind, not only the Minister who has just completed speaking, but as well all Members of the Government opposite that this fall Session was called to introduce

legislation not to ram it down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Now if you are interested in establishing a fall session to pass legislation at least have the honest decency to stand up and say that is what you want to use it for. You also said in your brief remarks or at least inferred that Opposition Members on this side of the House didn't want to extend the hours. We have stated time and time again the last few days that we are perfectly willing to extend the hours and we have, as well, on many occasions pointed out to you that that extension of hours is going to prove to have some difficulties for Members on both sides of the House in expediting their duties on behalf of their constituents. You said you thought we were blocking legislation. We say, firstly, that this fall Session is for the introduction of legislation. You point out that you have some legislation that is very important for people who are involved in rural telephones. We invite you to put that legislation in tomorrow and we will see that it has speedy passage.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Now the Minister of Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) pointed out that he didn't see why we would have any problems in handling the problems of our constituents in the hours that we were allotted despite the fact that he is interested in extending or at least implementing morning sessions. Now he may not have any problem serving his constituents because of the number of executive assistants and other assistants he has and also because of the fact that he lives in Regina on a full time basis.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — And I would point out that I may have been in the same position had I had the kind of assistance available to me that for example, the former Minister of Social Services, the former Member for Kindersley, had. There is no question that his executive assistant certainly did a good deal of his constituency work for him. We on this side of the House obviously don't have those benefits . . .

**MR. MacDONALD:** — A big airplane . . .

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I don't have an airplane nor do I have the use of the Government airplane. However, I should like to point out as well that not only do I not have the use of executive assistants but I have also been burdened by an enormous number of problems in my own personal constituency as a result of the work of the last Minister of Social Services.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — And I have spent considerable time in the early hours of the day trying to straighten out a highway problem between

Smiley and Coleville that was put in for political reasons. And I have also spent considerable time in the past few months trying to straighten out a grazing lease that was promised in the heat of an election by the former Minister of Social Services.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What was his name?

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Alex Taylor, I believe he works for the Government now, I am not really sure, here in Regina, I should refer my problems to him.

Now we pointed out that we are willing to sit in the mornings provided that the Government is prepared to give us enough time to work effectively on behalf of our constituents, to serve them to the best of our abilities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Now I don't know how hard the Government works on behalf of their constituents but I can assure you that those Members on this side of the House whom I am acquainted with work very hard indeed. And I pride myself on the fact that I spend a great deal of my time working on behalf of my constituents. So much in fact that I have gone to the trouble of establishing a constituency office at personal expense in my constituency because at this moment I don't find enough time to deal with my constituents' problems. And now you ask us to sit extended sittings in the mornings and you suggest that we have no problem solving or helping our constituents with their local problems.

Well we say we are willing to sit, we are willing to work the extended hours provided number one, that you make our work more effective, that you will enter into an exchange of debate in this House on the bills that we feel so greatly affect our constituents. I have found it interesting to find that our associates at least in this Legislature on my left are in support of the Motion and I am not surprised to find that they have time to sit every morning. I don't expect that they do anything differently also in treating their constituents than they do in this House. And if that's the case then perhaps they do have time to sit in the mornings.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — As well as finding the time to work on behalf of our constituents we need time to prepare for this Session, and I think it is obvious by the calibre of addresses given by the Members on this side of the House that we spend a good deal of time preparing our addresses on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Not only do you ask us to forego a considerable amount of time but you ask us to spend that time we are foregoing in debate in this House which puts a further burden on the amount of time in preparing for debate. I am not convinced personally that Members opposite are interested in seeing that this House works to the best of its legislative ability. I have also been shocked by the methods of the Attorney General on behalf of the Government. I suspect, he's prepared to use this time in order to ram legislation through this Session, a sitting that as I pointed out was proposed only to introduce

legislation. And I am shocked as a new Member.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MCMILLAN:** — I have on some occasions heard some very decent things said about the Attorney General and one of them was that he was, in most cases, exceedingly fair and I must say that I am surprised that you have taken the approach that you have and particularly with new Members on this side of the House.

As well I am surprised with the ruling that was brought down by the Speaker. I assure this House that I am not a lawyer, nor do I currently have any burning intention to become a lawyer, but even the logic involved didn't make much sense to me. As a Member of this House I will abide by your ruling but I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was shocked.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Now, I must point out that our concerns over here are legitimate concerns. We have pointed out about 15 good reasons why we feel that the effectiveness of Opposition in this province is being abused by the Members opposite. We have said that we felt without exception that where we were able to co-operate in the best interests of the people of this province we were perfectly willing to do so. We said we are willing to sit extended hours provided it is in the best interest of the workings of this Legislature and in the best interests of the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — We have pointed out I suggest conclusively that these extended hours in the way they have been proposed are not necessarily in the best interests of anyone and, in fact, may be to the detriment of democratic government in this province.

I have no problem supporting the amendment to this Motion, just as I would have no problem supporting the Motion if it had been introduced with a little sincerity on behalf of the Government opposite. I expect some of my colleagues on this side of the House have something further to say about the amendment and I will take my seat. I will be supporting the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — I want to direct myself briefly, fairly briefly at least to the amendment proposed by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). In doing so I want to indicate to Mr. Speaker, that there shouldn't be any misunderstanding about the process that we are here going through and what has brought this amendment from the Member for Morse.

What we are engaged in in debating this Motion is an effort by the Government to suspend the usual rules of the House (the usual rules of the House don't have a sitting in the mornings) in an effort to add at least two additional hours

without in turn taking away two of the hours in the evening. We had early proposed that we would be prepared to sit in the mornings if you relieved us of sitting in the evenings. We would add five mornings and subtract two evenings. We were actually, in terms of your wish to have additional sitting time, more generous in our position than what you are in yours, in making that decision in that amendment.

Now I want to make this point, too, that when we come to suspend the usual rules or extend them or add to them in circumstances in which we are dealing, what we are really doing, what the Attorney General is really doing, is attempting an effort really to exhaust the position of the Opposition. I think what happened in the process is he miscalculated the extent of the Opposition that was going to arise on these two bills from us, thinking suppose as he did that we were ten new Members of 15 and that we might be as easy to deal with as what the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) has been in his quiet approach to the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — It is very real this need for additional time in the morning and I want, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate my point about the importance of the mornings because we have heard from the Member for Nipawin about the kind of drivel that we have heard in respect to the potash debates. That is I guess how one satisfies one's own lack of performance, by calling those who do perform, drivel.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — The other point made by the Attorney General, which he makes repeatedly is that we are trying to obstruct, that we are filibustering and we are unreasonably delaying passage of these bills and that he wants to cut off any further close examination of these bills by us outside of the House, which is sometimes the most important time.

I want to tell Members what I did this morning to illustrate the very real importance of the morning period for us. I was taking a look section by section at Bill No. 2. When I come to speak on Bill No. 2 I intend to look at each one of these sections in detail, examine them and point out a number of weaknesses. This morning I spent my morning on Section 20 which deals with the powers of audit in connection with the potash corporation. The reason I point this out is to illustrate the importance of having these hours to do research before we come into the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Section 20 of Bill No. 2 gives the usual power to the Provincial Auditor to audit the books of the potash corporation. That's usual, standard. But it goes a step further, it says that the books . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member is speaking to the Bill. The Member has already spoken in the debate. His debate at this time is

limited to the change in the amendment from 10:00 to 11:00 o'clock. I think that gives the Member a very narrow position from which to debate. I wish he would stay within that limit because you were talking about the Bill in some detail.

**MR. CAMERON:** — I have a very good, legitimate point that I am putting to the House, Mr. Speaker. My point is this, I preceded it very carefully by saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that the morning period is an extremely important period for us. The Motion that is before us would have us sit from 10:00 to 12:00, the amendment would have us sit from only 11:00 to 12:00 to give us an additional hour. The point I am beginning now to make is how important even one additional hour can be in the morning for research in preparation of the debates that follow in the House later in the day. That's the point I am making. To underline and illustrate the validity of the point I was telling Members about what I was doing this morning in terms of research on Section 20 and why I was doing what I had to do, including getting in touch with the Provincial Auditor to find out what the position was. And it is a very, very important significant point that this Bill carries something which one does not find in other comparable pieces of legislation.

The Government in drafting this Bill slipped in some words, very few, but nonetheless very meaningful. I phoned the Provincial Auditor's office this morning to see what was the practice in connection with Sask Tel and in connection with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation about who audits their books as a matter of legislation. This morning while I was doing that the Provincial Auditor told me that it was his office that did that. This morning I looked at the statutes governing who must audit the books of Sask Tel and Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Saskoil, it was the research I was doing this morning in connection with Bill 2 preparation for this afternoon; indeed, I was on the phone during those very periods.

Now, and as a result of that research, what I am going to put to the Government is that they are taking a power in Bill 2 with respect to the auditor of the potash corporation books that does not exist in respect of any other Crown corporation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I listened very carefully to the Member's remarks when he made them the first time and I listened very carefully when he made them now and I agree his remarks are in order up to a point but once you get to the point where you are talking about different audit procedures in different corporations, I don't think that is a legitimate point since you are discussing the details of the Bill. There is another place and time to do that. The Member I think will confine his remarks to why the change from 10:00 o'clock to 11:00 o'clock is important to him.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made the point of the importance of the morning period to do research and I will be speaking to the point I was making at greater length and again demonstrate how we are digging into these bills in a very real way in that period.

The thing that emerges in this debate on this amendment,

and we have now heard from two Ministers opposite and I am pleased at that because at least they are beginning to get involved in the debate in connection with this matter if not in connection with more substantive matters that are before us, but what is emergent here, very clearly, (a) is that this is an effort of a kind of closure which the Government is doing and that cannot be mistaken.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, Rule 31 of the Rules of the House provides that:

Immediately before the Orders of the Day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, any Minister of the Crown (with the approval of the House leader) standing in his place, shall have given notice to the previous sitting of his intentions so to do, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned and shall not be further postponed; and in either case such question shall be decided without debate or amendment; and if the same shall be resolved in the affirmative, no Member shall thereafter speak more than once, or longer than 20 minutes in any such adjourned debate.

That's a rule we could be working with, that's the power that the Government has in connection with the House. It doesn't have the courage though to use the rule. What it does instead is it tries to do indirectly what it can't do directly or doesn't have the courage to do directly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — The other thing that this debate on this amendment is doing, is again underlining very clearly if the point isn't already made, that we are passionately and dedicatedly opposed to these two potash bills.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — We want the opportunity to debate them and debate them at length. We want the opportunity and we are prepared to debate them from 11:00 o'clock to 12:00 o'clock in the morning, but not from 10:00 o'clock to 11:00 o'clock in the morning. As I say, that's the second thing that is clearly emerging in all of this; it is that the extent of the Opposition here is profound, deep-seated and dedicated and I think that was misconceived by the Government when they brought these pieces of legislation, such massive pieces of legislation in a fall session, a point made by my friend behind me.

The other point, too, that is emerging, and we have yet to hear from the Conservative Leader (Mr. Collver) on the amendment proposed by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), and he may speak on that, I don't know, but the other point that is emerging there is that they are not prepared, for whatever reasons they have, to enter into these debates. The Attorney General made an interesting point in that connection last evening when he said what's happening in the process is that the Liberals are being seen as the official Opposition, which they really are, and the

Conservatives are being seen to fade in the process.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — I hope we are going to hear from the Member for Nipawin on this amendment.

I think in view of the comments of the Minister in charge of Sask Tel (Mr. Byers), I would be entitled, Mr. Speaker, on speaking to the amendment, to rebut some of his remarks that were not ruled out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I might take this opportunity to remind the Member that the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Byers) was speaking for the first time in debate, and therefore, he has full right to speak on the amendment and the Motion, whereas, you have only the right to speak on the Motion. Therefore, you do not have the right to necessarily rebut all of the remarks that the Minister of Telephones made. So I just want to caution you on that.

**MR. CAMERON:** — If you will let me, Mr. Speaker, conclude my remarks in connection with the amendment, and to do that briefly, I simply again remind the Attorney General that if he thought the 'new look' Liberals were going to be as timid as the 'new look' Leader of the Conservative Party, that was a gross miscalculation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Now he's in a bind and he wants to sit in the morning from 10:00 o'clock to 12:00 o'clock, and we say we will sit from 11:00 o'clock to 12:00 o'clock, but we won't sit if we can avoid it from 10:00 o'clock to 12:00 o'clock because we need the time to work on the massive pieces of legislation so ill-conceived by bringing them forward at this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — And that really in essence is what the debate is all about in connection with this amendment, and the various other amendments that have been made and the Motion itself.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I say I will support the amendment, I will not support the Motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise briefly in speaking to the amendment. My remarks may be somewhat different from my remarks yesterday because I am restricted now to addressing myself to the amendment.

I think in beginning my remarks about the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress a point that was suggested by my colleague from Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and that is the reaction of the press. I suggest to you that the reaction of

the Press to this debate made yesterday, and the anticipated reaction of the Press to this amendment and the amendment yesterday, is very important to the House. Indeed, the perception of the Press, I suggest, is a true perception. That the Press has rightly realized that this debate is really a part of the continuing potash debate and as the Attorney General said to us repeatedly in the course of both this debate and the debate on the amendment and the debate on the potash Bill, that it's the dirty Liberals more or less continuing a filibuster.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that to characterize our opposition to morning sittings as solely a continuation of the filibuster is not fair and I suggest to you to characterize our resolve in this amendment to maintain some time is not completely fair, but I think that it is true that it is all part of the sort of continuing saga that goes on with our very fervent and determined opposition to the passage of the potash Bill in the timetable that the Government has suggested.

Now the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is designed to permit Hon. Members additional time to prepare for the House, additional time to prepare for their dealings with constituents. And in a way that's related back again to the potash debate because the only bills that the Government calls are bills that have anything to do with potash, by and large, although with the co-operation of this side of the House we have seen some progress on Bill 16 - The Residential Tenancies Bill.

Mr. Speaker, my friend the Member for Regina South has referred your Honour to references made in the electronic media. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to refer you to the references made in the print media, in the Leader-Post yesterday, the headline of which said, "Liberals Delay Motion to Extend Sitting Hours." It is germane to our continued opposition and it is germane to this amendment; this amendment which says, though we are prepared to be available for certain extra hours, we are not prepared to be available for the massively increased number of hours that Members opposite suggest would be appropriate.

It is important in deciding for Members whether they will vote in favor of this amendment, or not, to remember that the Hon. Attorney General is quoted in the paper as having said on Monday that the original motion was being introduced to get the Liberals off their filibuster. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that the Government Members indicated that they will oppose the amendment now before you is a part of the piece in trying to, as Mr. Romanow would characterize it, get the Liberals off their filibuster.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's not what he says.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Of course, that's not what he says here, he says very different things here - well he catcalls different things from what he says when he speaks at least. And he says different things in the corridor from what he tends to say in the House, perhaps we'll all learn from that. But that's the way he is reported in the Press and I bring that to the attention of the House.

Now, this is as the Press reported, the debate on the Motion, a part of the Government's attempt to use closure in a

different way. I don't want to oversell that argument but I think that it's fair to say that press reaction has been, and the right reaction, that this is all part of the piece. This is a manoeuvre by the Government, the reluctance to pass this amendment will be nothing more than a manoeuvre by the Government at any cost to ram through the passage of this potash Bill. Ram through a bill and ram through this Motion and deny the amendment, because they have in their arrogant way decided that they would set the imaginary standards that they propose to meet.

Do extended hours of any sort assist the province in an examination of the bill, and would the removal of one hour a day of those extended hours so deprive the House of the inability to quickly deal with business? We have heard for instance from the Hon. Member for Wadena-Kelvington (Mr. Byers) that they have other bills. Well we certainly haven't seen those other bills. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if we knew that those other bills were coming we might be dealing different with this amendment. We might then have taken the view that on those other bills which came before us a long time ago, and that we in large part prepared for, that on those other bills we could now deal more expeditiously. There's no reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government defeats this amendment, if that's their choice, if the Government uses their power to ram through this Motion, there's no reason I suggest to believe that we will hear more of those other bills.

Now that Minister is saying that he opposes this amendment in restricting himself to the amendment and the Hon. Member the Minister for Moose Jaw, both stressed that they could sit in the morning and they didn't need the extra hour that we suggest we do need it in order either to prepare for our dealings with the House, in order to prepare for our dealings with constituents. Now it's an easy thing to say when you are a Minister with a staff, secretaries, with executive assistants with a speech writer or two, or at least a John Burton that you can borrow from time to time . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — . . . and who is this John Burton indeed. He sits beside me in the pew.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of rather specious arguments that you have heard from Ministers may apply to Ministers, but they certainly don't apply to a working Opposition. They don't apply to an Opposition who, in large part, have far greater demands made upon them, on their time outside of the House than back bench Members on the Government side. There's a great tendency when you are on the Government side, if you are a Government supporter, to approach one of the many Ministers that the Province of Saskatchewan has rather than to approach one of their own Members. We say that we need time to deal with our problems, that our problems are different from a Minister's problems and that our problems and the requirements on our time are different from the requirement on the time of a back bench Member such as the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) who spoke earlier, or perhaps some of the other backbenchers on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the position that mornings is the time

Members used to prepare for the day sitting, was presented yesterday in the Leader-Post article to which I referred, and though this amendment is different from the amendment that was presented yesterday, you may recall that the amendment yesterday said if you take away our mornings, give us back the evenings, an amendment which would incidentally considerably have increased the time in the House, this amendment is certainly different. It's different because it says that we will be available at the same time that Government offices are available. I, for instance, find that I have difficulty getting mail out because the Government Mail Office is closed. Closed at 5:00 o'clock, a problem that I am sure the Ministers don't face. I'm sure the Hon. Ministers who have spoken in this debate don't face it at all.

How much additional help would five hours a week be? That's the amount of time that this amendment would whittle away. The proposal is to increase the sitting time quite dramatically. How much difference would five sitting hours a week make? I suggest not very much. I suggest indeed that when the Hon. Attorney General who hasn't spoken to this amendment but has spoken in the last couple of days, when he suggests that what we need is more time in the House, he is failing to appreciate that what the Opposition believes would be proper in the potash debate and that's inexplicably integrated into debate on this Motion and the debate on the amendment. What we need is more time so that the people of the province can appreciate the problems with which they are faced.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are wondering whether I propose to read through this address when it comes back to me, and I give the assurance to the House that I'll initial it unchanged so that Members will have an opportunity to fulfil their brains . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else particularly to say, except that . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Except to say that I am surprised at the attitude of the Government about this amendment and about the Motion. An attitude which really says that their will be done, regardless of what the 60 per cent of the province want, regardless of what the people of the province may want, they will jam this thing through for their own purposes. It has been described as a subtle form of closure and I adopt that. Not even a subtle form of closure - it's a chicken-hearted form of closure, a better way to describe it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — A form of closure that I believe won't go well with the Press and won't go well with the people of this province. Now I don't know how soon the vote on this amendment will come. Probably early this evening, and I expect that if the vote on this amendment does come this evening that we will again see a demonstration of those Members who have managed to find their

way to the House, standing up and being counted, basically rubber stamping whatever has been suggested to them by the Cabinet and by the Hon. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, those are my only comments and I invite Members of the House to pass this amendment. I think that you have heard good reasons from various Members of the Opposition on why this amendment should be passed. Clearly there is an understanding by Government Members that a great deal happens outside of this House. Clearly that's understood by the Cabinet or else Members of the whole House wouldn't be paid, for instance, just at the time when the House is in Session. We are paid not only for sitting here, paid not well for the time here, but paid for our entire year, a year which in my experience occupies about 30 or 35 hours of my time on a weekly basis.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Now when I come into this House I have the continued duty to my constituents of that 30 or 35 hours a week and I fulfil it. And Members from the rural constituencies have even greater demands on their time than the city Members have.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Indeed part of the reason that an Opposition has a greater demand on its time and part of the reason that I think this amendment should be passed is that as an Opposition, I suppose when you are number two you try a little harder and we do try a little harder. We perhaps have on this side a better quality of Member because only the best get through when the Government isn't with you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — That perhaps makes us somewhat more conscientious than the bad that got through and didn't get into their Cabinet.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Now you take our 15 . . .

**MR. DYCK:** — How come you are only 15?

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Well, now if I'd been passed over a couple of times I wouldn't be so jumpy in the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. DYCK:** — . . . take you on.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Could you speak more quickly I can't follow what you are saying.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you don't hear the asides but some others of us do who unfortunately aren't blessed with your selective hearing and I can only suggest to the Hon. Member

that every one of us would take you on anywhere in our constituencies and we'd move a lot closer to yours than you think and I suggest in the next election that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — My selective hearing says that you are out of order. You should confine yourself to whether you prefer 10:00 o'clock or 11:00 o'clock for the extension of hours.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you asked me that question, because I prefer 11:00 o'clock.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that perhaps the reason I require that extra time is that I am a night person. That's not the case indeed. Indeed I use those early hours to work as hard as I can and I had hoped to avoid coming into the House at those hours when I'm working for constituents.

Mr. Speaker, to the great horror of the official Opposition, I take my seat.

**MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of statements that I should like to make with regard to the amendment. But first of all there is a reaction I have to a statement made by Mr. Dyck. He suggests that I should take him on in a man to man battle in the next . . .

**MR. DYCK:** — On a Point of Order. The Members opposite persist in identifying opposite Members here by their name. I think the rules and traditions of this House are clearly stated. Now I am the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair. I'd like the Member to respect that and recognize me, if he's going to talk about me, as the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Quite frankly, I think the Member is doubly out of order, by referring to Members by their names rather than by their constituency and secondly because he's talking about something that is foreign to what he is to be talking to now. The Member has already spoken in this debate, therefore he must confine himself to remarks as to why he refers 11:00 o'clock rather than 10:00 o'clock. Strictly to that.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, might I just make a suggestion which would be acceptable, I think, to all people. It is 5:25. May I call it 5:30?

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

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I think as it was called 5:30 I had been interrupted on a Point of Order and I think it's only fair that because of that interruption I apologize to the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair for having ticked him off and I recognize that that's the second time that I have done that since the House began. I want to tell him, that by my count I just owe

him ten more for the number of times he ticked me off while I have been a member of city council in Saskatoon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, in addressing some remarks to the amendment I want to go back to a statement that I read in the Press the day before yesterday, attributed to the Attorney General in which he suggested that what in fact the Government had in mind was an attempt to, and I'm only paraphrasing now, I'm not directly quoting him, but effectively shut off the attempt of this caucus to allow for a reasonable time for debate on the question of the potash bills.

I think it's important for us to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about the time needed for debate and the point has been made before, we're not talking about a compressed amount of time that is needed, we are talking about the need to stretch out the debate, to give people in the province an opportunity to react to the legislation which has been put before us and which this Government is attempting to ram down our throats and down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — I think too, having said that, that the amendment that has been put is a little bit more reasonable than the motion that had been put previously by the Attorney General. I'm surprised, as a matter of fact, well really maybe not quite so surprised, I guess it was going to take something like this, but I was amazed that the Attorney General had so clearly underestimated the intent of my colleagues and myself to see to it that proper time is allowed, so that the people of Saskatchewan can in fact become aware of what this whole business is all about.

Now the kinds of constituency concerns that I get, Mr. Speaker, are a little bit different from some of my colleagues. As you are well aware, I am a Member from an urban riding, but I think it's important that Members opposite have some idea of the kinds of concerns that as an urban Member I am called upon to deal with in the morning, and if this amendment passes, in the morning prior to 11:00 o'clock.

One of the things I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, while I'm here, is that I listen to the kinds of suggestions and concerns that my constituents and the people from other constituencies have and that they bring to my attention. I think it's important and I'd like to give you some indication of the kinds of concerns that I spend my time dealing with in the mornings. I have a letter here, a copy of a letter from a Mr. Paulson in Saskatoon, addressed to the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, Premier of Saskatchewan, and I'm not interested in the kinds of suggestions that come in a letter like this, but I think it's important that I have time to be able to respond to them.

The letter has suggestions like this:

On several occasions both you and Members of the Government have made references which lead to believe you feel you are talking and acting on behalf of the majority of

the people of this province. This seems to me very much like an overstatement or maybe a matter of somebody having forgotten the last election results. The fact of the matter is that the NDP suffered a setback of elected representatives in the House as well as only polling less than 40 per cent of the votes cast. Under these circumstances I feel it is very questionable to talk in these terms and thus leave this kind of impression both in and outside the province.

This letter goes on. When I talk about the kinds of suggestions that come before us that we need to deal with and that we need to have time to think about, I urge all Members to listen to this kind of a suggestion.

In conclusion I would like to make a suggestion, (this writer says). If you believe, you are fully convinced that you are acting in the best interests of the people of our province, please take it to them. Call for a plebiscite, ask the people if they are interested in investing in and operating potash mines. I'm not so sure that this was part of the mandate you were given in the last election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — I like to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to have time to listen to those kinds of suggestions. To listen to those kinds of concerns. They are not only concerns that come in written form, they also come by telephone. I had a call yesterday from a person in Saskatoon who had some questions about the proposed takeover and I think it's important that I should have some time to be able to deal with those kinds of questions. The kinds of questions he asked were questions along this line. First of all he wanted to know why, what kind of reason had been brought before the House.

**MR. ALLEN:** — On a Point of Order. I believe that the Member has already spoken once in the debate and now he is speaking again on the amendment and he isn't very close to the topic at hand. I'm sure all Hon. Members are interested in listening to him relate letters that he has received, phone calls that he has received on the potash question, but that, Mr. Speaker, I think should perhaps come when we are considering Bill 1 and Bill 2 and not when we are discussing whether or not we'll sit at 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock in the morning.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member has very clearly stated that he is rising to speak in favor of the amendment. He is trying to illustrate why he requires this extra hour in the morning to deal with the problems of his constituents, to deal with the problems that he was elected by his constituency to solve on their behalf. He has made it very, very clear and precise, I believe, in his statements that this is why he needs this other hour. He's made it very clear that he's giving examples as to what he does in that other hour, whether it deals with potash or whether it deals with problems of the city of Saskatoon or education problems or whatever. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he is quite in order to give these examples to the Legislature to try and get across to the Members on the

other side, that we do need this extra time to be able to perform our functions as duly elected MLAs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think I've heard sufficient from each side of the House to guide me in a ruling on this. I think that the Member should make every attempt to stay as close to the item that is before us now, which is the amendment, changing it from 10:00 o'clock as it appears in the Motion, to 11:00 o'clock. I think, quite frankly that the Members are straining the rules a bit by getting into discussions about details of letters or as I raised earlier, details of bills. They should just stick to the point of why it would be better to have the House opening at 11:00 in the morning rather than 10:00 in the morning.

**MR. PENNER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, Sir, that I am attempting to convey why I feel it is important that we use, have that time to use to answer questions and I'm merely attempting to point out to Members opposite that there are many kinds of questions that are brought to our attention. As I was suggesting people are asking why. We need time to be able to answer why. They are asking us where the money is coming from and we need time to try to deal with that question, despite the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we really haven't had very many answers to that question in the House. We are asked, what's the rationale? We need time, Mr. Speaker, to be able to deal with that. And as was so ably pointed out by my seatmate earlier today, we need time to be able to get into the nuts and bolts of the bill so that we can come to grips with it, understand it and be able to answer the questions that are asked.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — I think when we speak about the question of time, Mr. Speaker, it's important to note a point that was made by the Hon. Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) when he rose and spoke a little while ago. He made a pretty good point, Mr. Speaker, about time. He indicated that there were some bills on the Order Paper that could be brought before this House and I say he's absolutely right, because they are noncontroversial and they could be dealt with quickly. If that had been done there would be no need to be debating this amendment and there would be no need to have had the original motion put.

With regard to the question of the whole function of the fall Session, it seems to me that it has been clearly there to present legislation and where there is controversial legislation to allow time for reaction. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that had the Members opposite taken that approach in this instance, had they placed legislation before the House that was controversial with the idea that time would be allowed for consideration, we wouldn't need to be dealing with this matter in the way we are.

Mr. Speaker, in each instance with amendments that have been put by Members of our caucus, as is the case with this amendment, they have been put as a positive effort to sit for a longer period of time, because none of us are concerned particularly about next week, although frankly many of us would rather be somewhere else, but we are prepared to sit here. We

know how important the legislation is. Every time, as in this instance, an amendment had been put by Members of this caucus it has acceded to the request that we sit for a longer period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment which is before us now is a very reasonable amendment and I think that it is important that Members opposite should have an opportunity to consider the reasonableness of that amendment and, therefore, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Adjournment negated on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 12**

Steuart	MacDonald	Clifford
Stodalka	Penner	Anderson
Wiebe	Edwards	Merchant
Malone	Nelson	(Assiniboia- Thatcher
	Gravelbourg)	

**NAYS - 37**

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

The debate continues on the Motion and the amendment.

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have very much more to say and I must say I am glad that pleases the Members opposite.

I must say I am a little surprised. There has been a great deal of talk from some of those who have spoken, who sit in the Conservative caucus about wanting to get on with government business. It seems to me that we have spent a good deal of time talking about how long this House should sit, and that we might at least, in a rather reasonable way, adjourn debate on the Motion that is before us and get on to the business of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — As I say, I am quite frankly very surprised.

**MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current):** — I begin by saying I rise due to popular request. I should make it very clear that our caucus, probably more than any other group in this House, suffers because of this particular

Motion on extended hours. It is significant to know that we are the only party in Canada that does not receive a third party grant. As a matter of fact, we are not even recognized by this particular Legislature as a third party. We agree with the other Members in the Opposition that there is a great deal of work to be done by rural Members and six of our seven are rural Members. We have many miles, probably as many miles in comparison to most Members in the House.

We are willing to stay here and sit here and participate provided there is productive legislation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in this debate, once again. I must say I was impressed with the maiden speech of the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham).

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — I think probably it is about as productive an effort as we have seen from the Members to my left in this entire Legislature.

After the House had adjourned at 5:30 this afternoon, I was heading down the hall towards those beautiful premises that have been awarded us by the friends opposite - it is known as room 275, that is if someone would care to call it a room - I ran into a very interesting gentleman there, he was on his way out. I suggested, he shouldn't leave so soon, because we have another evening to go on. He replied, "Boy you guys on that side sure must like your \$20 a day. If you guys are willing to go along with drive like that for your \$20 a day, I feel sorry for you."

You know, Mr. Speaker, he just may very well have brought up the whole reason as to why the Government would propose to extend the sitting hours of this Legislature. Maybe it is a very deep dark plot and you know after listening to the Member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange) and all his plots, it is enough that you start thinking about deep dark plots yourself. I think everybody knows, it is associated with politics that nobody likes a dollar more than a socialist. Nobody is more adept at raising their own salaries than what has been the socialist Government. Take a look at the British Columbia Government which is now past tense, shortly to be followed by this one, from one shot, they were elected in 1972, the salary of an MLA out there was \$6,000, they were in for six months, the salary of an MLA was suddenly \$24,000.

But anyway to get back to that deep dark plot, Mr. Speaker, is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that in order to justify the pay raises that these gentlemen across the floor want so badly, is it possible that they feel that they have to go to the length to justify their pay raises by extending the hours?

Mr. Speaker, one reason that I am very strenuously opposed to increasing the length of sitting, I guess I could accept the amendment as put forward by the only Opposition, but one of the reasons for which I don't want these hours extended, is because there is one experience that I would like to take part in in this

House. Now I have been informed by an MLA who retired last election, and I mean retired not defeated, he said, the one thing that you have got to go through is when the NDP want to raise their salaries. You haven't lived until you have had a meeting in the washroom with Henry Baker to talk the situation over.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, if we extend these hours, the odds become increasingly less that I may get to meet Mr. Baker in the washroom and discuss this proposition. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman who would like to partake in all of the benefits of the Legislature and the educational opportunities, I really think that the Government is perhaps being a little rough on us rookies.

But getting back to the serious aspect. I wonder if this is what it is? Because if that is what you are looking for, if you are looking to justify the workload, and that you are going to pour it on us, then come to us and say, listen, if you fellows will agree, we'll give you a pay increase, forget it! Forget it! Because every one of you is overpaid as is every one on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that really awes a new Member coming into this Assembly is maybe the very glib politicians on the other side of the House. One of the most awesome people whom we saw the first day or two was the Attorney General. There is no question about it, he does awe you. All I could think of as he was speaking was, that is a 'guy' you have to stay clear of, he'll chop your head off. You know, Mr. Speaker, have you ever noticed that as time goes on and he stands up a little more frequently, the similarity of his phrases, 'you boys', 'you guys' and take the rank basic politics out of his speech, there really isn't all that much there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I am sure, Hon. Members are all interested in the debating skills of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), we have seen him in debate many times in the House, and we all agree that he is very good, but how that relates to whether we sit at 10:00 o'clock in the morning or 11:00 o'clock in the morning, is beyond me, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think I require any more guidance on the Point of Order! I would hope the Member for Thunder Creek is in awe of the rules of this House as he is of the Attorney General, or even more so. He is not speaking to the Motion that is before us. He has already spoken in the debate, therefore he has to confine his remarks to whether he prefers 10:00 in the morning or 11:00 for the recommencement of the Session should this be passed.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a coincidence that the backbencher from the other side should mention that because I was just coming to it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the amazing things about this entire

debate and why we are talking about this amendment, versus a motion, is the bad generalship that the Attorney General has shown as House leader. There comes a time when probably the hours must be extended. But let's not kid anybody, we all know full well, there is only one reason they want to extend this debate and that is so this Opposition will blow itself out, you will wear us down, and that ultimately this insidious bill of yours must come to a debate. Let's not kid anybody, it is part and parcel . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — We are not interested in running away, we'll sit right here until December 24, if it ultimately must come that we must start at 10:00 or at 11:00, we will be here. The points have been made very validly by other Members that this additional time is required for work in our constituencies. That's very fine for Cabinet Ministers, who have the executive assistants, the secretarial staff to answer the letters and do the routine work. It is fine for them to say, oh, no problems for us. Unfortunately, they can't bring these executive assistants and these secretaries into the House during the question period. The fact that you refuse to answer questions, the fact that you refuse to accept an amendment pertaining to questions, I think is indicative of the skills that this Cabinet has. Take three or four out of there and it comes down like a house of cards.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, one thing that I think has been accomplished by the Government in this very shallow attempt to wear down the Opposition, to ram something through, one thing you have done that I never dreamt possible was how very tightly you could weld this caucus together. Because gentlemen, you have got a scrap on your hands.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — The Attorney General by his Motion has waved a flag at us and there is no way you are going to be out of here by Christmas. You can bring us back between Christmas and New Year's and there is no way you are going to be out of here by New Year's. We'll sit New Year's Day if you want. Mr. Speaker, I repeat once again, we'll meet at 11:00 on New Year's day if you so desire. We are fighting two of the most insidious bills, Bill 1 and Bill 2 that have ever been brought to this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can isolate the intent behind this Motion and isolate it away from Bill 1 and Bill 2.

As I started to say earlier, it is the generalship that has surprised me, the inflexibility of the House leader across the way. As I indicated earlier, he scared a lot of the rookies over here, he doesn't scare us anymore. In fact, Mr. Attorney General, I don't think anybody is afraid to take you head to head any time, any place, anywhere.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Of course, you are the best

that they have across there too.

Mr. Speaker, by changing this time from 10:00 to 11:00, granted it is not much, but it does give us some time to work with our constituency problems. I really can't emphasize just what a problem that is working with them. A certain number of questions of course are very general. So when you come to a question period here in the Legislature, you may try to ask a Cabinet Minister a question pertaining to some phone call, or some letter that you may have received in the course of the morning. What is a typical answer that you get from a Cabinet Minister in that question period? He'll say write it out, put it on the Order Paper, so we can bury it for six months, so that he doesn't have to answer it. We have several in that category. Or else he just doesn't answer it. Or, what has been the most frequently used excuse, he doesn't know anything about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Consequently, Mr. Speaker, when a constituent contacts you and is desiring information, obviously you have to start into that bureaucratic mess known as the civil service. So first off it is a feat in itself to find in that massive telephone listing the pertinent individual, the pertinent department that you would like to find. That's really quite a feat. I suppose you become more skilled at it, I doubt if I ever will.

However, Mr. Speaker, by changing this time from 10:00 to 11:00 at least you have one additional hour in which to accomplish this. I think, Mr. Speaker, a very reasonable alternative was offered which was ruled out of order. That was that additional time between 10:00 and 12:00 as was suggested by the Government, that the entire Cabinet would make themselves available for questions from MLAs. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me this afternoon, but yesterday as a back bench MLA I found it very difficult to become recognized. I don't know whether this is a problem common to all back bench MLAs but nonetheless when the question period comes, unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, the Front Benches are the first ones that you see. This is very natural and I don't criticize you for it. Mr. Speaker, if we had had that two-hour question period, I really wonder would that make our constituency load that much easier. I really think that it would.

Mr. Speaker, I think in the upcoming period of time it could get very monotonous in this Legislature because we are, under no circumstances going to lie down on this bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Our friends across the way may and that is their choice of course, but under no circumstances are you going to get out of here for quite some time unless you want to. The Attorney General, the House leader has made one other very basic tactical error. He has underestimated his adversary. I think, Mr. Attorney General, that in the coming weeks you may tend to show a little more respect for what you call this tired, worn out Liberal Opposition.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Because, Mr. Attorney General, we are the only Opposition here, we are the only ones that are fighting you. And the invalid excuse that we are all freshman people and that we are not capable of getting up in the House, we are sitting here to learn, that simply isn't valid. Ten out of the 15 are brand-new faces here, including myself. I don't think we have been hesitant about standing up and ultimately every one of us knows that some of the professionals across the floor are going to knock our front teeth out some day. I am quite sure, Mr. Attorney General, you will have occasion to knock my front teeth out. I can assure you shortly afterwards you will be lying on your back when you do it. Nonetheless every one of us will get our heads knocked off, every single one of us. But we will bounce back. I can only show contempt for those who are afraid to stand up and take a shot in the head.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — As to why these hours were lengthened or why the Government would like these hours lengthened, it has got to be a bit of a mystery. Because there has really got to be some of the worst House generalship that maybe we have seen or has been seen in this House for a good many years. I would suggest to you that if the Attorney General had been commanding the British Forces in 1763, this country could have perhaps taken a very different turn.

I see we are finally getting the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) reacting. He has been rather silent. I must say that I have had occasion to miss what has become so typical of the Minister of Labour, that sneering, snarling voice and I can only feel that if I am now getting it turned on me, then obviously I must be getting somewhere in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I know I am not going to be allowed time but I should like to tell the Member for Saskatoon, the Whip on the other side, I should like to tell him a little bit about that silver spoon, but I imagine I would be called to order so I won't attempt to do it. Unless you would care to give me leave to do it, on that side.

Mr. Speaker, what are we going to accomplish by having morning sittings? I suppose we should look at the realistic aspects of it. This business of delaying these two potash bills which are unquestionably tied together with your motives for extending the sittings really isn't going to change anything. It is going to make the speeches from this side a little less scintillating and considerably more boring. But if you think that by stretching us out another couple of hours, that you are going to get us out of here, forget it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — The archives that we go into will just perhaps become a little more boring. The books that will be read to you may become a little less interesting. Although, in the fact that so many of you don't read perhaps having some books read to you will be of some benefit in your case.

Mr. Speaker, what is their advantage? You might as well

accept it right now, you are here for a while unless you want to withdraw that bill, Bill 1 and Bill 2, then we would be happy to leave with you. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, every one of us on this side can think of a thousand places that we would rather be than right here doing what we are doing. We don't like it any more than you do. But you have brought a bill upon us, two bills upon us that I think, if I may repeat myself from last night, are repugnant.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — And make no mistake about it you are going to have the fight of your life to get them through.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Big deal, big deal.

**MR. THATCHER:** — That snarly voice is coming through again now.

Mr. Speaker, really what I was talking about here, we are consuming a lot of time and I will be the last one to say it is productive, frankly it is sickening. In fact maybe this whole business of what you are trying to do and what we are trying to do in many ways is an indictment upon the democratic process. You are trying to ram something through. Whether or not we should be attempting to do something so productive is open to debate. Nonetheless it is in the rules. If you don't like what we are doing the rules should be streamlined. Maybe we shouldn't be allowed to ramble on like this. On the other hand democratic debate must go on. Yet at the same time should you people be allowed just by the sheer weight of your numbers to ultimately pass two bills which are going to change the entire face of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — One area that I do agree with the Member for Nipawin was that he said some weeks ago that this process is irreversible. And make no mistake it is irreversible because there is no getting out of it.

Mr. Speaker, as long as these rules are available, we fully intend to use them. I think that what is going to happen and what is so fearsome to you people on that side of the House, is that you know full well that public opinion is slowly mounting against you. At this point most people are busy with the aura of Christmas hanging over them and probably have more pleasant things to do than the very repugnant, distasteful thing which Members opposite are doing. But after Christmas is gone and New Year's is gone as this continues to go on, whether we are starting at 10:00 o'clock in the morning or 2:30 in the afternoon, but as it continues to go on, very slowly, very surely this popular opinion is going to rise against you.

You people know that it is going to rise against you. It is very interesting going back a couple of weeks when the Bill was introduced you would maybe get a phone call at your desk protesting the Government's intervention into the potash industry. As time has gone on, slowly that one phone message waiting for you has become a stack of them. Every day the number goes up, maybe five, six or ten. Very slowly but it is coming.

We make no apology for holding you up and we will make no apology in the future for holding you up.

Mr. Attorney General, I can see that you are really enjoying this and if I can I will try to keep the rapture in front of you for some time, but believe me when I run out somebody else is going to take my place. When he runs out someone else will take his place. Part of it, Mr. Attorney General, that I suppose our party will always be grateful to you for is that you are giving the ten rookies on this side of the House, you're giving us some experience that normally would take us a couple of years to get. And that may very well prove to be your undoing. I must say that we all enjoyed the day in the House yesterday and we are enjoying it today and I am quite sure that when necessary we will enjoy it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we would love to go home for the Christmas recess just as much as anyone on the other side would. In fact you can't adjourn this House too soon or leave it out too long for me. Because I can think of a thousand places I would rather be than here. Ultimately, it is going to get down to the point where we are going to be sitting here for virtually nothing. You may have some hope that some big retroactive pay increase is going to come in to you. It may. You can vote it in but don't look for it unanimously. Very shortly you are going to be sitting here for your \$20 a day. We could care less. We will work for nothing, it doesn't bother us. Just as long as you want to do it we are happy to stay here.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the topic of why we should sit at 11:00 rather than 10:00, one more reason is that I have found in making calls to many Government offices that particularly are in this building here, that the later in the day it goes the quicker the phone is answered. Actually when a vote is being taken in some of these buildings, when the bells start ringing you find that somebody answers the phone a little quicker than what they do normally because it seems to take a vote to make many of your hacks, your executive assistants etc., to waken suddenly to the fact that we are doing business in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think that unquestionably a very great miscalculation has been made on the part of this Government. I think a miscalculation was made yesterday and you got burnt on that. I am surprised that you bothered to try and bring this in today, because really, I think had we planned this I don't think we could have planned it any better than what the Government has done.

The Attorney General appears to think that he is really throwing an insult at us when he motions to the Press and says, filibuster. He seems to think that he is really cutting us to the bone marrow when he motions to the Press and says, obstruction. Mr. Attorney General, if I could only get you to make a mailout to my constituency, and tell them about our filibuster and tell them about my obstruction, I will be eternally grateful.

**MR. McNEILL:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I think the Hon. Member over there is not talking at all about whether the House is going to sit at 10:00 o'clock or 11:00 o'clock. He is talking about everything else.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Point of Order is well taken. I have heard discussion on pay increases, mailouts, physical abuse of the Attorney General and numerous other things. None of it that I can see is related to the subject that is to be discussed here, namely whether this amendment should be adopted and whether we sit at 10:00 o'clock in the morning or 11:00 o'clock in the morning. I wonder if the Member for Thunder Creek could try and regain control of himself to confine himself to the amendment.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A very valid point, Mr. Speaker, and very well taken.

Mr. Speaker, in closing on this matter, I would merely wish to add one more thing that in all seriousness I am done for this particular amendment but somebody is going to take my place. Somebody will take his place and right on down the line. You can go as long as you want and we are right with you. You don't have much help from this side in terms of Opposition. But we will fight you all the way. You have made a great miscalculation, you have underestimated your adversaries.

**MR. J. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased to see that the Liberal Party has a new House leader and a new Whip. I am also more than pleased to see that the number of people who are now trying to render their great decisions in this House are trying to suggest to their colleagues that they are the potential leader of their party. Because it is quite apparent that they are using every opportunity they can now gain in trying to prove that they each are capable of being the leader of that party. They are using it in a type of filibuster . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SKOBERG:** — . . . and I can assure you that I know what filibusters are all about, because I happened to be involved in filibusters. When we filibustered a bill at the federal level we did it for a purpose. We didn't only filibuster a bill for the purpose of delaying and using the tactics of delays that they are using right now. But we delayed a bill to prove to the people of the country and to prove to the Opposition and the government, at that time the government, naturally, to prove to them that we had something to say about it. When the Liberals introduced bills in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, insofar as extending the hours of the individual debate that may pertain to that particular bill, it was done for a purpose. It was done to allow the Members of the Opposition the right to stand up and say what they were talking about.

We haven't heard for the last day and one-half one solid criticism of why we should extend the hours. I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that personally I am concerned that we have a number of Private Members' bills on the Order Paper and I would suggest to the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek that he may be intimately involved in one of them and those Private Members' bills cannot be passed unless we extend the hours of this Session. It is very apparent those people opposite are not concerned about Private Members' bills. They are not concerned about the debate in this House. They are concerned only with

their filibuster so they don't have to get back on their rhetoric of why and when and how they should oppose Bill 1 and Bill 2.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you at this time that for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan that we have to extend the hours of sitting in this House in order that the Private Members' bills can be considered, can be debated, the amendments can be debated and they can come back into this House and they can then be passed for the benefit of those seven or six Private Members' bills. But it appears that the Members opposite aren't concerned about that. They would rather filibuster, in fact, the cheapest, political gimmick I have seen in my life is what happened this afternoon when they had to filibuster a ruling from the Chair. I would be ashamed if I was on that side of the House to use that type of a filibuster.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SKOBERG:** — Mr. Speaker, at least at the federal level you couldn't challenge a ruling of the Chair. I would urgently suggest to those Hon. Members opposite in the Liberal Party that if they are using a filibuster to challenge rulings of the Chair, then they must look at themselves and find out exactly what they are looking at in the mirror. They can't look at themselves intelligently because that should not be used in any House whether it's in a provincial House or the federal House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that there has to be a time for debating insofar as the bill is concerned, and I did have an opportunity at the federal level to participate in a type of filibuster that those people now are using. But we filibustered for a specific purpose. We filibustered for a purpose of trying to bring about amendments to a bill - we filibustered to an extent that we knew that the Government knew what we were talking about. And when that went to the Committee of the Whole, invariably it was a subcommittee, and then back on third reading, we had as Opposition Members, an opportunity then to introduce amendments. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that as far as those people opposite, that's in the Liberal Party only, as far as those people opposite are concerned they don't want to know the truth in Committee of the Whole. They have been told that they will be told the actual facts, told the situation and details, though not the regulations, in Committee of the Whole. It utterly amazes me when I look at Hon. Members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, for him to allow his Members to stand up and say and tell us the regulations. He knows, and every Member in this House knows, or should know, that the regulations can only be brought about after the Bill has been passed. He knows that the Federal Government, as of tonight, is only going to bring about the regulations of the Anti-inflation Bill. It utterly amazes me when I look across and I see the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) preparing notes, but that Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley well knows that regulations are brought about after the Bill has been introduced and passed. He knows that, that's parliamentary procedure. It utterly amazes me while I listen to the rhetoric and all the rest of the stuff that goes with it, and people are suggesting opposite that they want to know the regulations of the bills that are introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you tonight, that I visited schools the last day or two, in fact, hearing the Hon. Member

for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) maybe he hasn't been to a school lately, maybe he doesn't know what the school students are talking about, or thinking about, maybe he doesn't know that they are interested in what all this parliamentary procedure is all about. I visited Riverview Collegiate yesterday morning and they said to me, why is this taking so long? Why are Bills 1 and 2 taking this long? Why in fact would the Opposition deny us, the Government, for extending the time of sittings in order that the Government can then bring in and pass that type of legislation that is necessary?

It is also rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have extended time because those people aren't aware of the fact that what the people in this country are all talking about. They are not aware of the fact that the people know what the Government can do and why they are elected to do it. We have a Premier here in this province and he is the head of the province, the head of the province that's introduced a Throne Speech. We know what that Throne Speech is all about. We have talked on that Throne Speech, and I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that because the Opposition, the Liberal Opposition, are not familiar with what the Throne Speech was all about, they are not familiar with what we are trying to tell the people of this province. They are not familiar with the fact that the people of this province appreciate what we are doing in legislation. They have to now try and lobby and boycott and say we don't need more time because everybody else knows what it's all about.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this appears to be a situation that the people in this particular House must have more opportunity to express their opinion. It appears that they haven't had that opportunity. Look at the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek and the rhetoric he came up with. When I look at that individual and realize that he hasn't been to the Chamber of Commerce in Moose Jaw, I have been there with a letter expressing my available time is at their disposal to explain to them what this is all about. I have been to the schools and said I will come to your school and tell you what this is all about. I will make my time available to you. But the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek doesn't quite find the time hardly to spend time in this House, in fact, he doesn't find time even to talk to the people in his constituency and he doesn't find time to try and find out what the whole issue is all about.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that we must have more time, not to educate the people of Saskatchewan, but we must have more time to allow particularly the Liberal Opposition to have some time to get off their chests that which isn't concerning anybody else. They believe that they are building up a great crescendo of public resentment against the legislation being introduced in this House. All they are saying is that they do not want this House to discuss Private Members' bills, they do not want this House to discuss the rentalsman bill that went through this afternoon (thankfully it went through), they do not want this House to discuss very important things that should be discussed insofar as this Government is concerned.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that beyond a question of a doubt, anybody with brains in their heads opposite on the Liberal side, knows that bills have to be passed, they have to be discussed, they have to go into committee, they have to come back to the third reading, and then if those great magnificent defenders of the public of Saskatchewan want to

stand in their place, then I suggest to them, pass those bills that we are talking about, don't give us the rhetoric and reading out of books. I have been through that crap before myself. Don't go through that stuff, but you be responsible to the people of this province because you are not being responsible right now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SKOBERG:** — You know, it not only amazes me, Mr. Speaker, when I hear these people talk about the number of phone calls that they receive. It utterly amazes me about the difficulty of meeting, as our House Leader has said we should meet, which I subscribe to 100 per cent. We have been through that. We know that the opposite Members in the Liberal Party are telling less than the truth, when they say about the number of phone calls they received. And the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) utterly amazes me when she went through a whole rhetoric of phone calls she received and the reason that she couldn't possibly meet earlier in this House. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if I were a little younger I could well visualize I wouldn't mind making a phone call or two myself, but it not only amazes me that we on the side of the Government aren't receiving these phone calls that you people are supposedly receiving. You know they are not receiving them. You know that you've got as much time as we in the back bench have got to prepare speeches, particularly when you read it out of a book. And particularly when the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek said, we can read books, we can stay here until after New Year's and Christmas. I can assure the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek, who is now purportedly trying to be the new Leader of the Liberal Party (and you have got lots of competition my Hon. Member), but I can assure you that we also are prepared to stay here without any hesitation at all, because in the interests of democracy and in the interests of parliamentary procedure, these bills and all legislation including Private Members' Bills have to be considered. I would suggest to you that you people have an obligation, the Liberal Party has an obligation to recognize the fact that there are various ways of the parliamentary procedure that you can use. But to filibuster, even the Speaker's Ruling, a filibuster extension of time, is a complete indication that you are not interested in parliamentary procedure, you are only interested in filibuster and I can assure you that that's what you people have in mind, and I can assure you, keep on with it because we're here, we are prepared to stay, and I can assure you we're prepared to stay exactly with the philosophy of what this Party stands for, exactly what the bills stand for, and exactly with the support of the Saskatchewan people in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MISS L. B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the amendment.

Being as everyone on this side of the House according to Members opposite seem to be running for the leadership, I'll let you know that I am also, about 1983, not this time, but about 1983.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment that my running record so far hasn't been that good. I have been called out of order, I shall try very hard not to be called out of order. I will try not to shoot my theory to pieces, and I'm not proposing an amendment, so therefore I shall stick right to the point.

The other day we sincerely proposed an amendment for the reasons that we feel we need an extra hour in the morning to do our constituency work, and I stated 23 reasons I do admit, why I needed my work done in the morning. And I do get a lot of phone calls, I also admit that. But I also, perhaps you have selective hearing too, because I also stated that not only did I get these telephone calls, and I'm sure that the Members opposite got them, that perhaps someone else is answering their telephones. So, therefore, I was not stating that they do not have the problems that we do. But I think they too could use the hour in the morning to do this constituency work.

I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, when we are discussing the hour between ten and 11, or whether we start at 10:00 o'clock or 11:00 o'clock in the morning, this morning I happened to be in a government office, the office of the Fire Commissioner from 10:00 o'clock until 11:00 o'clock and we were discussing a problem with a community centre, and I won't go into the problem, I won't read the letter but I just want to very sincerely make a point that I was there discussing a problem which I think needs to be solved and it has been in abeyance for a long time. I am sorry that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) is not here because I think I have a point that might help him, because in my discussion with the Fire Commissioner I found that he needs a little bit of help there as far as staff is concerned and I think that maybe if they had the hour to find this out this might be an additional help to them if they took that time . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — . . . and I'll be glad to tell him where the staff can be used.

Now there have been many reasons and when I first was thinking about standing up here this evening, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would just very briefly and plainly state again and ask for your consideration, your listening, if you listen to why I think we need the time. And I am appreciative that you are listening. But, there have been many reasons stated and one has been that this possibly is a method of closure that you are trying to force in more time so that we can get to these potash bills. Believe me, we want to be here and my amendment which was overruled stated explicitly that we wanted to be here. We want to be here to do some productive debating, and you may laugh but . . .

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — You read books.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — You don't think my debating is productive. Would you listen? Fine! I haven't read out of a book.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — But the fact is we have got to look at why we are proposing these morning sessions. Why are we proposing them? Our purpose behind this speaking whether you think it is productive or not, is because we want more time for the public to get to know why, and what you are proposing and let them decide. I am not saying maybe we are not always right, although we feel very strongly that we are, but let them tell you. No one is always right but in this problem I think that we have got a good cause, that we want the people of Saskatchewan to give you their opinion which I am sure will say, stay out of the potash and this is our purpose and this is what we are standing for.

I will make an aside here. You were speaking of school children and what they are saying about the reasons why we don't want morning sittings and the reasons why we are staying here. There is one thing that I know about school students and people of all ages and that is that when you present to them the facts that you think you have something to fight for which is their right to speak out in Saskatchewan, they all know that we have a good reason and they will be behind us because they have been reading and they know that we sincerely believe that this is their right. So that the people of Saskatchewan know this and they are asking for you to give them time to talk to you about this Bill on the potash industries.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to give very many more comments, a comment has been made that we could use this extra time to propose Private Members' Bills and believe me there is nothing I should like better than to get The Rural Telephone Act in, but this can be done in many ways. It can be done by putting it on the Order Paper and start debating rather than just pushing and pushing and pushing on two bills. Everyone here, young and old, no matter how long you have been here knows that that is the case.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say on this matter and I sincerely hope that the Members opposite will be listening because we sincerely believe that we do need this time as do you need this time to get more feedback, not only from the province but from your constituencies. I am not here to abuse anyone, the Attorney General in particular, physically or otherwise. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the amendment.

**MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to the amendment. I think the amendment is very important, in one way it does give us the extra hour we do need in the morning. I find if we are going to meet at 10:00 o'clock, we have to sit in caucus at 9:00 o'clock and most government offices are very hard to get into before 9:00 o'clock in the morning for some reason. At least this morning I had a bit of a problem getting in one before 9, after 9 I could get in there for a while.

I have also stated before that if we must extend the hours why don't we extend them in the evening, why take up the only time of the day when these offices are open?

Pardon?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The doors open at six.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — I'll be down to see you tomorrow then. I'll be there at six, Mr. Byers, because I'd love to see you. I'm sorry I used your name, you're Department of Highways or something, Environment. I'll be there at six tomorrow if that's an appointment you are quite willing to make. I do appreciate you making it.

As I was saying, it's very important, the one hour sounds probably nit picking, but it isn't. It does give us at least an hour to get in these offices and to make phone calls to them.

I quite often find that a lot of my constituency problems do require a trip to offices and certainly phone calls. It's very difficult to explain by letter, or it takes a great deal of time to explain in a letter a lot of your problems, where if you can find the Minister, or Deputy Minister in charge it can be easily facilitated. It's no use saying I have Saturday to do it in, the offices aren't open, Sunday they aren't open and they aren't open in the evenings. They are only open from nine to five. If we are going to sit in this House from nine to 5:30 it's a very difficult proposition for an MLA to represent his constituents.

I also feel that there is not that great of a rush in this sitting. We do have all winter and the whole year, I would believe, ahead of us.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The potash will still be there.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Well certainly and I hope I will be too. I'm not as old as some of the Members across, so I can last I suppose as long as they can. I think they are all in pretty good shape, we don't have to have these Bills through by Christmas or anything like that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:** — I am glad you like my speech, Sir, I'd hate to bore you. It seems strange to me that this Government is so afraid to have us approach their Ministers that they lock us into the Legislative Assembly when their offices are open. They seem to be quite shrinking violets, in fact, they are quite insistent we must meet at ten to protect them I guess. It also seems rather strange that they not only don't want to take calls from the people of this province who want to talk to them about problems, such as potash. Pardon?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . can I . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Oh no, certainly, speak. I like to hear a jackass bray.

Another thing in doing this closure at this 10:00 o'clock, they are not only depriving us from seeing the Ministers, they are depriving us of the opportunity of speaking with our constituents and this I believe is the end of democracy. We saw what happened when this tactic was used in the United States with Mr. Nixon when he divorced himself from the people and let

his advisors run him. He ran into things such as Watergate. I feel if we are going to keep our Ministers in the House all day, protected from the population, we are going to keep MLAs in the House all day, closed away from the general citizen of this province, we are going to start to rule by "triumviral". We are not going to consider the democratic process and this is a dangerous and sad route for any government to fall into. It sets a dangerous precedent. This is why I say that the hour from ten to 11 doesn't seem important, but it is to me at least. It gives an hour where this work can be done.

As I said before I would rather that you had brought your motion in to sit in the evening hours. At least the offices are closed, we can do this.

As one Member, I am sure, brought up and I quite agree with him that there are many other bills, private bills to bring up that I would beg leave to adjourn debate on this.

Request for adjourned debate denied.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — And so as we don't seem to have any Private Members' bills or any rent bills to bring on the paper, I will continue debate on why we should meet at 11:00 o'clock.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:** — I would say by popular demand which is a nice way to come back.

As I was saying that this action and not allowing us an extra hour in the morning does appear to me that the Government is more interested in divorcing us from our constituents, divorcing themselves from meeting the constituents, making themselves more unavailable than they are in debate.

If this weren't true, this extension would have been asked for evening sittings, so we'd be open in the House. But obviously this Government is afraid to talk to their people, they would rather cloister themselves as in a monastery. It's a shameful method of showing the utter disregard this Government seems to have for the citizens of this province, and so therefore, I will support this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of the amendment to the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — The amendment would change the motion so that the proposed morning sittings of the Legislature would begin at 11:00 a.m. instead of ten. Speaking in support of that amendment, I should like to make it clear that I am prepared to sit here and debate the bills before this House as long as anybody wishes. Even though there are many other duties at this Christmas season that a wife and mother might wish to be doing on behalf of her family, as she prepares for Christmas, I am prepared to stay here and carry out my duties as an MLA.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — All we are requesting in this amendment is a request for one extra hour each morning to attend to the many duties and commitments that come as our responsibility as duly elected Members from our constituency and as Members of the official Opposition.

Perhaps the Hon. Attorney General has forgotten about the early days when he was a new MLA. Perhaps he didn't need to research material and prepare speeches as I find I have to do. As a new MLA it probably takes me longer to research and prepare my debates for the afternoon session.

There are Members in this House who don't have that same problem of having to do research and preparation. I would say that there are two kinds of MLAs who don't have to work that hard. First of all I would suggest that the Cabinet Ministers with all their assistants don't have to spend the hours that some of us do in preparation. Secondly there are other Members in the House who have not yet spoken in any of the debates and I suggest that they don't have to spend time in the morning doing research and preparation either.

I should say that such Members show little understanding or concern for us Members of the official Opposition who are taking our responsibilities seriously and doing our best, even though many of us are here for the first time.

Some of the Members opposite may think one hour shouldn't make that much difference, but I want to assure you, one hour means a great deal to me, as I try to keep up with the duties that I have taken on as the representative of Saskatoon-Sutherland. I won't bore you or take up time, Mr. Speaker, with bringing attention in detail to some of the problems that have been brought to me by my constituents, but they are important issues and I feel I have a responsibility to do what I can on behalf of those constituents.

I have letters here and you say people don't get letters. I could read letters and these are only samples of letters. I don't suppose many of you realize, if you don't come from Saskatoon however, other Members from Saskatoon should realize how many calls I get and I don't know whether they get the same calls or not.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Robbins) he's only been the Minister of Health for a short time and perhaps he doesn't realize the number of senior citizens that can't get a bed when they have a stroke and are paralyzed and all that. He will find that out when he's Minister of Health for a longer time. In my work in Saskatoon in the health care field I get calls regularly about . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Well I tell you, if I dealt with one of those letters it would take more than an hour to find a bed for somebody that hasn't got a bed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — As a matter of fact, if the Minister of Health would find a bed I wouldn't have to.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — I'd be glad to send these letters over to him and tell him all about these 30 or 40 people who are sitting around our hospitals that haven't got a place to be sent out to.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Regarding Bill 16, I've had letters, meetings and calls from people who are concerned on both sides of that issue, tenants and landlord alike. They are concerned about the legislation. They want fair legislation and I've been trying to explain to them what I can about Bill 16 and what we are trying to do, and how we are supporting something that would help the situation. I think this is what we are dealing with in this House. These are the issues of the day.

Perhaps you don't have to deal with problems of your constituents. I don't know. Maybe they don't phone you, or write you. As a matter of fact some of my constituents say they can't get through to you on the phone. So maybe that's why I'm getting so many calls. They have to talk to somebody from Saskatoon.

There are concerned teachers, concerned nurses and concerned women. There are women who are concerned about needed changes in the legislation that discriminates against them and they are depending on Miss Clifford and myself to speak for them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — Now as a new Member, before I came down here I read the procedures that went on last year and in making my plans for the opening of the Legislature I read that last year the House adjourned on December 12. It wasn't called back except for a special sitting on January 14th and 15th to do with a special issue and then it did not reconvene until March 10th. Now I ask why is the situation so different this year? Why does this Government think it is so necessary to pass two bills before Christmas? You'd honestly think that potash was going to go mouldy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — It's just like the Christmas spirit, it will keep and not go mouldy. It will probably get better through the years if you just wait.

I want you to know that we are serious about opposing Bill 1 and Bill 2.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — And we can sit here just as long as you can and we can

debate just as long as you can.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — I cannot accept that these Bills have to be rushed through before Christmas. If the Government were acting in a reasonable way, they would realize that the course they are following in attempting to force this issue through the House before Christmas is wrong and it's irresponsible.

The Members opposite would try to have us and the people of this province believe that they are the only ones concerned about people in this province. They want us to believe that they are the only ones who listen to people. You remember that saying and you read it in the papers, "Speak up, your Government wants to hear you." They won't stop and listen. As a matter of fact I think there is a reason they want this rushed through before Christmas because they are afraid to go home and face their constituents during the adjournment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — I have always said when you are opposing something you should always be prepared to give constructive criticism and probably some good sound advice. What I would like to present to you from a woman's point of view is some good commonsense advice. This is my first sitting of the Legislature and I offer this, with respect, to all the Members opposite.

This is Christmas time when all of us here should be concerned about our families. Particularly you fellows about your wives, the mothers and children. As a woman I put forth a commonsense solution to this debate that we are in right now.

This, as I've said before, is the Christmas season, a season when we talk of peace and good will towards men. I tell you if the Attorney General would show some good will it would be the greatest gesture of all.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. EDWARDS:** — I think the Attorney General would show a great gesture of good will towards the House, the Assembly, the people of Saskatchewan if he would think about what I am saying and if tomorrow morning he would come in here and adjourn this House until after Christmas.

I am supporting the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to be back, I'm glad to be able to take an opportunity . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — . . . to participate in this debate and I want to make one thing clear when I start, that I don't intend to ever let Bill 1

and Bill 2 pass this House. I'm going to tell you, I haven't had an opportunity except for a few moments extemporaneously to speak on Bill 1 and Bill 2. But I'm going to tell you, as far as I'm concerned, I don't ever intend to let Bill 1 and Bill 2 pass this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That means I don't care what the implications are. I don't know what my capacity is. I don't know the feelings of my own Members except to assess what they are doing, but I do know this, that we've got a purpose. I stand here now not to delay this particular Motion.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Why are you . . .

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Yes, you choo, choo engineer from Moose Jaw. You know he stands up when he yaks from the seat of his trousers at the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) but he doesn't have enough guts to stand on his feet and talk. If you've got something to say about the Member for Thunder Creek stand on your feet like a man and don't sit there and interrupt the way you do from morning until night. I think it is time you Members got this very clear, you just had better get something very, very clear, we're not playing in this and perhaps some of the things we may have to say in the next month or two months may not make too much sense . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's right. Because if I have to talk 15 hours I'm not sure it will make sense for 15 hours. I'm going to tell the goal and the objective and the purpose of what we're trying to do. It will sure make sense and will make sense to the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — If you think I'm going to sit here and let 40 per cent of the voters of this province, the minority, dictate a policy that will change the economic and social fabric of this province and have an impact on the Dominion of Canada, you've got another think coming and I have no intention of letting it happen. Absolutely no intention. You know, Mr. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg), I'm going to tell you why you are back in Saskatchewan and not at Ottawa. That had to be the shallowest speech, the biggest tripe that I have ever heard in this House for a long time. You know, he said, "When I was in Ottawa I participated in a filibuster." He said, "I was part of a filibuster." He wakes up now the Member for Moose Jaw North, would you stand on your feet, would you take this opportunity, we would love to listen to you. All of us will. We'd be glad to sit down. Instead of yipping, yipe, yipe, yipe. You know, you're like a backbiting puppy. He said, "You know I took part in the filibuster but we had a purpose." Well, I'm going to tell you, I've got a purpose too and that is to strangle Bill 1 and strangle Bill 2.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I have yet to hear the Member speak to the Motion that is before us. He is devoting his comments to Bill 1 and Bill 2 and other sundry matters. The matter that is before us is the extension of the hours of the House. I am sure the Member wants to be in order.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I certainly apologize if I didn't. What I am really trying to say and I will try to relate my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that by trying to extend the hours and to thus shorten the debate will in reality defeat the very purpose that I stand before this very Legislature tonight. The very reason I feel that I was elected, that is to preserve the way of life that I believe in, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Do you know, I understand that our good friend, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver), gave a second lecture. He lectured the Members on this side, the Liberals, yesterday. Unfortunately I wasn't here for a pretty good reason. I wish the Member for Nipawin was here because I want to tell him that if he thinks the purpose of this House is because the Government have a majority and because they can win the vote, that there is no value to stand on your feet and espouse the ideals and the principles that you believe in and the principles and the ideals that the people elected you for, then I say that is a tragedy. A tragedy!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy for the Conservative Party but a much bigger tragedy for the people of Saskatchewan. And that's the tragedy of the Leader of the Conservative Party and that's the tragedy of the Conservative Opposition.

When I heard the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) congratulate the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) who has been in this House for five, six, seven weeks and make a maiden speech of one minute in length about the biggest and most important issue that has ever come before the people of Saskatchewan. If we ever let those boys . . .

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — If you want to make a Point of Order, fellows, the procedure in the House is to stand on your feet. That's what you do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I'll be glad to sit down if you've got a Point of Order.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is going off the Motion which is before him for debate. You have indicated this to him once and he continues to side track again.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I could show . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, I think I've had enough guidance on that. I think lecturing other Members in the House whether they be a recognized political group or not, is not in relation to the extension of the hours and it is really not on the subject. I want the Member to try and observe the rules. They are not my rules, they are your rules.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly endorse what you are saying, but what I am really saying is I hope that my colleagues to my left will participate on this Bill so that they won't permit the NDP Government to shorten or lengthen the hours and ram this legislation through. They have got a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan to prevent that. That's all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very germane to the Motion. What is the attitude, what is the purpose of the speaking pattern of Members of this House toward an issue on a basic and fundamental principle about whether or not we should let this Government get control over every aspect of our economic lives or not, whether or not we should let a precedent of socialism, an expropriation and, by the reading of the Bill, almost confiscation of the resource industry in this province, take over and set a pattern for the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we don't jam this Bill out because I hope, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty that I'll be standing here in March speaking about potash on Bill 1 and Bill 2. I really mean that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to assess why this particular Government is doing this, this time. I think it is important because I think, Mr. Speaker, as I get the sense and the mood of the public in Saskatchewan that all of a sudden the NDP are becoming frightened. They know, Mr. Speaker, they know that there is a reaction and a bad reaction. They also, Mr. Speaker, know that when we turn around and every time we go out people are beginning to ask questions: How much is it going to cost? Where are they going to get the money? How much interest are you going to pay? What's this going to do to investment in Saskatchewan? And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely vital that we take our time and present this issue very clearly, very concisely and take as long as is humanly possible in order to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan will have an opportunity. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is why the Government is ramming this through in this special fall Session, because Members know that very, very rarely do the people of Saskatchewan react to the Legislative Assembly for a long period of time. People are busy, it's Christmas, they have an opportunity to do so many other things and the first thing you know the Bill has gone through and no reaction has occurred. All we want is we're going to make absolutely certain that by the time Bill 1 and Bill 2 ever do get passed in this House, that every man, woman and child in this province knows what you are doing and four years from now they'll be able to give a judgment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And I'm going to tell you that judgment is very important. Because there was a judgment a few days ago. You know the judgment was brought about by exactly the same issue as is here now in the Province of Saskatchewan. What happened to the resource industry in the Province of British Columbia and that's why Dave Barrett was thrown right out of the province and lost his own seat.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — That's why, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and to all Members of this House that in no way will this Bill ever pass as far as I am concerned and that is why I hope this Motion will never pass. I am not worried about what the days are, the length of time, what I am talking about is the importance of the fundamental principle that we are debating. What it means, will it change the pattern in the social fabric of Saskatchewan life? Will it change the pattern and thrust of resource development in Canada? Are we going to turn around and see the same thing happen to other resources as has happened to the oil industry. You know, the interesting thing, the Minister who was in charge of Saskoil is now presiding over the death of potash just as he presided over the death of the oil industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — You would think, Mr. Speaker, that when a man led one industry to the execution block in this province and completely destroyed it at a time when energy resources and resources were so vital, that now he would not preside over the execution of the second resource industry. That really bothers me. One of the reasons I don't want the debate to lengthen or the time lengthened is because I hope that Minister will take the opportunity of standing on his feet and expressing to the people of Saskatchewan how he can justify the execution of the second resource industry in this province when he presided over the execution of the first.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The funny part of it is, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thunder Creek really hit the nail on the head when he said, I have never seen such poor management because it is poor management. This particular amendment of my colleague is a very reasonable one. I don't know if any of you have ever sat down and tried to figure it out. It's one more day to debate this Bill before Christmas, it is an extension of almost 20 per cent of the time. We are trying to be as co-operative as possible. All I'm saying is that I don't want that amendment to pass and I'm glad the Attorney General got his back up and said, don't let anybody suggest that the Opposition won a battle, that that Opposition won a point. Oh, no, he's going to win them all and he's going to do whatever he wants in this House or by gosh you fellows - how many times has he told you - you'll have a new House leader. Well, I'm going to tell you Members on the back benches, I wonder, if any other parliament or any other

House or Legislative Assembly in this country would ever not have the good sense and the good management to sit down and say, okay, you know what you have lost on Bill 1 and Bill 2, which I am delighted about, is two days and I am also going to tell you I'm going to be talking at 9:30 and if you want to bring it up on Monday, I'm going to be talking about it at 9:30 on Monday night. I had not better say what I can do because I'm not sure, but you have already lost two days and I'm delighted, I really am. If you want to call that obstruction, if you want to call that filibuster, I say, Yes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Because if I can stop by filibuster or obstruction the expropriation and the takeover of the potash industry in the Province of Saskatchewan, I will obstruct and I will filibuster.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I am going to tell the Member for Moose Jaw North that as far as I am concerned this is the greatest purpose. I have been in this House since 1964, I have never felt more strongly about any bill that has been introduced in this Assembly as I do about these two. Strangely enough, my colleagues, some of them who have been here for the first time, feel equally as strong. We feel we have a responsibility and a serious responsibility and a serious goal and we'll do everything we can to carry out that responsibility and carry out that goal. As I say that is the purpose for which we are standing on our feet yesterday, today and Monday, Tuesday, whatever day it takes. We will not permit the passing of Bill 1 and 2 if we can prevent it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I also want to tell my friends the Conservatives, that I wish they would join this battle because one of the things they are going to learn, it is not always important who wins the vote, that's not always important, because sometimes they will win the vote and lose the battle. That's what's important. I am convinced right now that the Government may win the vote if it ever comes to one but I am equally convinced that they are going to lose the battle. It is too bad that you fellows aren't part of that battle.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Not only would we welcome your participation, we will welcome your efforts, because you know something is happening and yet you gentlemen don't realize it. All of a sudden the public is beginning to get a real sense of where this Government is going and what direction they are aimed at and just exactly what plan they have for the Province of Saskatchewan. What is that grandiose plan? They are beginning to realize, and you know I am going to tell my friend from Nipawin again, that if he thinks he is going to have another issue, don't mistake these birds opposite, they are going to put everything possible through this time. You should see them a year or two before the election; sweetie pies, smooth, sweetness and honey. This is the

crunch, this will be the biggest debate and the biggest issue that this House will face in four years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SNYDER:** — You're running scared.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — You're yipping again. Would you stand up when I'm finished. When I'm finished I'm going to ask all the Members on this side of the House to let you stand on your feet and make another one of those great atrocities of yours again and instead of yipping, instead of sitting there barking like a puppy dog, you will have the courage to get on your feet and express your principles.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — And I'll respect your opportunity to speak and listen to you with all I can.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You've got your book upside down.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I've made my position clear on this and the position of my fellow colleagues that we are not here to delay this Motion for a day or a week or an hour. We are here to prevent the passing of Bill 1 and Bill 2. Make no mistake about it. I hope I have made that clear. I hope I make also clear the reasons we feel so strongly that is because this is the one thing that really divides this side of the House from that side of the House. How often have I heard my friend the Attorney General stand up and say, socialism is no longer a bad word. Let me tell you, Mr. Attorney General, socialism has become a bad word very quickly in Saskatchewan. Very quickly. It became a bad word in British Columbia very quickly.

I should like to tell my friend from Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange) he likes to espouse that word. I happened to come in contact with a lot of his constituents yesterday. They are pretty disturbed about his socialist attitude. Pretty disturbed. I am going to tell some of the rest of you backbenchers, the reason we are trying to prevent this Bill from going through the House is to save your skin. To save your skin. Because if we don't save your skin you are in trouble. If you let that Attorney General ram this bill through and pass it, because when some of you Members go home, go back to your constituency, go back and talk to your constituents, when the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) walks down the main street of Weyburn and the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) goes down to his home town, they are going to find out that this isn't the great and beautiful scenario that they thought it was. They are going to find this out very, very quickly.

The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) is gone. What did he say, big deal, big deal. One of his yips, that was his contribution to the debate. I am going to tell you it is a big deal. It is a very big deal for the Liberals, a very big deal. So big it is beyond your comprehension to understand.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — You know what you have, for example, you sit in this House and you think that these people are standing on their feet and talking about something only to prevent two hours of morning sittings. Two extra hours. That is not what they are trying to do at all. They are standing here because they believe very firmly that what you people are doing is wrong. What you people are doing is bad for Saskatchewan. That is the reason they are standing up here. That is the reason they are going to do battle. That is the reason they are enjoying the battle. I am going to tell you, the Member for Thunder Creek said, you know we are getting an education, we are getting as much experience in a month as we would get in two years. It is an opportunity for something in relation to an ideal and a principle to unite a group of people. It is not the hum drum, in it not the ordinary or everyday problem, but what it is is a principle that everybody believes in, an ideal by which they stand for and you have given us that and you have given the Liberal caucus that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I have to make a comment in relation to my colleague for Thunder Creek. You know as I sat and listened to him and watched a Thatcher raise the ire on the back of the necks of every NDP, it reminded me of another Thatcher.

**MR. ALLEN:** — Where is he now, Cy?

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I'd like to tell you, Bill, but you better . . .

**MR. ALLEN:** — I didn't mean it that way.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — But you said it in that way. Please don't ask me to interpret what you say. That other Thatcher, one thing that he did, he believed in freedom of the individual.

**MR. ROLFES:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to know what the previous Thatcher has to do with us sitting at 10:00 o'clock or 11:00 o'clock as the Motion is before us. I don't think he is on the Motion at all and I wish you would draw that to his attention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think I require any more guidance on this Point of Order, thank you. The Point of Order is well taken. I have always admired the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley in being able to take bits and pieces that are thrown at him from across the Chamber and make a debate out of it. But that still doesn't make it in order, because it comes from the Chamber. To be in order it has to be on the amendments before us, whether we sit at 10:00 o'clock or at 11:00 o'clock and in your case the entire Motion about the elongation of the hours.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, once again I will respect your judgment. May I respectfully suggest to you, Sir, what the whole purpose of what I am trying to do and I think it is very much related to the issue or the Motion. What I am really trying to say,

Mr. Speaker, is that this particular Motion hits at the very core, the very substance of my beliefs and my opposition. And what I am trying to point out to you and Members of the House, all those reasons why we shouldn't put these two additional hours into the morning sitting so that it would tire out the Opposition, speed up the bill, make it possible to pass it quicker. But I will try as much as I can to stay to it.

I want to say one other thing and I hope I am germane in this, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moose Jaw North said, you know the Liberal Opposition suffers because of this debate. I am going to tell you, gentlemen, you are wrong. The people who are suffering will be the people of Saskatchewan if you pass this bill, that is the people who are going to suffer. That is why it is important that we don't turn around and jam this through. I don't think that you people in the back benches have ever seen a debate in the House. I am sure you are confused and wondering why Members of the Opposition would stand up and talk and talk and debate about something, sometimes you don't find the meaning and the sense to it. I am sure that you have a reason for that. I respect that question. But I am going to suggest to you if you look a little deeper you will understand why and that is the real motivation behind it.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Motion doesn't really offer anything to adjournment of the House, to the passage of the bill, it offers nothing except another opportunity for another debate in which we are glad to participate. I think we have offered the Attorney General a very reasonable proposition today, a very reasonable proposition. As I say in most cases he does a pretty good job but I think he lost his cool today. His logic went out the window. His common sense went out the window. There is no way, after him being in this House for eight or nine years that he must know, that there is no way the Government can put the whip to the Opposition, no way. Because we and the Members, the backbenchers are going to learn this that we have the last word, we have the opportunity to speak and to propose amendments and to hold up the bill until we feel that the debate has been as extensive, that the knowledge has been as widespread as humanly possible. This is our prerogative, because we happen to be the Opposition and we have the opportunity to speak, because free speech is really here.

What is this Motion trying to do? It is really trying to impose closure. It really is. I think - the Attorney General nods his head - and I think that is right. I think that is legitimately right. I think you backbenchers have learned a long time ago that democracy has one purpose and that is freedom of speech. I think that you know also that democracy is the opportunity of the minority to speak out and speak very clearly in the Legislature. I think that all of you will know soon that this is the prerogative that we are now exercising.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It is abuse.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — No, it is not a question of abuse. This Motion is the abuse, my friend for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson). This Motion is the abuse. Really what it does is show contempt for this group of people over here. But what is more important it shows contempt for the people of Saskatchewan. That's the real issue here. You know why it shows contempt? Because it has one goal

and objective to get this bill passed as quickly as possible so that public reaction will be as little as possible. There is no question about that. You all know it. Everybody knows it.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason we are going to continue this and continue the debate with the hope - and I am also going to put it to you another way - we are not really standing up here just with a complete concept that all you people are going to vote for Bill 1 and Bill 2. We don't want to shorten this debate because we are hoping that maybe, maybe this Government will recognize as it has in the past that this is bad legislation, and withdraw the bill. By withdrawing the bill, it won't be a question of saving face, it will be a question of really doing it. I don't know if you people are really aware when I talk about public reaction and time, the importance of time. As I said to my friends to the left, this is the real purpose in debating this legislation, not to win the vote. If we expect to win the vote there is no purpose in debating because we are going to lose the vote.

I want to tell you what we are really saying. We want to give the opportunity to the public of Saskatchewan to react in honesty and with knowledge.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, there is beginning to be a bit of reaction. Beginning to be a bit of reaction. I happen to have here an ad that comes from, I believe, the Globe and Mail, all the way from Toronto. I should like to read it to the Members of the Government because it is an indication of what would happen if we had gone and followed the advice of the Conservatives, you know what would have happened? There never would have been this ad. There never would have been an opportunity for thinking people regardless of what side of the fence they are on, to sit down and express an opinion. There would never have been an opportunity because if we had followed the advice of the Conservatives we'd all be home now. The Member for Athabasca would be out skidoing, the rest of you would be out on the farm or wherever you would go. This Legislature would be forgotten, then you would pour the thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars to propaganda on the people of Saskatchewan. Government advertising. The first thing you know you would brainwash them, the people of Saskatchewan would begin to think, well, it must be a good thing. Nobody raised Cain, nobody expressed opposition. But because of what we are doing there is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — There is a reaction and I am going to read that reaction because I think it is important. It doesn't even come from Saskatchewan. It is a group of concerned citizens in another province who are worried about what is going to happen to this country if we let you birds get away with what you are trying to do. It starts off: "The taxpayers' money." That is a very legitimate statement.

There are in fact more ways to lose money in the potash business than say a shoe factory.

I don't like to bring up that shoe factory because - I do believe the Attorney General has used it a couple of times but I suppose it is a realistic or practical example. But I don't like to use it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — On a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, I think you ruled earlier today that Members were not to go into detail into bills, but they were in principle to argue the why or debate why we should or should not sit at 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock. I would like you to rule on that.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I will try to stick to it but I am trying to point out to the Members opposite the reason we do not want this Motion to pass is to give an opportunity for the bill and its implications to be widely known and discussed around Saskatchewan and Canada. I am pointing out that had we passed this Bill when we first came in the House, within two or three days, there would have been no opportunity for public reaction. If we lengthen the debate in this House another two hours a day, then all of a sudden we will cut off reaction from the public.

I think it is important to point out that by delaying this bill, by debating this bill very hard and rigorously in this House we have got a reaction not only in Saskatchewan and Canada to indicate what lengthening the two hours of this House would do and to point out to Members what kind of reaction so that they will appreciate the arguments of my colleagues. I in no way want to lengthen the debate in this House for two hours. And I would just indicate the reaction, Mr. Speaker, and then I will get back as quickly as I can to the main issue of the debate.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, further to the Point of Order, I think earlier today you ruled that Members should not go into detail explanation . . .

**MR. MALONE:** — He is speaking to the whole Motion.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I realize he is speaking to the whole Motion.

**MR. LANE:** — Then what's the problem?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I have the floor.

**MR. LANE:** — Do something with it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — If you would shut up I would. Why don't you take your shoe off and fill that gap, on second thought take both of them and fill it.

Mr. Speaker, I think you ruled earlier today that people are to speak to the Motion before us and not to go into detail or extraneous matters that do not relate to the general Motion. I ask you to rule on that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it is quite clear that any Member will have

ample opportunity to extend the debate on Bill 1 and Bill 2 as much as they wish or as little as they wish depending upon what their views are. Extending the debate on this may be indirectly extending the debate on Bill 1 and Bill 2, but that is not the point of this debate. The point of this debate is the elongated hours. I ask the Member to relate to that closely.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling once again and I am speaking, I hope, to the elongation of the sitting hours in this Assembly. I am trying to point out the reason for my opposition. I listened to the Member for Moose Jaw North talk about his experience in the House of Commons, what he thought a filibuster was and the great purpose and motivation they had. I listened to somebody else talk about additional research and I think I have been more germane to the debate, Sir, with due respect, than most of the debate on that side of the House. I will try, I am just going to point out again the importance of not whistling this bill through the Legislature, because we want to get public reaction and public education. Surely one of the very reasons we are here, gentlemen, is for an opportunity to give the public the views that go on here, that is why we have the Press Gallery, that is why we have reporting on the Session in the Legislature, is to educate and give the public of Saskatchewan an opportunity to view and hear and understand and have a knowledgeable opinion of the laws that are passed in this House. That is a pretty serious responsibility for Members of the Legislature. That is one of the reasons it isn't the normal practice of this House to commence the House at 10:00 o'clock in the morning. That is one of the reasons for the normal practice of the House to start at 2:30 o'clock. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, once again I will try to read this very quickly:

Why Premier Blakeney says he wants to get into the potash business. He says he has four reasons. He wants to regulate production but he already does this. He doesn't need to own the companies to regulate production. Of course he is talking about prorationing which is regulation.

He says he wants to ensure expansion of the industry. He doesn't have to take over existing companies to do this. He can start his own mine or better still he can create a favorable atmosphere for potash companies.

He says he wants to ensure the cash flow of the province. But Mr. Blakeney's Government is already taking over 80 per cent of the revenue. Saskatchewan tax revenue from potash will be an estimated \$120 million in '76.

He says he wants more Canadians in the management. We suspect that what he really means is that he wants more bureaucrats in the management. Because he wanted more Canadians there are easier ways to do it than taking over the companies.

This is rather interesting. By extending this debate, this kind of reaction in the city of Toronto. It is a pretty knowledgeable group of people. The National Citizens Coalition is pretty knowledgeable about what is going on in Saskatchewan. That is because of debate that has been extended over a period of a month.

Surely no one of that side of the House - you know what we will do, you and I will see in this Legislature when Estimates come up a debate of ten hours on \$100,000 because somebody feels quite strongly about it. Here we are talking about one billion dollars. Now you want to extend the sitting of the House two hours in order to get through it and that I think is a shame. It is a terrible shame. Mr. Speaker, to show you the reaction this kind of extended debate has brought from Ontario, it talks about Mr. Blakeney and oil:

On the very same day Premier Blakeney said he was thinking of taking over the potash business he said that he was going to give the oil companies money for exploration and development in Saskatchewan. Think about that for a moment (it says). The potash people risked a lot of money, spent a lot of time developing the potash business, after a long time it became profitable, now the Government wants to take it over.

In other words what they are really suggesting is that you can't have your cake and eat it too.

At the same time the Government wants the oil companies to spend a lot of time and money developing the petroleum business. If you owned an oil company wouldn't you suspect that Premier Blakeney just wanted you to develop the industry just so the province could take it over. Would you be willing to invest money in Saskatchewan?

This is kind of amazing that after five weeks of debate that this kind of knowledgeable reaction is coming from the rest of Canada. I am going to suggest to you gentlemen, by not extending this debate two hours, that what we are really going to do is we are going to find everybody in Saskatchewan, five weeks from now or two months from now, there won't be a single person in the Province of Saskatchewan who is not familiar with potash. Potash will be a byword in every house. They will also be very knowledgeable and they will be so knowledgeable they will be able to make an intelligent decision in 1979, a very intelligent one and that is exactly what we are trying to do and that is why we don't want to agree to extending the debate for another two hours.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk again a little bit about what the weapon of the Opposition is. Some of you seem to have a great lack of understanding of what kind of tools the Opposition has, particularly the back benches over there. I should like briefly to point out to you some of the equipment that is given to the minority in the democratic system. It is important because the minority is part of the process that makes democracy. If we didn't have this minority group on this side of the House we would be living in a dictatorship. That is what this particular resolution seems to be leading to. So what the minority or the democratic process offers to the minority in the House are a few weapons. First of all the protection of the Speaker. I think all of us are going to say that the Speaker is gathering the respect of both sides of the House for his fairness and his knowledge and his understanding of the real issues of the Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The second thing that the

democratic system offers to the minority or the Opposition in the House, are the rules of the House. What we are really asking in this Motion is to set aside the normal rule. We are saying that that particular rule of starting the House at 2:30 in the afternoon is a protection for the minority or for the Opposition in the Legislature. No question about it. That is there for their protection. That is why in this province we don't have that rule where we can go on and on and on until 1 or 2 in the morning, except under closure. So we do have that protection. Yet you gentlemen want to set that protection aside for your own narrow doctrinaire purposes, which is exactly what you are doing in this Motion.

The third thing the Opposition has, the third weapon, if you want to call it that, is the opportunity to stand up and debate. Through the means of the debate to convince the public. As I said one may lose the vote but one may win the war. That is the real basic function of the Opposition. If you want to call that a filibuster, you go ahead, it doesn't bother me, it doesn't bother me at all. Because I do intend to filibuster. When I get on Bill 1 and Bill 2, I certainly do. There is just no way I am going to let you pass it if I can help it. My colleagues may pull me down, I don't know, but I repeat what I said at the start. I hope in March we are still talking about potash. I hope in March the people of Saskatchewan still know that Bill 1 and Bill 2 are before this Legislature. I honestly think it is possible, I think it is possible. I think if you Members want to go home for a couple of days for a Yuletide meal, we'll accept that. I think we will all agree to that. Would you fellows like Christmas dinner at home? We'll all get Christmas dinner, why we could send out for Kentucky Fried. I am serious, we could go home for a couple of days so nobody would be deprived of the opportunity of getting home with their families and their friends. We could come back between Christmas and New Year's, get home for New Year's for a couple of days. Get back after and get right at it. Then I think we would get right down to the hard core and we will begin to see. I think that this is a very bad time to be debating this Bill.

This is another reason that I want to hold it over. Everybody is so busy at the Christmas season, shopping, down town, businessmen making money, night shopping and so forth. People have limited opportunity to read the newspaper, watch television, to listen to the radio. I think it is important - is the bull moose going to speak, the old bull of the woods, I really hope so because I have been telling, I want to tell the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer), I've been telling the gang that it is delightful to listen to you. Not very bright but very colourful. I hope that you are going to get up and participate in this debate because I tell you, Mr. Member for North Battleford, I would personally be disappointed, because, as I say you sometimes don't make much sense but it is always colourful and interesting. We would be glad to have the old auctioneer stand up and participate. In fact, I will make him the same offer as I made the Member for Moose Jaw North. As soon as I finish I will ask my Members to let the Member for North Battleford stand up and participate so that we can hear exactly what he has to say. As I say I will be interested in your thoughts because I think the people of the North have watched what has gone on in the timber industry, just as the people in Estevan and Swift Current and Shaunavon and Morse have seen what has gone on in the oil industry under Bill 42. Your people have seen what has gone on in the timber industry, therefore, I

think it will be important that they make sure that they understand about potash.

I really think it is important and another reason I don't want to lengthen the sitting day is because I really think that any time anything is important, as is Bill 1 and Bill 2, should never pass this House without every Member standing up and expressing exactly what he feels. For example, I know the Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar) doesn't agree with this Bill. His whole way of life and his philosophy of life is against it. I know party rules and party loyalty, but I think he should get on his feet and tell the people of Melfort, tell them what his position is on this Bill. That is why it is absolutely vital that we don't extend that sitting day for two hours. I hope the Member for Moose Jaw North gets up and talks about more than the 10:00 or 11:0 sittings when the potash bill gets back. That is another reason I don't want to lengthen the day because I want to hear and the business community in Moose Jaw want to hear, exactly what the Member for Moose Jaw thinks about this takeover.

I should like to hear from all the rest of them. My good friend the Member for Weyburn. He is pretty well respected, I think he should get up in this particular debate and express his opinion, tell his constituents about the reason he thinks it is important and therefore if we lengthen the sitting day, you will never get that opportunity. I want to see that you get that opportunity.

I am thinking of the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie). I think because he is a lawyer, he should get up on his feet to tell the people of Saskatchewan the legal implications of a couple of the sections of those Acts which give more power . . .

**MR. SKOBERG:** — I wonder if the Hon. Member would consider a serious question in the midst of his serious dialogue at this particular time. I should love to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the length of time that we have been in the sittings up to now. But I am wondering and I appreciate the fact that the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley has indicated that we need a lot of time to educate the public of Saskatchewan, that we need a lot of time to express our opinions and I am more than willing and I want to have that extra time myself to again express my opinion in so far as this certain legislation that is before this House. I am wondering whether or not because of the fact that every minute, every hour, every day, is very, very necessary for us to express our opinions in so far as certain legislation is concerned, whether or not the Hon. Member possibly wouldn't agree with me that if, in fact, that is true, and I am sure he agrees with me, is that not true - he nods his head in agreement - then I would ask him that if that is true and if he agrees with me then why wouldn't we need the extra time for very limitedly asking for at this time in order that we can make our views known and also that those Hon. Members on that side of the House can make their views known so that the public of Saskatchewan can become fully familiar with what this important legislation that he refers to is all about? Because there is other legislation too that I am concerned about.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — There aren't any of you

who have enough guts to stand up and talk about Bill 1 and Bill 2. The Minister of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation (Mr. Cowley), can you imagine in this House, the Minister who is responsible for the Potash Corporation, \$1 billion, doesn't have enough courage to stand up in the House and he has to get a colleague to get the bill through.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) in this House who will be responsible for the repayment of \$1 billion doesn't have enough guts to stand up and talk. And you tell me to extend the time so that you can stand up and express your opinion. I want you to look, Mr. Member for Moose Jaw North, look at this Order Paper. There is nothing on there from Government Members except the odd thing, it is all Opposition. You backbenchers are a bunch of sheep. You don't ask any questions, you don't express any independence, you don't represent your constituencies. You don't represent the people of Saskatchewan. All you are is a bunch of sheep who do what the Attorney General tells you to do. That is why. You tell me to stand up here and extend the length of debate. We will be here in February talking about potash and I will tell you something and I hope you are right and that is that the Minister responsible for the potash corporation will have the courage to get on his feet and talk about it. The Minister of Finance, can you imagine any bill as important as a billion dollar takeover and the Premier of Saskatchewan has not entered the debate? Can you imagine that? I will guarantee you that there isn't a bill that is passed by any Legislature in the Dominion of Canada, even in the House of Commons that debate has gone on as long as this without the Premier or the Prime Minister entering the debate and explaining to the citizens of the province or of Canada exactly what is going on and what is the thinking of the Government.

I want to tell the Member for Moose Jaw North - just a minute, I would love to have you ask another question, I am enjoying this. Just sit down, when I sit down you can ask another question. I am going to tell him that if you want to demonstrate to the people of Saskatchewan that you have some ability, some ideas, some view, that you have got a capable back bench, that you are not a bunch of sheep, then don't vote for this Motion. See that this debate carries on so that your people will know where you stand. Did you say you wanted another question?

**MR. SKOBERG:** — Yes, if I may, I would be only too pleased. We may as well prolong the agony because it is going to go to 9:30 anyway. I should like to ask the Hon. Member if I may, that if in fact he has read the routine proceedings and realized the number of individual resolutions that have gone on the Order Paper by individual Members and how many Members have put those on? Also I'd like to ask the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, if he wouldn't agree with me that this is a deliberate, deliberate attempt at blackmailing this House and the public of Saskatchewan into not knowing what's going on because your people are not prepared to put the facts on the table because you haven't got them?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — I want to tell the Member for Moose Jaw North that he really hit the nail on the head. We haven't got the facts

nor have the people of Saskatchewan got the facts. This Government is running around and asking the people of Saskatchewan to take a \$1 billion debt on their shoulders without telling them where they are getting the money, they are not telling them how much it is going to cost, they are not telling them about the interest, they are not telling them, for example, even how much they are making from the potash industry this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — If the Members would sit down. I've been very courteous to you and on Monday when I stand up again I should love to have another question but I should like to finish responding to your last question.

I am going to tell you something, Mr. Member for Moose Jaw North, that you have finally hit upon one of the real basic issues of this debate, the lack of facts, the lack of knowledge, the reason the Premier hadn't spoken, the reason the Minister in charge of the potash corporation hasn't spoken, the reason the Minister of Finance hasn't spoken, the reason the Attorney General is pushing this bill through, because you don't want them to know the facts.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Sit down.

**MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake):** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, this has gone far enough. He hasn't spoken one time on what's happening about 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock. He has mentioned the fact that we are not representing our constituencies, I want to point out that the first time Meadow Lake has been represented in 11 years is since I . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think you get to a point in a debate where even a person of my patience loses his patience and loses the ability to hang on and keep the debate in order. I used to have an old friend that sat in this Legislature by the name of Toby Nollet and he used to say, "You might as well let the tail go with the hide." I think the rules have gone out the window in the last while and I think the questions have been out of order and the answers have been out of order.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — All I want to say is that I was merely responding to questions as you know and if the questions led to the answers I am sorry for the Member for Meadow Lake. I do apologize for him, if you would tell your colleague not to ask such idiotic questions I wouldn't have to get in that position.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call it 9:30.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.