

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eighteenth Legislature
34th Day

Monday, January 12, 1976

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

LOSSES INCURRED BY SEDCO

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I would address a question to the Premier.

Is the Premier aware that SEDCO has suffered a large loss for the year ended December 31, 1975, and would he not agree that detailed information about this loss should be made available to the public immediately before any more business ventures like Consumer's Gas, Novapharm, the potash mines and the like are considered by his Government?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that any information made available to the public with respect to SEDCO's financial results should be made when an audited report is available, when we are operating on the basis of financial statements audited and not on the basis of rumors and other comments which come from people who are less well informed than the auditors.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier.

In the light of his answer, is he suggesting that when a relatively major loss is incurred in a Crown Corporation the significance of which to the Province of Saskatchewan or the size of which SEDCO is, is it not, the citizens' right to know this as soon as it is known? If not an audited amount certainly an approximate amount, an approximation pending making further decisions to make incursions into the competitive business community?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the question presupposes a great number of facts which are not facts. Note carefully that the question presupposes that any loss from SEDCO came about as an "incursion" into the private sector. If it is a policy of Members opposite, and particularly the Progressive Conservative Party, that we should not have an agency making loans to private industry, then I wish they would make their policy known. Operations such as SEDCO and IDB have been going for many years and no one has ever thought that they were "incursions" into the private sector. As to whether there are losses from SEDCO, which is neither admitted nor denied by me — I will wait until I have the audited reports — unlike the Member for Nipawin. I will then decide on the basis of the facts and not of rumor whether the losses (if any) came about because of "incursions into the private sector" or whether they came about because of lending operations to private business which has been a function of the Government of Saskatchewan since 1947 and a function of the Government of Canada for approximately the same length of time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question.

I am certain the Premier is aware of the substantial difference between the lending of funds and the acquiring of equity interest in organizations. If the public are in fact becoming owners of the ventures in terms of acquiring minority and in fact majority shares, which is the prime rationale of the Government of Saskatchewan for becoming involved, and a major reason given by all NDP speakers as they refer to the potash question, is not one of the prime rights of ownership the right to detailed and immediate financial information in order to make future decisions?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member totally misconceives the nature of SEDCO. This is perhaps understandable since he has not had dealings over a long period of time with that organization. SEDCO's prime function is by no means to obtain minority interest in companies. I would think that only in a relatively small number of transactions does SEDCO obtain any share interests and then it is usually for purposes other than to assert the ordinary rights of ownership. It maybe to protect the loan made, or as the case may be. Accordingly I think that the basis of the question is misconceived. And once again, there is, no evidence whatever — and I don't even think the Hon. Member was asserting that there is — that SEDCO, if it suffered a loss — which again I say I will wait for the facts — suffered losses in respect of its lending transactions which has been part of the function of SEDCO and the Government of Canada for more than two decades.

CANCELLATION OF THE YOUNG VOYAGEUR PROGRAM

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education I should like to direct a question either to the former Minister of Education or the Provincial Minister of Finance.

I see in Saturday's Star-Phoenix that the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) made some comments about the fact that he was rather unhappy with the Federal Government's cancellation of the Young Voyageur Program and I wondered if either the former Minister of Education or the Minister of Finance could tell me what number of students in Saskatchewan that the cancellation of that program would affect?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the actual number, but I can seek the information and provide it for the Hon. Member.

Mr. McMillan: — By way of supplementary. Could either of you two gentlemen . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister has not given an answer, therefore, a supplementary is not allowed.

RULING OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Hon. Attorney General regarding the Human Rights Commission.

Is the Minister aware that in the latest over-reaction of the Human Rights Commission they have ordered Regina hospitals, and I assume hospitals all over the province, to stop taking information with indicates a person's religion? That if the patient demands to have that down it will be put down, but the hospitals have been told that they are not to take that information. It used to be that they would take the information of the person's parish, and the result is that the chaplains trying to work in the hospitals find it now virtually impossible to deal with the hospitals. Indeed, perhaps the Minister would give me the answer to a question posed to me by a nun who said that she delivered communion and just finds it impossible now to know whom to see and where to go and I wonder if the Human Rights Commission and the Government disapprove of chaplains operating in the hospitals and why the Government is taking this step to make it more difficult for the religious bodies to deal with the hospitals?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would have to answer the Member that I am not personally aware of this development because as the Member will know the Human Rights Commission is an autonomous organization in the sense that when the appointments are made, there is a statutory protection period and they act in a quasi-judicial certainly independent function and I'm not familiar with that development.

I would say that the Member should not confuse what might be opinions by certain staff members of the Human Rights Commission with indeed the actual rulings for orders of the Commission, the Commission having heard and determined any one particular issue. I do know of circumstances where organizations and individuals in the public will ask the officers of the Human Rights Commission to give opinions as to what might happen, or what could be the interpretation and an opinion is offered. It seems to me, judging from the thrust of the Member's question that we might be only at that level of the inquiry and if there is no order or ruling with the effect of law given by the Commission yet and it may be that in fact the Commission as a whole sitting will have to determine this.

So, to answer the Member's question I would have to go to the Commission to find out if in fact this is the case and whether or not it's merely an inquiry at this stage of the game.

Mr. Merchant: — Would it be then the opinion of the Minister that I could go back to the hospital boards and say to them that there is nothing improper about asking this question, given the fact that frequently confidential information is obtained for obviously good purposes, and I suggest to you that this is a good purpose. Would the Government then say that that was appropriate information and if the Human Rights Commission have given that order and we've seen curious orders from the

Human Rights Commission from time to time before, would the Government be prepared to overrule that decision or to take some steps to encourage the Commission to back off that particular position with reference to hospitals?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I would tell the Hon. Member that the Government, I would personally loathe to interfere with the quasi-judicial nature, of a tribunal like the Human Rights Commission, as I say, has independence. I believe that all of the Members are appointed for five year statutory term. Even if it were proper for an Attorney General or for a government to interfere in this sort of semi-judicial type of situation I doubt that the Commission would be under any obligation to listen to us.

I would say to the Hon. Member that indeed it would be a bad practice for the Government to directly try and say to the Commission that we disagree with a particular ruling or opinion. The obvious remedy as the Hon. Member will know, being a member of the bar, is to take the Human Rights Commission to a court action where there is a certiorari application or something by way of a review and a possible quashing of the decision of the Commission if it is made wrongly and improperly. And while I have my own opinions on this matter I would not be able to give the Hon. Member an opinion as to specific problems. I would want to take legal advice and then give him some opinion. But even that I don't think would have very much merit, if we are going to leave that to the Human Rights Commission, as is the policy of the Government, and I think of the Legislature.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I accept that as a valid answer. Am I clear though that the Hon. Attorney General has indicated that you will make an enquiry and inform the House? The reason that I put it in those terms, I would be apt to contact the two Regina hospitals most directly affected myself, but it seems to me that this is something that has suasion or is of consequence throughout the whole province. And quite frankly, and it's my last thought, I wondered — and I'm told that it is in order — and I wondered why the Human Rights Commission didn't go one step further and say that you couldn't take down the sex of the patient either. Perhaps that's confidential information and perhaps go into mixed wards, or double beds or something in the hospitals.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I will certainly make an enquiry of the Human Rights Commission to determine what the situation is with respect to Regina hospitals. I don't know when I can inform the Members of the House. Perhaps I can inform the Member personally and I shall certainly do that.

I should like to just say that in his first question the Member talked about the over-reaction of the Commission. While all of us will from time to time disagree with a recommendation of decision made by the Commission, I think we should keep in mind that it is a relatively new institution in Saskatchewan life and that while it may err, perhaps this is even an error, I don't know, nevertheless the defending and advocacy of human rights through such a new Commission is a laudable step forward and I would hope that while the Member would disagree with that decision we would not level the attack of the decision to such an

extent that we would undermine the entire confidence of the human rights program.

DISCRIMINATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. D.M. Ham (Swift Current): — A question for the Attorney General. Is it true that the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission was conceived as an agency to assist in removing discrimination from Saskatchewan society?

Mr. Romanow: — I would say generally as an answer "yes". You look at the powers in the Bill, the Commission has an educational role, has an investigatory role and I think a hearing and decision-making role. So in general terms I think I would agree with the Member's question.

Mr. Ham: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why did the Commission then sponsor a workshop on the women in the work force that was open only to Saskatchewan Federation of Labour members?

Mr. Romanow:— Well, Mr. Speaker, again I don't know of what workshop the Member refers to, but it is not an unusual activity for any Human Rights Commission, whether it's in Saskatchewan or in any part of the country, to carry on what is essentially an education role. A workshop, the rights of women, especially International Women's Year having just been concluded, is something that I think is quite properly a subject of a workshop or seminar by the Human Rights Commission. I think that that falls in this education role.

As to the question as to why it is limited only to Saskatchewan Federation of Labour women I don't know that. I suppose that perhaps it had something to do with the sponsoring organization, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. Perhaps they wanted to limit it to their organization. I am sure that the Commission would be pleased to meet with other organizations on this very topic and conduct seminars in conjunction with that organization, the sponsoring organization as well. So I don't think that we should place too much emphasis on something like that, because I know that they have held many workshops with many organizations over the last year or two years.

Mr. Ham: — A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Would you not then agree that if the Government does not support discrimination why was this same conference also sponsored by the Department of Labour?

Mr. Romanow: — Well, I am not sure again what the Hon. Member is quite driving at.

The Department of Labour for quite some time has had a very strong interest in the question of equal rights for women, and in particular for working women. The Hon. Member will know that one of the very prominent ladies in this whole area just recently retired. Wasn't her name Mary Rocan, Mr. Premier? She was involved in the Department of Labour. And this is an activity that the Department of Labour, I am sure, has

sponsored years gone by even before the Commission was established as a part of promoting a further understanding of what the rights of working women are under today's law. Once we set up the Human Rights Commission, it is only natural it seems to me that the Department of Labour would work with an agency of government — if I may use it in those terms — to promote that type of better understanding. As I repeat to the Hon. Member again, there is nothing sinister and nothing should be read into that. If the Progressive Conservative women in Swift Current want to get a workshop on working women and the law and the rights of women under the law, ask the Human Rights Commission and if you are interested I am sure that they would set up the same workshop and the same thing in a non-political fashion to discuss it. I know that they have done it. I believe they have even done it with the Liberal Party in a part of the province. If my memory serves me right I think they have. All I am saying to the Hon. Member, there is nothing sinister about it. I welcome such a promotion. I think that's exactly what the Human Rights Commission should be doing. I don't think the Human Rights Commission should be making rulings or judgments as much as it should be educating and fostering a greater understanding of the equality of rights of all people in Saskatchewan.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying Thursday night before we crashed to a halt at 9:30, that this Government, the Government that sits to your right, has demonstrated an arrogance and contempt for the people of Saskatchewan that probably has never been equalled by any other government anywhere or at any time. They have done so, Mr. Speaker, by their complete failure to give us information, to enter into the debate, to back up the statements they have been making in this debate about the actions of the potash companies in the past, markets in the future, and so on. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it is abundantly clear that this is what has happened. I think the Press have realized this. I think the people of Saskatchewan have realized this and I think that it is completely inexcusable.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, calls for a committee to study certain aspects of the Bill, in fact, the entire Bill. I don't think that it is anything unusual that the Liberal Opposition is asking for and I think the Members who sit to my left indicated they were prepared to support this amendment.

This committee type of structure has been long known as a vehicle of the legislature in Saskatchewan to obtain information and to come to decisions particularly controversial decisions. I should like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last four years under the Government opposite that there were at least two committees that I am aware of that did very good work, they were committees on welfare and the committee on liquor and drinking habits in the Province of Saskatchewan. Those

committees travelled through the province they travelled about the country. In fact I think the liquor committee did its best to inquire into the drinking habits of most people in the whole continent of North America if one looks at their travel record. They had a difficult task, they had a difficult problem they were facing. They took the time, they took the effort to go and talk to the people that those problems most affected.

The result of the committees' work was that they came with answers, answers in some that were not agreed upon by all members of the committees, but in many cases here was unanimous agreement as to suggestions that those committees made. I can see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the same thinking or the same philosophy does not hold with these potash bills.

As the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) said the other day, what is the hurry, the potash isn't going to go mouldy. I think that comment was well taken. In the few speeches we have heard from the Members opposite, we have heard no reason whatsoever as to why this legislation had to be pushed through as quickly as the Government initially demanded. You will recall the Premier, not in this House, but in a Press conference indicated they wanted the legislation through by Christmas and that within the next 18 to 24 months they would be in a position to control half or all of the potash companies carrying on business in Saskatchewan. No reason was given for that. There is no matter of dealing with Ottawa like we were on the debates surrounding gas and oil in Saskatchewan, Bill 42. At that time we vehemently disagreed with the provisions of that Bill, and I think our disagreement has been proven to be right. At that time we were asked by the Premier and by the Members opposite to pass that Bill to aid them in their negotiation with the Prime Minister and their Opposition Members in Ottawa. The Premier and the Government at that time gave a reason which we disagreed with, but they gave a reason to have that Bill passed as quickly as possible. Because there seemed to be some legitimacy behind that reason, we opposed the Bill as strenuously as we could but we acknowledged the fact that there was this reason given by the Government and therefore we did not hold the Bill unduly and did not delay its passing.

The same cannot be said for Bills 1 and 2. There is no reason that has been advocated by the Attorney General in his very long speech when he introduced these Bills as to the necessity for moving quickly. In fact, surely, Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation, this is the type of thing that not only the Legislature, the people of Saskatchewan should give careful and long consideration to. If for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, there are many others that feel that the potash companies be given a chance to be heard, give the potash companies an arena under which their representatives could be examined under oath by Members of the committee or counsel to the committee if that is required and let them state their case.

I don't hold any brief for the potash companies and I don't think the Members on this side, and even the ones to my far left do. These companies have been slandered and vilified and condemned by the Premier, the Attorney General and more recently by the Minister of Mineral Resources. The Premier in introducing this legislation in effect said that the potash companies lied. He said that the facts and figures that were given to government officials by the potash companies were wrong. He said he didn't believe those figures. The only inference that can be made from

that comment, Mr. Speaker, is an inference that the potash companies were fraudulently misleading the government representatives of this province. I say that that is the type of allegation, Mr. Speaker, that if not proven, not justified, is surely contemptible.

This type of committee would give these potash companies a chance to respond to the accusations that have been made. I notice in this morning's paper there is a report about the Minister of Mineral Resources giving a speech in Melville. I am not sure whether the report is accurate, but I assume it is. There the Minister said that the potash companies have been, "pretty bad corporate citizens." Then he goes on to say about the amount of tax they have paid in the past few years. I suggest that that type of slander of these companies without definite proof, without definite facts, is irresponsible and especially irresponsible when it comes from a Minister of the Crown. The Minister knows full well that when these companies first came into Saskatchewan to carry on business, for the first few years there was no money made whatsoever by them because of the world market for potash. They were not in a position to pay significant taxes because they had no income to pay those taxes on. He knows full well that when the world situation changed and when the price for potash increased and markets began to develop that the potash companies indicated through their spokesmen and by way of letters to the Premier and by way of public statements in their meetings with government officials that they were prepared at all times to renegotiate the tax structure, they were prepared at all times to pay a fair tax for the product they were taking from the Province of Saskatchewan. He didn't say anything about that, Mr. Speaker, according to the report that I have, all he did was condemn and damn the companies for daring to fight back against this legislation which we find so detestable.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker, why I feel there should be a committee or that this legislation should be held up is to give the people of this province a chance to state how they feel. I was interested, Mr. Speaker, to hear that over the Christmas break the Youth Parliament defeated this very issue. I think that those young people, although young and perhaps not having great knowledge of parliamentary procedure and so on, but I think those young people are representative of the people of Saskatchewan. I am sure that if you went to those young people and talked political philosophy and what they stood for you would find that many of them are Liberals, many of them are Conservatives and indeed many of them would be Members of the New Democratic Party or sympathize with the philosophy of that party.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when this came to a vote in the Youth Parliament, there was a tie and that the issue was finally defeated, that is nationalization, only because the Speaker, voted in this way. I can't help but think, Mr. Speaker, if this same thing happened in this Legislature and that there was a tie on whether these Bills should go through, that knowing the wisdom and good sense that you have shown since you have taken your high office that you would vote in a similar manner. However, Mr. Speaker, that is unlikely to happen, and I am sure Mr. Speaker that you would not have to find yourself in that uncomfortable position.

It was very interesting after that vote was made known that

the Premier was interviewed and he was asked by the reporter as to what he felt as a result of this vote that was taken. I was very interested to hear the Premier say that that probably was representative of how the people of Saskatchewan are thinking. I forget his exact words, if I recall, he indicated that in his opinion probably the split would be 50 per cent for nationalization or provincialization of the potash industry and 50 per cent against. He went on to say that the reason so many people are opposed is because the situation isn't completely clear at this time and later when the legislation is passed and effect given to it that they will come around to the Government's way of thinking. I must say if their political propaganda campaign in the newspaper continues in the manner that it has in the past, this may very well be the case.

Surely a government which receives the vote of only 32 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan, I am not talking of those who voted, but of the total eligible voters in this province, they received only 32 per cent of those votes, surely a government with that type of mandate would take a look at the situation. They would take a look to see what they are doing, when they admit that 50 per cent, or more than half of the people of this province are against the potash takeover, and knowing that they only received 32 per cent of the eligible voters and of the people who voted for them that supported their philosophy and their aims and that many of those people are now against Bill 1 and Bill 2. Surely it is not too much to ask for that Government to go slow, to not pass the legislation right away, to put it through a legislative committee such as we have suggested, to put it through a commission along the lines suggested by the Member for Regina South. This Government is showing its arrogance, its contempt for many of the people of Saskatchewan by refusing to do anything along these lines.

It is pretty apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this debate at least on the second reading stage is fast coming to a close. The speakers on this side of the House in the Liberal Party have spoken at least twice and many of us have spoken three times. We are now at the situation where we are simply exhausting our numbers, we are unable to put forth another amendment to the Bill for consideration by the Government, but there are not enough of us here to have a proper mover and a proper seconder.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this committee suggestion is not accepted, to the Members opposite and to the Press that this isn't the end of debate on Bill 1, this isn't the end of the attack by the Liberal Party on the principles that are set out in Bill 1. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it may not even be the beginning. We don't know what the Government's attitude is going to be when this Bill goes to Committee of the Whole. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members opposite and the members of the Press that Committee of the Whole will be a very interesting time. It may become tedious depending on the answers given by the Attorney General. I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that the information that hasn't been forthcoming to date and the attempts that we have made to get that information and have been refused by the Government opposite, that our efforts in this regard have not been stayed in any way because this Bill may pass second reading later today. In fact our vigor in this regard is just as big, just as strong as it was when this debate started 34 sitting days ago. In Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker, we intend to get this information, we intend to get it from the Attorney General and his officials. I may say to you,

Sir, that if we don't get the information, that Committee of the Whole may, indeed, last a very long time.

Mr. Speaker, before sitting down, I should like to make a few comments about the amendment, but in dealing with the amendment and with the Attorney General's right to close debate, I should like him to answer a few questions. I doubt if he is going to, Mr. Speaker, because if he was going to — in fact he is not listening — we would have had these questions answered by now by other Members. I should like to know why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of the Potash Corporation, and the Premier have not spoken on this Bill? I think we are entitled to that information. I think the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to that information. I should like the Attorney General to deal with the constitutional and legal issues that were raised by the Member for Regina South, I think those issues are very important. It appears that we will not be getting that information on a committee. I should like the Attorney General to deal with money, just where the money is going to come from, how much of it is going to be required? What interest rate is going to be paid on it? And many more things dealing with money. I should like him to talk about the risk of just what we are doing. I should like him to illustrate just why the Government has said and why the Premier has said, that this is a good hard-headed business deal? Because we haven't had any reasons from the Premier or Members opposite as to why this is the case.

I think, Mr. Speaker, even the Attorney General may admit that we have established a pretty good case for just the opposite that it is not a good hard-headed business deal.

I should like the Attorney General to talk about future markets for potash. Where those markets are going to be? Whether existing markets that we have now are going to be maintained? I should like to hear from him on that, and I think the people of Saskatchewan would like to hear about it too. I should like him to talk about what the effect of this takeover is going to be on future investment in Saskatchewan, not only in Saskatchewan but in Canada. I feel that is a legitimate source of concern that all people have.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are many other things, but I should like to hear from the Attorney General as to what more we are going to get when we do expropriate or buy out these companies, just in dollars and cents? How much more is this going to bring to the Treasury of Saskatchewan for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. We haven't been given that information either, Mr. Speaker.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, and before taking my seat, let me just say once again, that in my view, and in the view of all Members on this side, the Government has demonstrated its arrogance and contempt for the people of this province in the manner in which this Bill has been handled. I attach no blame personally to the Attorney General for that, I am sure he is being instructed by his caucus and by the Cabinet. This arrogance and contempt, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you will not be forgotten, it will not be forgotten before the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — We intend, Mr. Speaker, as the Liberal Caucus to remind

the people of Saskatchewan, day after day, day after day for the next three and a half years as to the attitude of this Government on Bills 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious I will be supporting the amendment and I invite all other Members to do so as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main thrust of my remarks on this amendment, there have been questions raised in the House and by the Press about the propriety of what the Liberal Opposition is doing in opposing so long and so vigorously Bill 1 and Bill 2. The question of the position of the Opposition, the responsibility of the Opposition has been raised on many occasions by the House Leader, the Attorney General.

Mr. Romanow: — I withdraw everything.

Mr. Steuart: — I would be very happy if you would rise and withdraw speaking on this amendment.

I want to read to him and, lately, it isn't very often that I agree with the editorial policy of the Leader-Post. As I said, often, my favorite editorial writer has turned out to be Liz Rowley and the birds and the bees, but I read one on January 10th entitled, "The Duty of the Opposition is to Criticize Policies" and I should like to read it especially directed to the attention of the Attorney General. It goes on:

A vigorous Opposition is a necessary part of the democratic process in any parliamentary system of government and that includes Saskatchewan. It matters not, surely, that majority government insures passage of legislation, proposed by the Party in power. The Opposition's duty to the whole electorate is to criticize policy, initiates when criticism is warranted and to use legal tactics of obstruction and delay to call public attention through opposing arguments. When the Opposition feels so strongly about specific terms of Government policy that extreme means are indicated, the Opposition has an undeniable right, yes even a responsibility, to use every strategy available to do it within the established rules of the Legislature. Consequently it is jarring to take notes of statements made in the Legislature last Tuesday by the Attorney General Romanow, who is also Deputy Premier, castigating the Liberal and Conservatives for using, what he called, gamesmanship. The incident occurred after a Liberal, Jack Wiebe, of Morse addressing an extremely thinly attended House on a Private Member's Bill, interrupted his speech to move adjournment. There was a scurry of MLA's to the Chamber and the adjournment motion was defeated 27 to 16.

Mr. Wiebe had a right to make his motion. The legislation he was proposing, largely before empty seats, involved a two-year moratorium on principal and interest payments for loans made by the Provincial Government to the currently hard-pressed livestock producers.

That issue may not seem to be a big one when compared with the Provincial Government's major policy thrust in recent times but Mr. Wiebe's argument surely deserves a much better turnout of MLA's than it received.

"What does the taxpayer think of us when they see this type of motion," asked Mr. Romanow. The taxpayers probably think the Opposition in the Legislature is on its toes and many will applaud them for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: —

Gamesmanship — I am as guilty of that as anybody, said the Deputy Premier, as he adjourned debate on Mr. Wiebe's Moratorium proposal, apparently to give him time to look up some Liberal speeches dating back five years and determine whether that Party had reversed its position on the debt moratorium issue.

Mr. Speaker, that editorial was written about the question brought up by Mr. Wiebe, asking the Government to give some consideration to the hard-pressed cattlemen, especially the cow-calf operators, the less well-off farmers who are involved in raising of cattle and are facing difficulties. But it could apply equally well to the debate we are now engaged in, the debate concerning, in this case, Bill No. 1, but also the debate concerning Bill No. 2.

The Liberal Party feels more strongly about Bills No. 1 and 2 than I think we have ever felt, certainly on any issues, since I have been a Member of this Legislative Assembly, and that goes back to 1962.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The reason we feel this way, the reason should be obvious, certainly they are many and they are varied.

First, we think it is a bad deal. We think it is an unnecessary risk and we are absolutely and totally convinced that when this Bill passes and when the Government moves in to take over all or a majority, or even one potash mine, that the investment climate in Saskatchewan will be damaged for generations to come. We are equally convinced that no one, with money, with skill, with dedication will invest in our province will ever again completely trust the Members opposite, the NDP Government.

Not only that, when and it will happen sooner, or later, this Government is defeated, the government that follows will find that this shadow, the shadows of Bill No. 1 and 2 introduced in this Legislative Assembly late last fall, the shadows of those Bills will reach a long way into the future of this province. The Government that follows the NDP will have an extremely difficult time convincing investors, whether they are Saskatchewan investors or Canadian investors, that you can trust the people of this province, because there will always be the fear that maybe some day the NDP will be returned to power and undo whatever good things and whatever trust has been built up by the government that follows them. I speak from experience.

When we became the Government in 1964 we had difficulty

convincing investors across this nation that in fact there had been a change in political climate in Saskatchewan and that you could now trust the people of Saskatchewan to invest their money and take the risks that are so necessary and so much a part of attempting to develop resources in any part of the world, including the Province of Saskatchewan.

So what they are doing now will not only hurt this generation of Saskatchewan people, but it will hurt generations for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will not, of itself, put an end to Bill No. 1, but we are confident that if this amendment passes and the Government does what this amendment proposes, that they will, in fact, be driven to the conclusion, come to the conclusion of their own free will, or be driven to the conclusion by the public outcry and by public sentiment and by public opinion that they are on the wrong track; they are doing the wrong thing and they would eventually withdraw Bills No. 1 and 2 and embark on a much more sensible course. That is to negotiate fair and reasonably with this industry so that they will in fact get a fair share of the revenue from potash for the people of Saskatchewan, a good share, a large share, but at the same time will keep trust with these people and will encourage them to expand and produce more jobs and even more revenue in years ahead. I am convinced that if they agree and pass this Resolution and set up these hearings and set up these public hearings that the preponderance of evidence that comes in from expert opinion and from the public of Saskatchewan generally whether expert or not but simply stating their own strongly felt feelings, that the Government will back down. There is nothing wrong with backing down. In fact, there is a great deal right about backing down if you are wrong whether you are a government or an individual.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that all political parties have when they are in government, one of the problems that a growing number of people in our society have with governments or with political parties generally, but especially after they receive power as a government, is the idea that once they decide to do something, once they state publicly that they are going to embark on a certain course, that they can't change their mind or they never change their mind. They then have to rally their forces and act as if everything they have done, or everything they propose to do, has been handed down to them from the Almighty, that they are right that there is never any question about the right of their actions and they refuse to listen to anyone else. It is this form of power hungry actions, by all governments — I don't just include the one opposite. When we were the government we were guilty of it. There isn't a government in Canada that hasn't been guilty in one case or another of this same type of arrogant action. I think there have been few, if any, governments in the history of Canada who have been as guilty or are as guilty as this Government, as it is now acting in regard to this kind of attitude. It would be refreshing in fact it would be politically very wise, and it would be honest and refreshing and would do a great deal to restore the faith of ordinary people, especially young people in the democratic process, if the Government said, okay, we will hold hearings; we will listen to people and if we can be convinced, we will change our mind. That is all we ask.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — If, Mr. Speaker, the Government had held these hearings, listened to expert testimony, listened to testimony and submission by ordinary people groups and individuals, if after all that they come back to this House and said, we have listened, we have weighed the evidence, we put forward our point of view and our side of the question and we have not changed our mind, we would still oppose what they are doing but I would say to this House right now on behalf of our Party, we would facilitate the passage of these two Bills as rapidly as possible, having said that then at least the Government has taken a reasonable attitude even though what we think they are doing is wrong and unreasonable.

Why is the Government stubbornly refusing even to let anyone be heard? They don't want to hold hearings. They have held hearings on a host of problems and policies and programs and projects that are far less important; have far less importance than the moving in and taking over of all or part of the potash industry, because this is just the beginning. This is the giant step in developing a policy for the development of our resources that will mean from now on, that only the Government of Saskatchewan will develop the resources of Saskatchewan in the future, at least as long as those people sit on the Treasury benches as long as they are in power.

And so it is of vital importance, not only in itself, it is a vital importance not only for what it holds and threatens for the future of Saskatchewan, but it is of vital importance because of what it tells us very clearly will be the future policy in regard to the development of our forest resources, our oil resources, our hardrock mineral resources, our uranium resources — in other words the entire gambit of resources we have in the Province of Saskatchewan.

What does the amendment say? That Bill No. 1 be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter of this be referred to a special committee on the nationalization of the potash industry being composed of Messrs: Kowalchuk, Thibault, Lange, Pepper, Feschuk, Mostoway, Larson, Dyck. Now that is one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight supporters of the NDP Government: Lane, Nelson and Wiebe, three Members of the Opposition — eight to three. No chance that that committee could do anything but exactly what the Government Members wanted to do. They were in the majority and they would appoint their own chairman and they would set their own rules. However, if they agree to this amendment they would, of course, be bound to have sittings in between sessions of this Legislative Assembly. They would be bound to send for persons, papers, records and to examine witnesses under oath and to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public and for this purpose to hold meetings away from the seat of government in order that the fullest representation may be received without undue inconvenience those desiring to be heard. "And, further that this special committee be further instructed to submit its final report to the Assembly with all convenient speed."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that last sentence is important because it means that there has to be no undue holdup of serious consideration by government and others in regard to the nationalization of the potash industry.

I would think that such a committee that was struck in the next day or two, if it could be struck, to pass this motion and we would then hold up proceedings, of course, on Bill No. 1. I would think it would be reasonable to then set Bill No. 2 aside for consideration after the committee reported. This House would adjourn very shortly thereafter, I would predict, and that committee could go to work. I would think in view of the urgency that the Government seems to put on this matter that that committee could go to work within the next week or ten days; they could hold hearings in the next six weeks or two months and come back and report to the Legislature before, I would say, half the year had gone in 1976.

The Government has the right to call the Legislature back together, if they had to, if we weren't still in session. Then having done that and if they still felt, as they apparently feel today, although they are very silent on the whole subject, but if they wanted to proceed with Bills No. 1 and 2, amended or in the form they are today, again, I would pledge that the Liberal Opposition would not unduly hold up proceedings on these two bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about holding things up for a year or eight months, we are not talking about holding up for even six months we are talking about holding it up for two or three or four months. Surely two, three or four months in the life of the potash industry is not much time.

Someone worked out an interesting statistic, to give the House and the Members some idea of how much potash we have in Saskatchewan. They said that if we started mining potash at the rate we are mining today, if we started mining potash the day Christopher Columbus discovered America in 1492 and had continued day in and day out, seven days a week, 365 days a year to mine potash at the present rate, that as of today we wouldn't have mined ten per cent of the available potash. We would still have over 90 per cent of the potash left to service the people of the world, in the ground here in Saskatchewan. In other words, we have enough potash for 4,000 or 5,000 years. Mr. Speaker, whether it is four or five thousand years or 1,000 or 2,000 years, surely two, three or four months would make very little difference in the long-term, the long run, the long range of this potentially great industry.

What difference on the plus side of the ledger might it make? It might make a great deal of difference. It might give the Government the opportunity, and it would give the Government the opportunity to call a great variety of people and to get their testimony. We will certainly give the Government time for pause and for second thought. I am convinced that the Government is acting stubbornly, they have got their backs up and they feel that if somehow they slow down, for even a week, a month or two months the passage of these two bills, they will lose face politically. They feel somehow that it may add to the credit of the Liberal party and in the next election might boomerang against them. I think they are wrong on all accounts. Certainly it might redound to the credit of the Opposition if these bills are held up and second thoughts are given to them and they make some changes, but I would think in the long run, and I mean by the long run, the two, or three, or four years, and certainly in the next election, that it would redound to the credit of the Government opposite. They would be recognized by the people of the province as a thoughtful, reasonable group of men who

were prepared to look at all sides of this issue before embarking the people of Saskatchewan on a course that will cost them, I say, as high as \$2 billion over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, I can't think of any other reason why they won't listen to this amendment, unless it is false pride, unless they have got something to hide. Unless they are afraid that if they wait for even a month or two or three months that some information that they have been bottling up, information they have been hiding might surface and embarrass them even further. So they want to rush it through, grab one or two or three of the potash mines and then if some information comes out, that is not in the best interest, or makes it appear that this is not in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan then they can say well it is too late, we have already embarked on the course, it is already done.

Whom would they call? Mr. Speaker, why wouldn't they call, why wouldn't they call publicly, for example, experts in the field of finance? Surely, the Attorney General, or the Premier if he ever decides to screw up his courage, face his responsibility and speak in this House, surely the Minister of Finance won't attempt to claim that they are very deeply versed in financial transactions involving \$500 million of \$1 billion. Surely, they won't attempt to claim that they have any deep grasp or international financing of the order of the magnitude that is involved here. I am sure they won't. Because they haven't, nor have we on this side. If we had we wouldn't be in Regina, we wouldn't be in Saskatchewan, we would be in Toronto or Montreal or New York. So why not call financial experts.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I think they already have. In fact I am positive that they have already talked to Dominion Securities, Harrison Partners, one of the largest if not the largest security house in Canada. A company with an excellent national and international reputation. I know that they have discussed and they have asked Dominion Securities, Harrison Partners to make a study of the financial implications of a proposed government owned and operated mine at Bredenbury or near Bredenbury. The overall picture of the Government's involvement in all or a major part of the potash industry. I know that the recommendation came back to the Government of Saskatchewan from this financial house recommending that they do not become involved. I know that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I know that the recommendation said, you are doing extremely well now, taking anywhere from \$120 million to \$140 million from this industry with nothing invested and absolutely no risk involved.

Mr. Speaker, why won't they make that public? I guess it is obvious if they made it public, if they held these hearings, and it was suggested that they call people like Dominion Securities or any other representatives of a sound financial house in this country, they would get without a doubt, the same advice. It would be pretty difficult for the Attorney General and the Premier of this province, the Attorney General and the Premier who both have been practising lawyers in the Province of Saskatchewan or Mr. Cowley who is going to head up the Potash Corporation, his background, he is a school teacher, in Regina.

Mr. Ed Whelan, his experience working for the Government of Saskatchewan and then as a small businessman. It would be pretty difficult for them to stand up and say, in spite of this advice, in the face of this advice we still intend to use our power to invest \$500 million or \$1 billion of the taxpayers money in a gamble, in a risk against the advice of these kinds of financial experts.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether they will be able to get the money to go into this venture or not, I suspect they will if they are ready to mortgage the future of the people of Saskatchewan. If they are ready to put the good name in question — and the people of Saskatchewan have a good name. The Government gets up and boasts, we have a good credit rating. What they are really saying is, that when financial experts or people with money look at whether they should lend money to the Government in the name of the people, that in fact it is the people of Saskatchewan who have a good name. The farmers, the business rating in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Government of the day happens to be the custodian of that.

Now there is no question, any government by short-sighted or irresponsible action can help to ruin the good reputation of the people in a province or a nation, and this Government is embarking on that course right now, I suggest. But it is in the final analysis the hard work and the thriftiness and the energy and the initiative of the people of a province or a nation backed by their natural resources that are God given that create for that province or that nation, a good reputation. If this Government is prepared to put into jeopardy, put into hock the good name of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, and mortgage their future, then I suppose they can borrow the \$500 million or \$1 billion necessary to proceed with this very huge, gigantic risk that they seem determined and bent on embarking upon.

I was in New York at the funeral of the late Mr. Carl Landegger and at that time I had the occasion to talk to people in the banking and investment business in that city.

I made it a point to talk to people in the investment fields in Toronto and in Montreal. I can tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that without exception whether you talk about Dominion Securities or whether you talk about the people in New York, whether you talk about Solomon Brothers, whether you talk about anyone in Canada or in the United States, without exception they are shocked, and that is their words, by the actions of the Government of Saskatchewan, in moving in to seize, literally seize all or part of the potash industry. They use words like the actions of a banana republic, they use words like, unbelievable, irresponsible, they use phrases like what has happened to those people, have they gone mad.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the Members opposite to laugh and to giggle. They are not going to be the ones who pay for this action. It won't be us, it won't harm us. It will harm the people of Saskatchewan as I say for years and generations to come.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That is why I am convinced the Members opposite will

neither engage in this debate nor will they listen to reason and support this motion to refer this bill to committee to stop, and not only get the advice themselves, because I think to some extent they have already got it, but to let the public in on what I think they already know. And that is, people who are engaged in financial transactions of a scale of this magnitude are convinced that it is an unnecessary risk and a very bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, we continually talk, we are guilty of it on this side, of an investment of from \$500 million to \$1,000 million — one half a billion to one billion dollars. But we are really not talking about that much money, we are talking about a great deal more money. I think people should very carefully weigh what the NDP say. Because unlike some people who look at the political scene in a rather superficial manner, I'm convinced that most political parties, including the one opposite keep their political promises. Some say the trouble with politicians is that they don't keep their promises I would suggest to the public that the trouble with politicians is that they do keep their promises, especially the Members opposite. And that is where the trouble begins. These people have stated without any question, both in the articles of foundation that started the original CCF, then changed it to NDP and in their platform — I am sorry but I am not one that says that they went to the people and hoodwinked them, they did to a certain extent, but it is clearly in their platform that they intended to have more public invasion on the private sector of the resource industry.

They didn't emphasize it because they are too cute politically. They know that if they come out as Dave Barrett did and hit the people over the head in this province with socialism, a frontal attack, they will be defeated and wiped out just as the NDP has had happen to them in British Columbia. I suggest they will stay in Opposition for a long, long time.

Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Romanow and company are much more clever politically, much more astute than Mr. Barrett. They know that if they had come out with this proposition as clearly to the people of Saskatchewan in the election as they did in the Throne Speech, they wouldn't be here today, they would be on this side of the House. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring this up is that I think it is time the people of Saskatchewan realized we are not talking about only \$500 million to \$1 billion, because one of the things that the Premier said, outside this House, granted, but in the speeches he has made and in the paid television broadcasts he made, six weeks, two months, three months ago, whenever this Legislature began. He said one of the reasons that we are moving into the potash industry and taking over a major part of it I think was his phrase then, is so we can expand it. He buys one or two or three mines. Now you are talking about \$1 billion. Then he expands that. Now we know and the Members opposite know, and the public should know that the cost of expansion is anywhere from \$150 to \$200 a ton capacity for a mine. This means clearly that once they take over and they are dickering now for three mines, if they take over three mines and intend within the next few years, and I think they intend to start right away to double the expansion. If they take over three mines they are talking about \$1 billion at least. If they double the capacity of those mines, they are not talking

about another \$1 billion, because the price of expansion for the potash industry like everything else has suffered from inflation. They are talking about adding at least another \$1.5 billion. I say that what we are looking at in these two bills, a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan is to say at the least \$2 billion to \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion. That is not talking about taking over the total potash industry. That is not talking about taking over two or three mines and expanding them.

Let's just talk about the interest rate alone. If it is \$100 million or at least if it is \$1,000 million, the interest rate in the first year is \$110 million at least. I think the public should know that this Government is committing every man and woman in this province to a debt load far in excess of anything that has ever been contemplated before with the interest rate in the first year on just the initial buy it will be in excess of \$100 million.

When we went into the pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, there was a great uproar and they had NDP television ads showing the money in the middle of the table, the big hands coming in and taking it out. We were talking about a total investment at that time or a total borrowing of \$46 million at an interest rate of roughly 5.5 per cent. We were talking the first year of \$3 million in interest repayments. The people of this province were very shaken, very disturbed. How much more should they be disturbed when ten years later we are not talking about \$3 million of interest repayment in the first year, we are now talking about \$100 million of interest repayments in the first year, we are now talking about \$100 million and that is just the beginning. That is just the first blue chip in the biggest poker game that has ever been embarked on by any government in the history of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I say it is a poker game with some very weak players representing the people of Saskatchewan. Because the debt isn't even in this country, it isn't even in this province. We are not talking about the Power Corporation now where we have a captive market where our customers are all within our own jurisdiction and under controls of our own laws. They can't take off to anybody else, they are captives. We are talking about an industry that sells not one pound of potash within our own borders. It must depend for 99.9 per cent of its product to be sold outside the boundaries of our country. So the debt in this poker game is not in our own hands, it is not even in our own country. It is as a matter of fact in New York or in Dallas, it is in the United States. There is where control of the potash markets exists and they will continue to exist no matter who owns the mines in Saskatchewan. The people at the other end of the pipeline who buy the potash, 70 per cent of them are in the United States and the other 30 per cent are in other parts of the world. Mostly the Orient.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be very clear that we are not talking about \$1 billion we are talking about a far greater sum than that. So that is why I say it is even more imperative for the Government opposite to come clean with the people of Saskatchewan. Tell them what they know.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And if they don't know, if they can stand up in their places and say we have not any advice from Dominion Securities, we have no advice from anybody in the financial field, well that's even a more serious admission. If any government would stand in front of the public and say we are embarking on a \$1 billion or a \$2 billion risk and gamble an investment and we have taken no more advice than we can get from Walter Smishek, the Finance Minister, or from Mr. Romanow or Mr. Blakeney or from Mr. Cowley, then with all the best men in the world, I don't think there are many people with the possible exception of their immediate family and I doubt even then, would consider that that's anywhere good enough. If they don't know then surely in the name of common sense it's time that they found out. It's time that they let us and through us the people of Saskatchewan in on the inner workings of this deal. If there's nothing wrong, if they've got nothing to hide then why not make it public? Why not open it up? One of their boasts was they would run an open government and in their first action, barely elected five or six months, they came in with the most secretive, closed, hidden pig in a poke deal that's ever been offered to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more involved in this than finding the money. As I have said, I have no doubt that by using the good name and reputation and the assets of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that they can borrow the money if they are prepared to pay high enough interest rates and I'm talking about ten and a half or maybe even 11 per cent. They can mortgage our future because we gave them that power. But the Government of Saskatchewan hasn't got enough assets to put up behind a loan of \$1,000 million, they haven't, but the people of Saskatchewan have. I think the people of Saskatchewan should be clearly aware that if the Government borrows this money and they sign the note and it's signed by the Premier, signed by the Finance Minister, it's signed by the Attorney General, what they are doing is they are putting in a mortgage on every farm, every business, every home, every asset that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, especially those assets that are here and can't be moved out. That's the assets they are mortgaging when they borrow this kind of money.

The people who lend them the money are very clearly betting that the people of Saskatchewan, even if this mining venture flops and there is good chance that it might, it wouldn't be the first time, that they can get their money even if it means that taxes have to go up and people engaged in farming or in small business or wage earners or professional people have to pay more out of their pockets, expect less in service, to pay off this debt that this Government so foolishly, with such little thought and little responsibility, took on, shouldered, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. That's only part of it.

The next most serious question is, can they operate the mines? Does it make any sense? Will this mining venture be a profitable one? Because after all if it is, if they can operate the mines, if they can hold the markets, if they can show a substantial profit over a long period of time, 20 to 25 years, then all the worries that I have or that we have and that sensible people have and that they should have as well and I'm sure they have, all the worries about this being a financial risk will evaporate, because they'll be able to make the money

and pay it back and it will be in fact as the Premier so glibly stated, a self-liquidating debt.

How do they know they can run these mines? How do they know they can keep the markets? Well if they know, they found out awfully quickly. If they know, then if the answer is yes, they can, they why not table the proof. Why not give us the facts. Now we know that they engaged Kilborn Engineering, Toronto to do a study on the feasibility of this Government going into the mining business directly. Sinking shafts doing all the work that's necessary to develop a very large mine in the Yorkton area, near Bredenbury, Saskatchewan. There is no question. We know this from the time we were in the government that that's a very rich deposit, considered a very rich deposit. Other people, people in the private sector of the industry have outlined that deposit many years ago. There was a group called Southwest looking at it and there were other people looking at it, and prepared to go in. Had this Government not acted in the way they have acted since they came back to power in 1971 that mine, I suggest, would have been developed. But with the action they took almost upon election, the shock waves began to go through the mining, especially the potash mining industry, around the world and a hands off Saskatchewan attitude developed. So these people were more than willing to get out from under and sell their mineral rights to the Government of Saskatchewan.

The Government of Saskatchewan has never yet publicly stated how much they paid for them. They have never yet publicly stated to what extent they are and what kind of an option they paid or what kind of long term lease or if they bought them outright. For to me this is rather amazing, because when you look at Saskoil every time they find a grease spot on somebody's uniform they announce it as a great new oil find. Every time the staff of Saskoil goes past a well stocked filling station, we are treated to an announcement that Saskoil just found a new oil outbreak or a new oil pool, or well or spot. This is very strange that in the oil industry we are not inundated or bombarded because good old Saskoil is having a little trouble finding any oil or proving up any oil, they are busy being taken to the cleaners, I think, regularly by the sharks in the oil industry and not so sharks in the oil industry, buying up anything that looks potentially promising in Saskatchewan and now out in Alberta, buying up. I have a feeling when the truth comes out, they are getting taken just about the same way those people over there got taken by the old fellow, a gentleman in the meat packing industry. However, they are very quick to run and announce publicly everything that might be construed as favorable to Saskoil.

Now, when it comes to Saskpotash they are strangely silent. We can't find out anything. We can't find out if they have a head office. We can't find out where it's located. How large it is. What kind of a lease they took. Whether it's going to be there for a month or six months or ten years. All we know is that some of the civil servants and some of the friends of the government have been placed in charge and been given high sounding titles and I'm sure extremely high wages. They have hired the odd individual from the mining industry. We can't even find out when they quit or if they do quit. Ministers are very reluctant even to tell us the facts that they know.

This should tell us something about their venture so far in the potash industry. That is that even from the beginning,

from day one when they decided to get into the potash industry, after mauling and savaging and mistreating the people who are already here, setting the situation up so they could go in the industry with some attempt at a valid excuse. Everything I suggest has gone wrong. Was it Mr. Schultz they hired? He quit on them. From the development at Bredenbury that they were all set to announce with great fanfare, promised all over that area in the election, all set to announce the great fanfare. Then they got the studies back from Kilborn, then they got the studies back from Dominion Securities and the answer I guess, came through very clear. It's too costly, it's too risky, too much money involved and you can't possibly hope to get your money back out in any reasonably length of time. Stay out of it. So they backed off. That was sensible. Nothing wrong with that.

If it had stopped there and then said okay it doesn't make sense at this point in time for us to get involved in the industry, but it does make sense for us as a government to do everything we can to get some expansion of this industry, so we'll sit down and we'll negotiate as is proper for any government to do, with anybody, individual, small or large business, we'll negotiate with the potash industry to get the necessary development that we want.

They didn't do that. They just buried their heads in the sand. They've buttoned up. They have stone-walled. They have refused to talk, refused to debate, refused to do anything. But hide, cover up and misrepresent and tell half-truths and I think sometime, Mr. Speaker, they've gone farther than the half-truths. They have told this House, the people of this province things that are not true at all.

So that's why we say hold these hearings and invite Kilborn Engineering to share with the people of Saskatchewan what they have already shared with the Government of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan have already paid for this knowledge. They have already paid and I suggest they paid dearly.

May Kilborn are wrong. Call some other engineers, call some other experts. I'm sure they would be prepared to come forward. Listen to them. Weigh the evidence. Hear what they have to say. Above all let the people of Saskatchewan who in the final analysis are going to back-up and foot any bill, are going to be in the final analysis responsible for any actions that we take in this Legislative Assembly or that you take in Cabinet, caucus or the Government of the day.

So, Mr. Speaker, we would know then if you can find the money and if the financial experts say on the surface it's a good or bad deal, you'd get their advice. You'd know from experts in the mining field whether this is a good time or a stupid time or a bad time to enter into the business. You'd know whether you can find the technical and professional people who are skilled and adequate to come to Saskatchewan and assist you in this venture. You would know whether you could get at some answers and you would have shared those answers with the people of Saskatchewan. People who you are ultimately responsible to. I don't think you are just responsible to them every four years. I think you are responsible to them every day of every year you hold office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — There's another group that has tremendous stake, a very direct stake, in what you are doing. That group are the men and the women who work in the potash mines.

Now I don't know whether they favor or they don't favor. I know that some leaders of some unions have stated publicly their support of the Government moving in and nationalizing the potash industry. We know that there are some union leaders who came out very strongly in favor of socialization of all the means of production and distribution. The farms, industries, big, small business, the whole works, all of our economy. I'm not sure, I'm never sure and I don't think they can be sure how much these particular leaders speak for the rank and file. If in fact they spoke for all the working people in this province then I suggest that the NDP would not just have received 39 per cent of the vote. They would receive about 99 or 89 per cent of the vote because I'm sure that 89 per cent of the people in this province generally work for a living, are working people. Anyway they would receive far more than 39 per cent.

So I don't think they can with any assurance, in fact, there's a great deal of evidence that these few labor leaders don't speak for the rank and file of the workers in this industry or outside this industry.

We have some evidence that the rank and file of working people in the potash industry are very disturbed, very upset. We haven't got a great deal of evidence, that I'll admit. We have the public meeting that the Premier held in Esterhazy, by the public reports and reports we get from talking to people who were there. Most of the people who attended that were workers in the Esterhazy mine, people who worked for the IMC. And that they expressed their opposition to the Government taking over the potash industry in no uncertain terms. They were angry with the Premier, they ridiculed the Premier and there was no doubt the vast majority of people who attended that meeting, not only were workers in the potash industry, administration, office workers and miners, that they were against it.

There was this poll taken at Kalium. Again it clearly showed that those people who were questioned, unanimously and they were workers, people who work in the mine, in every capacity, were opposed to the course of action the NDP have undertaken, taking over the potash industry.

We don't know but neither does the Government whether the majority of people who work in the mines, who make their living, have made their careers in the potash industry and the work in secondary industries that depend for their being and their living on the potash industry, whether they are for or against this move. Why not find out?

I think maybe the Government knows a little bit more than they let on. They held a meeting in Saskatoon. The locale of the meeting is very interesting. It was a union hall. Now in the course of things in Saskatchewan you wouldn't expect really to find a great anti-government ground swell coming out from the union hall in Saskatoon. I expected to see after that meeting a great deal of talk by Government Members, especially the Members from Saskatoon about the tremendous ground swell of support they had received from working men and women who attended that potash meeting, sponsored by the Government and attended by,

I think the Premier, there were certainly Cabinet Ministers, but it didn't happen. There was little or nothing said. There wasn't a very big attendance I understand. This in itself tells I think a very clear and very significant story. They stayed home. That to me is disapproval.

Having recognized and being aware that their leadership was supporting the Government and do so almost blindly on every issue. I sometime think that some of these labor leaders are really more NDP than they are union. The rank and file decided, I presume, because they didn't come out and show their support, that they better let it alone.

Probably had a feeling that they wouldn't be listened to anyway and why rock the boat.

Mr. Romanow: — NDP like Joe Morris.

Mr. Steuart: — NDP like Joe Morris. If Joe Morris wouldn't like anything that great Canadian statesman, Prime Minister Trudeau stated. He would have knee jerking reaction, if somebody tells him in the morning, Joe, here's what you should say. Joe says, yeh, is that what I should say? He says it, he's very good. He don't pronounce the words so good, but he says the sentence very clearly. I watched him. He made a very unimpressive performance in all. Again he is one I am talking about. He is far more interested in producing a socialistic status state in this nation than he is in advancing the cause of the working people who pay for his daily bread and butter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We invited him to come and speak to our convention.

Mr. Romanow: — Is that the same Joe Morris I saw on W5?

Mr. Steuart: — That's the one. We invited him to come and speak to our convention. He didn't even have the good grace to answer and say, no he wouldn't come. We wrote him twice. No he wouldn't come. We said come and speak, give us your point of view, labor's point of view on the proposals made by the Federal Government as far as anti-inflation fight is concerned. Give us labor's point of view. He never even answered the letter. He never even bothered to say I won't come, I can't come or I'll send someone else. We had other people there who certainly weren't on our side, there were a few. Unlike the NDP, the Liberal Party is always prepared to listen to all sides. No question, we are prepared at all times to listen to all sides. Our side and the wrong side, but we are always wide open to listen. We know there are at least two or three sides to every subject.

Mr. Speaker, they are not giving the working people in this province a chance to be heard, no question about that. And, as I say, even those who have a very direct stake and who make their living directly or indirectly in the potash industry. Mr. Speaker, I suggest they call people who are involved in financing, in the operation of mines and the people who actually do the operation, the people who carry out the mines. Again, in a final analysis, the success, failure of any venture comes

down to the people who work in that venture. If they are well trained, if they are expert, if they are well motivated, if they are energetic and if they are enthusiastic with their work as a team, the venture will succeed. If they aren't, no venture can possibly hope to be successful. And surely, surely, that Government that pretends and boasts about being the friend of the working people and are open to suggestions about working people, which spends thousands of taxpayers' dollars with Ombudsmen, and open lines and flying circuses all over the province and makes a pretence of listening to the public, when it comes to the greatest venture that has ever been put before the people, they totally refuse to go and listen to the people and let them be heard.

It is very interesting, I am looking at the Dean of the House, the second Dean of the House, the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), he just finished chairing a very important committee that held hearings, the traffic committee, I think had made an excellent report. It think it was one of the instances of democracy in this Legislative Assembly and the Members that were working, at its best. It took people from different political philosophies, different backgrounds with a common problem, and they went and they held hearings and they worked together and they produced a good report. And, just passing, I hope the Government is going to take some action on that report and take it very quickly. There are people being hurt and killed and maimed on our highways while the Government dithers and diddles and refuses to come to terms with an excellent report. I don't agree maybe with all of it, but it is a very excellent report. They should take it and come to terms with it and bring in some legislation. There are all kinds of things this Legislative Assembly can be doing and let me tell you if you bring in that kind of a Bill, we may debate it, we will debate it, we may offer amendments, I am sure we will but we will pass it and we will pass it in a hurry from our point of view.

However, what I started out to say was there was an example of when you hold hearings. I am not suggesting that the problems of traffic and the carnage and the unhappiness and death that is happening because of traffic and the outdated laws and regulations we have covering traffic, the change in traffic is not import. It is of vital importance. I think we give it and I know we obviously give it more importance than the Government opposite. I am sure the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) gives it far more importance than his Cabinet colleagues do. That's important and you did what was right, you haven't finished the job. You took a good step, you set up a committee and they held hearings and they come back with some excellent recommendations. Now for goodness sake, go the rest of the way, put it into law. Why won't you do that for this? Why won't you listen? What other ingredient is necessary to make that venture a success or to know whether you should proceed or you shouldn't proceed? Surely if you have got the financial backing that's sound, if you've listened to the workers and they are enthusiastic and you can get them to work for you and well motivated, that's necessary. Certainly if people who are experts in the mining of potash tell you that it is feasible and you can do, that's an important ingredient.

But all of these will fail if you haven't got the market. You might have the best workers in the world, wonderful financial backing, you can produce a good product and lots of it but if you

haven't got the market. You might have the best workers in the world, wonderful financial backing, you can produce a good product and lots of it but if you can't sell it, the whole thing has been a failure. I would remind the Government once again that this is not a captive market. We depend on the Americans, whether you like it or not, to consume 70 per cent of our potash and you have no guarantee, in fact even to the contrary, but you have no guarantee. If you have then by all means show it to us, show it to the public, that you can save any or all of the market for the mines that you are zeroing in on, that you are taking a bead on. Surely, common sense tells you that if you can't hold the major or the majority portion of those markets, that you will be in trouble. That's not important, what is important is the investment backed by the ordinary men and women in this province will also be in trouble. Call experts, we have people in this country, we have people outside this country who are in the business of marketing potash. Find out if they are prepared to deal with us, find out and tell the public. Surely that is part and parcel when you are going to mortgage the future of the people of Saskatchewan. I say you have got a responsibility to say, look, we can sell in the market, here are the deals we have made, here are the commitments we have received, here are the guarantees we have got.

It goes deeper than that. Surely you are open to advice. Now I know that the NDP are convinced that they are the containers and the custodians of all the sanctity and the well-meaning philosophy in the world. I have all along recognized that, that there is no group in our society who have such a strangle hold, who have such a monopoly on good wishes, and sanctity and all that's holy. Now we know that, we hear it all the time, even if they had never been in government at Ottawa, they are responsible for all the good things, the old age pension.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear, says the old auctioneer. Nice to see you back, hope you're feeling better. But surely, even the NDP don't pretend that they have got all the information . . .

Miss Clifford: — Mr. Shillington will . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I'm beginning to think you are right. But surely even the NDP don't pretend that they have got all the information. It is just conceivable that if you stop and listen, someone somewhere might come to one of those meetings, you might invite somebody, who could give you some good advice in this case on the marketing of potash.

Mr. Speaker, there are other problems, a great many other problems that they could use some advice on. In this case, I know they haven't got the advice, I know that they are groping in the dark and that is the constitutional question. The question of the relations between the provincial Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government in regard to the operation of the potash industry and the taxation of the potash industry. By their own admission within the last two and one-half months, the Government has taken one stand publicly and then changed that stand publicly. In the beginning when the Premier so glibly announced that this was a good deal, the Attorney General almost simultaneously announced that they had no worry about

being forced to pay federal taxes on the potash industry once they had nationalized it. He said, one Government cannot tax another government. Therefore, one government cannot tax the creatures of another government, in this case a Crown corporation.

After the authorities of the Federal Government had very clearly stated that they had every intention of taxing it and continuing to get their fair share of taxation from this industry, then the Attorney General comes out and said, well, maybe he was wrong and that they recognized that the Federal Government could and probably would tax the potash industry. But he said that that didn't worry him. It was rather amazing that the Attorney General can shrug off a cost that could amount of \$3 million or \$5 million from a fully matured mine and this is what the level of federal taxation could well be — \$3 to \$4 to \$5 million. I say a fully matured mine because a mine, any mine, whether it is operated by a private individual or a private group is entitled by law to certain write-offs. Just as a farmer is entitled to certain write-offs, depreciation on machinery, just as anyone who enters into business are entitled under our tax laws. And our, astute Minister of Mineral Resources, Mr. Whelan, suggests because the potash industry took normal and legal advantage of tax write-offs that everyone in this country is entitled to, has by some mysterious method made them bad, to quote him, corporate citizens. I don't know, however, one thing that has come through crystal clear is that the Government of Saskatchewan does not know where they stand constitutionally or in regard to taxation with the Federal Government if and when they take over all or part of the potash industry. They don't know. Surely this is a major consideration and it might become a major obstacle in the possible success of the potash industry.

Why don't they find out? What are they afraid of? I was going to say, what have they got to lose? Well, an election, yes, that's the ultimate fear that the NDP always have. Everything relates to the election, not what's good for the people not what's best for the people, but what appears would be best so they can maintain themselves in power. They have got a great deal to gain, I suggest, because if they find out, as they found out in the prorationing Bills that their action was vires, that they have exceeded their powers, it is only common sense, surely a reasonable, responsible government would find that out before committing the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to this slippery road or down this path that they cannot retrace their steps once they have started. Surely it is common sense to find that out and it can be found out so easily and so quickly. That's another reason why we think that a reasonable group of MLA's not blinded by doctrinaire socialism as apparently the front benches or the Cabinet Ministers are, but looking clearly and with common sense at the common good of the people of Saskatchewan before they risk the greatest, hugest, largest sum of money that has ever been risked by any province or any government in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — You can't unscramble the egg.

Mr. Steuart: — The Hon. Member says, you can't unscramble the egg and that's for sure. But we are suggesting before you break it, before you get past the point of no return, stop and look, stop and listen. Who else did they call? Mr. Speaker, surely a democratic government would call the public and that's what this

motion foresees, that's what this motion asks for, for them to call the public, I'll quote again from the amendment:

To receive representation from interested parties and the members of the general public.

Well, why the general public? The government may say the general public are not experts of the potash industry. I agree, most of them aren't. Most of them know so little that they would qualify to be Members of the NDP Cabinet. However, they know a great deal more than you NDP give them credit for. They know what they want and they know what they don't want. It might be honest and it might be worthwhile, in fact I suggest it would be worthwhile, if the NDP listened to the public and found out from them their priorities. If you asked the public what their first choice is to do with \$500 or \$1000 million dollars, I think you'd find the grabbing and the seizing of the potash industry or a part of it, would be extremely low with 99 per cent of the public of this province. If you asked the public what they would sooner do, rather than pay back \$110 million a year to some American financiers, what they would sooner do with that money, I am sure you would find all kind of answers. They might tell the Minister of Health (Mr. Robbins) that they might like to see the hospitals reopened to the full extent in this province. You might find that the schoolboard would like a little extra help. You might find out — Oh, the old auctioneer is gone again — well anyway, win some, lose some — you might find out that they would like to see a little more emphasis put on the maintenance of our highway system, being neglected very badly by the Government opposite. I am sure you would find out that they have all kinds of priorities. In fact what you might even find out is that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan said, look, we are just a little tired of government spending more and more of our money, our priority is don't go into the potash business and don't do anything else with our money, just stay out of it and leave us alone.

You know we have asked on several occasions for the Premier to come clean to this House and tell us if he is in fact receiving a great number of complaints or exactly what is happening in public opinion as hears it.

Mr. Romanow: — I got nine letters . . .

Mr. Steuart: — The Attorney General suggests he has only got nine letters, six for and three against. I didn't know all the Members of your family could write that well, they're not that old. However, let me read a few letters, Mr. Attorney General, that I have received that have been sent, not to me, but to the Premier and copies were sent to me. I suppose in the hope — they know they will disappear -

Mr. Romanow: — How many languages?

Mr. Steuart: — I've got them in several languages as a matter of fact. I've just got a small sampling, I didn't want to bore the House with the bagful we brought on at the time of the debate on the Land Bank when we asked the public to send us the letters. You might stay and listen to this letter, it is from a company that is located at 901 East Centre, Saskatoon, it's called the Kenitex. If you can pronounce that, I'm having a little trouble

myself. I've had trouble with my Irish since I left the old country.

Mr. Romanow: — Julian Handigand.

Mr. Steuart: — He's an intelligent individual. I don't even know him. But allow me for your benefit to read the letter. It is written to Mr. Allan Blakeney, Premier of Saskatchewan, Legislative Building, Regina. January 7th I received it:

Dear Sir: I am very disturbed at the Saskatchewan NDP Government passing legislation to take effective control of the potash industry. Mr. Blakeney, your Government's philosophy and policy have created a situation to make it economically impossible for the potash industry to expand. Now that the potash companies have stalled their expansion, your Government is moving in quickly to take over the potash industry and telling the people of this province that you are going to do what the potash industry has failed to do. Your Government was the cause of all this and you know it. The people of this province know it. If an election was to be called on that issue, your Government would go down to defeat like the Barrett Government in B.C. for playing similar tactics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Is he still vice-president of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Steuart: —

Each individual in this province has enough creativity, imagination, desire and ambition to get things done on their own whether they are farmers, businessmen, professionals, tradesmen or whatever. They have a sense of responsibility, efficiency, productivity, higher than any government ever put together.

Mr. Blakeney your proposal is absolutely unfair and unjustified. From a business point of view a very poor economical proposal. It will not be efficient and you know that and most of all your are destroying the initiative of the people of this province and the future investment coming into this province. The question in most people's minds is: who is next? Is your hunger for power to great that you are giving it priority over the future potential of each individual?

And he closes it by saying:

Think about it.
Your truly,
Julian Handigand.

He sent a copy to Roy Romanow, as a matter of fact, and one to Bev Dyck and one to Paul Mostoway, one to John Brockelbank, who has now become an independent so I don't think he has to read this one, and one to Herman Rolfes.

An Hon. Member: — Who?

January 12, 1976

Mr. Steuart: — Herman, or is it Rupert, no it is Herman. And one to Wes Robbins, and one to Dave Steuart — spelled wrong; and one to Dick Collver, and one to Glen Penner and one to Evelyn Edwards and one to the Star-Phoenix.

Mr. Romanow: — You know an interesting thing . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I don't blame him. The only question I have on my mind is that when you sign it in blood, whose blood is it? That is the only question. I have another letter here and this is an excellent letter, I think. This is from Saskatoon. You are in trouble. It is 9 Webb Crescent and it is signed Mrs. Cecilia Forsythe.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . she is an authority on potash.

Mr. Steuart: — I will read it and it is rather poetic.

November brings winterskill, Grey Cup and Remembrance Day. On this day the entire nation reflects on its past history, pausing to appreciate life's freedom something that Canadians take for granted to remember those who gave their life in the name of Freedom.

And what is freedom

Webster defines it as, (1) quality or state of being free. (2) a privilege. This word has been printed, abused, misused and abused so often that its popular meaning is not as precise as the dictionary meaning. Present day philosophy of doing your own thing is confused with individual freedom, but the worst is yet to come, all under the name of freedom, of course.

November 1975 has been chilling, indeed. The Saskatchewan Roughriders didn't make it to the Grey Cup, but the Saskatchewan Government revealed certain socialist ambitions that shook the province. Perhaps future generations will recall Remembrance Day in Saskatchewan as Expropriation Day and sing, "where have all our freedoms gone" instead of, "where have all the flowers gone."

In other words I am trying to say that the Provincial Government should regulate, in a fair manner, private industry, but not control it.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Forsythe.

She sent this to Mr. Blakeney, Mr. Romanow, Mr. Steuart and to Mr. Collver.

I have another letter here and it is from Saskatoon as well.

The Government announced November 13th its intent to expropriate some or all of the potash mines in the province. I feel that the Government is unfair and

inconsistent in its treatment of the various sectors of the resource industry and that the money to be used to purchase mine properties could be better spent in other ways.

The Government threatens expropriation of potash mines, but says it will offer inducements to the oil industry to return to Saskatchewan. Regulations for uranium and base metals are also involved as compared to potash. Why? The Government appears to be taking vengeance on the potash producers because they object strenuously to the back tax loads. The oil producers also objected strenuously to the tax of Bill No. 42 and they brought their case to court. However, the oil companies also could, and did reduce their operations sharply in the province. Now the Government says it wants the oil companies back, but what company would trust the present Government after this.

The potash companies are unable to move out as easily as the oil companies and, therefore, the Government finds them an easy target. The financing of this project seems very strange. The Government now takes most of the revenue from potash and has no capital investment in the industry. An enormous capital investment will be required for purchase of the industry, but the additional returns will be low, as companies point out their profits are small or non-existent. Indeed, it has been suggested that interest charges on the loan would far exceed the additional Government revenue upon takeover.

We have been promised no increase in taxes as a result of the takeover, but if the revenues are diverted to pay off the loan, how will the Government maintain this present level of services? Whether or not that promise is kept, there has been no suggestion of a tax decrease due to Government ownership. What advantage is this to the people of Saskatchewan?

Royalties and taxes on the oil companies have eliminated the sales tax in Alberta, why can't potash do the same here. Why does not the Government simply reduce the tax rate, let them expand or offer tax incentives for expansion whereby Government revenue will increase as a result of greater production even at low tax rates.

At present, various Government agencies regulate the companies with respect to production, safety, environmental protection, etc. if the Government owns the mines and has a vested interest in their profitability, who will regulate the Government. If the Government writes the regulations for its own mines, how will workers be assured of impartial judgment or safety requirements.

At present, with multiple ownership of mines, unions negotiate with one company at a time for contracts. With centralized ownership negotiation will be for all mines at once and in case of strikes the entire potash production will be stopped. This is a poor risk in view of the Government's stated objective of assuring production. In multiple ownership there is room for give and take in bargaining. Comparisons with other operations, etc. If the Government alone deals with the unions, a poor decision

could be very costly, it could be very costly to the Government or alternately a hardship on the workers. If the Government buys out the mines the companies will go elsewhere with that money and develop potash production, which will then be in direct competition with Saskatchewan. This would certainly reduce the present buoyancy of the potash market and affect Government profits.

In the past Government ownership has been restricted to business, or services which are a public necessity, but unprofitable or which could be monopolized or controlled by the Government. The potash business does not fit these categories and would probably be influenced by external forces in the future as it has been in the past.

With an extraordinary debt load the Government would be at a disadvantage in any future business downswing. This action of the Government seems to have its main intent to bring more power to the central authority one step closer to the Orwell's world of 1984. The Government complains that the companies have been uncooperative, but in fact, the Government has all of the controls and could if it wished establish an atmosphere in which objectionable taxes were removed, production, employment, tax revenue and industrial activity all also improved.

Much to-do is made about the people and about the people's resources, but the resources were unavailable before the engineers with the skill and courage created complex industry in what was once considered impossible conditions. One is reminded of the story of the Little Red Hen but in this case when the hen finally bakes a loaf of bread, the farmer cuts off its neck. The reward for success is nationalization, who is next? Where will it stop? Are we going to be like East Germany or Hungary or the Ukraine? Perhaps Britain is the model. Under the previous system North America grew and prospered as no other land in history. Now government action has threatened to destroy the system and the incentive which made our vigorous society.

I hope that the Government will reconsider its policy in this matter and encourage a thriving industrial activity in our province.

Don Jendwill,
133 Sparling Crescent, Saskatoon

Mr. Speaker, I have several more letters. I even have one in French. I thought of reading it but then I didn't want to embarrass some of the Members over there who might not be as active as some of the other Members and as knowledgeable in the Canada of their language, just to say that they think it is a pretty rotten deal — I think what the phrase is, it is a very bad business deal.

To speak of this seriously there is one thing that comes out of these letters — and there are lots more, hundreds more and you can read the one in French if you want — and that is the commonsense in these letters. It is all very well for the Attorney General to laugh and downgrade these people to say they never agreed with me. He doesn't know whether they agreed with them in the past or not. The one thing that comes through these letters is the commonsense and I will guarantee you,

Mr. Attorney General, if you would listen to commonsense and refer this Bill to a committee and listen to these kinds of people, I am sure you would find that your own people, your own supporters, people who supported you in the past, that many of them feel exactly the same way as the people who have taken up pen or who have sat down to a typewriter and had the courage, and it takes courage, to write a letter to a powerful government and state their objections. Because this Government and that Attorney General have never hesitated for one moment, Mr. Speaker, to threaten anyone, individual or a large group, Chambers of Commerce or Boards of Trade, who have had the courage to exercise their democratic right and did disagree publicly with the Government of the day. And so I say that it does take courage. But if the Government was sincere about being an open democratic government and encourage people to come and freely present their point of view, whether they disagree with the Government or agreed with them. I think that they would find out something that they already know and that is that the vast majority of people in Saskatchewan don't like this deal and they are concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, one thing that comes out in these letters and in representations that we have had made to us, is that this total investment of anywhere from \$500 million to \$1 billion, there will not be one new job produced for the people of Saskatchewan, not one new job. Another thing that comes out quite clearly is, how much better we could use that money doing something else to enhance the future of the province and bring about sound, good, sensible development that will help all our people. And what the people find most unobjectionable, is that if the Government, right or wrong, is the potash industry right or wrong, would not expand if the Government felt that there was a market for more potash and this should result in more jobs and more revenue, then we said, well we might not agree with the government nationalizing and moving into this industry at least it would make some sense. But to most people this makes no sense whatsoever, a risk of a thousand million dollars and not one new job and very questionably would it even maintain the same level of government revenue.

Another thing that comes through from representations that we have had, letters from individuals — and I am sure the Government has the same if they were honest enough to admit it — is as a result of the Government doing this and as a result of the Government forcing all or part of the potash industry out of Saskatchewan, these people now engaged in the potash industry are now, at this present time, going elsewhere to find new sources of potash to fill the markets that they now own, markets that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest they will keep; markets that they will fill not with Saskatchewan potash, but with potash from Montana, North Dakota, New Brunswick, potash from New Mexico, robbing us of Saskatchewan jobs, robbing us of Saskatchewan taxes, robbing us of new revenue to pay for new roads and highways, schools and hospitals.

Let's look at what some other people think about this. I have an editorial from the Northern Miner, November 20th and it is called, "Socialist Shock Tactics." Now the Northern Miner has long been considered the Bible of mining men in Canada and the Northern Miner speaks about the problems and policies and changes in the mining industry. People who have knowledge

of the mining industry, listen. It has long been a well qualified and respected source of information in regard to all types of mining in Canada.

Let me read from this editorial, entitled "Socialist Shock Tactics."

Immeasurable harm has been done to Canada's reputation as a sound country for investment in the mineral industry by the announcement of Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan to the effect that his Provincial Government plans to take over and nationalize half or all of the potash industry.

In the same Speech from the Throne the Premier promised decreased taxes and inducement to oil companies to tempt them to return to exploration in the province from which his tax policies had caused them to withdraw entirely.

What resource industry, however, is likely to be receptive to such inducements in the face of the drastic and arbitrary takeover of potash producers in the province.

Premier Blakeney maintains that the ten potash producing companies of the province all privately owned companies, have been unwilling to expand their production in response to a growing world demand for this mineral. Nowhere does he even hint that the inability of the companies to increase production is due entirely to his outrageous escalation of taxes. The incidence of government taxation varies with each company, but the average impact of government taxation, federal and provincial currently exceeds 85 per cent of per tax profits.

Mr. Blakeney has said that a reasonable return on invested capital would be from 10 to 20 per cent. The average return on capital invested in the potash mines of Saskatchewan which represents about \$1 billion is about five per cent. Who in these circumstances is going to pour more money into plant expansion?

Mr. Blakeney's drastic decision to take over the potash industry is no doubt his angry response to the actions of ten companies in suing the Provincial Government in the courts in the belief that some of his tax measures are unconstitutional and ultra vires.

One company with support of the Federal Government instituted a suit some years ago against the Saskatchewan Government on similar grounds and won the case. The verdict is subject to appeal.

Faced with the threat that much of its mineral tax legislation will be ruled invalid, in the courts, Mr. Blakeney has resorted to the drastic measure of socialization of all or most of the industry. It is difficult to see how the Saskatchewan Government can avoid future legal battles. An impartial arbitration board is to be established to determine the value of such property. The verdict of the board is subject to appeal. This opens a long vista of legal battles extending far into the future.

Mr. Blakeney's action is all the more shocking because he had undertaken to discuss with senior members of the industry some means of resolving the current impasse but instead the Premier has slammed the door and brought down his socialist acts. In doing so he has followed a different course from that adopted by the Government of British Columbia. That government has undertaken to review with representatives of the mining industry its whole program of legislation including taxation in view of the very serious problems and handicaps, most of them government induced, from which the mining industry of British Columbia has been suffering. This seems a sensible conciliatory course but not in Saskatchewan.

We have yet to see what will be the industry's response to this shocking announcement. There have been provincial takeover's before, mostly in the field of public utilities, or some service industry such as car insurance. In the latter case the record of Saskatchewan Government is miserably unimpressive. In some years they have run up a deficit of over \$3 million at the taxpayers' expense. This is the first instance to our knowledge where a provincial government has announced that it proposes to take over a whole segment of the mineral industry. There are no grounds for thinking that the Saskatchewan Government could run the potash industry off the mineral industry. There are no grounds for thinking that the Saskatchewan Government could run the potash industry of the province as well or better than the private companies who risk their capital to establish the industry in the first place.

Mr. Blakeney and his colleagues have got themselves into very deep water. All the talk about subsidiaries of multinational corporations is so much eye-wash pandering to the provincial patriotism or parochial prejudices of the people of Saskatchewan.

The subsidiaries of multinational corporations are the experts in the field, with years of experience and successful and economic management, any provincial corporations are the experts in the field, with years of experience and successful and economic management, any provincial corporation would be hard-put to match them in enterprise and experience. We can only regard this move of Mr. Blakeney as ill-considered, ill-timed, potentially disastrous for the people of Saskatchewan. It will certainly deter private capital from investing in mineral exploration and development of the province. The ill-effects will certainly not be confined to the province. Canada's credibility as a sound place of investment in the development of mineral resources will be called into question because of the shock treatment administered by one province. Mr. Blakeney has served ill not only the potash industry of his province but the mineral industry of Canada. In fact if this sad event is allowed to stand, the reputation of the whole country will be besmirched.

Mr. Speaker, I have other copies of editorials and articles written by people who are expert in the field of potash and of mining and of resource development. They have one thing in common. They have in common all that runs through that editorial from the Northern Miner. The point of view that they have in

common is expressed very well by the editor of the Northern Miner and that is every facet of the risk that this daily involves, not for the Government, their risk is only political — I think it is a bad risk politically, but it is only political. The risk will be borne on the backs of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is always amazing how quickly the socialists are ready to socialize somebody else's wealth how quickly the socialists are ready to place the burden of their intemperate and irresponsible gamble on the backs of the people who have worked hard and who have shown initiative in the Province of Saskatchewan. Again in this particular project policy, the NDP, the socialists opposite show very clearly their basic philosophy. What other people have earned, what other people have developed, what other people have risked, through their hard work, through their initiative, these people will move in at every opportunity, take it over, seize it and revile the same people in the process.

Mr. Speaker, we have all mentioned that this will have serious overtones for other industries. Again I want to remind the House that we are in jeopardy right now of losing almost \$200 million of added investments in the uranium industry. I want to quote an article in the Globe and Mail of December 12, 1975.

Saskatchewan Plan Seen as a Threat to the Uranium Industry.

I want to remind the Members opposite of this, because again if they would listen to this amendment and hold hearings I am sure the people involved, the uranium industry would make representation. They, we, and the public could judge if in fact there are serious about withdrawing their plans, proposals for tremendous expansion in the uranium industry in the very part of this province where we need investment the most, and that is Northern Saskatchewan.

Let me quote:

The proposed change in Saskatchewan's uranium production royalty policy would give the province another \$100 million or more in the next ten years. This the uranium industry say could result in a marked decrease in exploration and development because of restricted cash flow.

The new royalty policy which would switch to a graduated taxation system based on uranium prices from the previous flat rate taxation of profits will have other detrimental effects the industry fears including the creation of a dis-incentive towards optimizing production.

Confusion over the proposal has already resulted in two of the three uranium companies in Saskatchewan delaying expansion plans. Eldorado Nuclear Limited of Ottawa the federal uranium company has postponed its plan to double production at its Beaver Lodge operation in Uranium City.

I wonder how the people in Uranium City, as an aside from quoting, feel about their Member, the Member they just elected five or six short months ago representing the new constituency

of Athabasca, who has yet to speak out in this debate in defence of a reasonable level of taxation, not only in the potash industry but on the uranium industry. There is no question that in Uranium City, the Beaver Lodge Mine and many hundreds of jobs are going to be denied that area because of the actions of this Government and the example set in the potash industry but many of the jobs that are not existent, many of the jobs now there, many of the people now working union people, people who supported the NDP and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson), stand in jeopardy of losing their jobs and being forced to move out because of the actions of that Government. I find it a betrayal and a sellout by the Member for Athabasca individually who has not had the courage of his convictions to speak up against this legislation and against this action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, this article goes on, to talk about Eldorado Nuclear of Ottawa curtailing or stopping the doubling of production that it was planning for Uranium City. Then it says that Amok of Saskatchewan a unit of the Mott Company of France, planned to start up a production for early 1978 near Cluff Lake, has pushed back at least one year.

Again we have heard from the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McNeil) saying this is nonsense. He doesn't believe it. Well, if it is not true, it is stated there, I have read other articles of statements by officials of that corporation, then let that Member show his concern about that area, let him vote in favor of this amendment to at least give those people a chance to be heard publicly before the Government embarks down this path, before it is too late while there is still time to pull back.

I want to remind those Members from the North over there that they were elected by the people of the North, not to represent what Mr. Romanow thinks is best for the people or what Mr. Blakeney thinks is best for the people or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) from Moose Jaw thinks is best for the people but to represent your people. Yet you are fast becoming and you have already become, unless you change and change rapidly, a rubber stamp for any ridiculous plan that the Government benches, the Cabinet have to foist on you and to us and onto the people of the province. I suggest that you show some independence, think for yourselves. That is what you are paid for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That is what you were elected for. I would suggest that the Members of northern Saskatchewan pause and reflect why the old CCF and the NDP could not maintain Members in northern Saskatchewan beyond one term. I will tell you why. The same fate is going to happen to you because they came down into this provincial capital and they voted like sheep, they followed the Government line whether the government line was bad for the people of northern Saskatchewan or not, and it usually was. You are following the same line, you will enjoy the same fate at the next election.

They can gerrymander all they want in the North and they have gerrymandered, the worst gerrymander in the history of the North. An insult to the judge and that committee that they set up to make a redistribution of the boundaries. As a matter of

fact that judge and that committee should have refused to take on the job unless they were given the whole province. They should have said and I am amazed that they didn't, I said that then, they should have said, why don't you give us the whole province. Why do you want to start off with two seats in your pocket? That is exactly what you did. You gerrymandered those lines because you were so bitter, that you could never elect anybody in northern Saskatchewan. You said we'll do two things: we'll draw the line anywhere we feel like, then we'll pour in money and we'll bribe those people, we'll bulldoze them, we'll do anything we can so that Mr. Bowerman and the rest can stand up and say DNS is successful, the northern people are happy.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it might have worked once, but if you keep on at the rate you are going, even the civil servants that you think you have in your hip pocket are going to wake up there and realize that what you are doing is not only not in the best interests of the people of northern Saskatchewan, it is in the worst interest. In the final analysis if the people of northern Saskatchewan the natives of northern Saskatchewan are to be pulled out of their poverty, are to be given a chance to take their place with the rest of society, they can only do it if they are given jobs. I don't mean jobs as free-loaders on the back of the public, at the whim of Mr. MacAuley and the whim of Mr. Bowerman, at the whim of anyone else, jobs in industry. The answer to northern Saskatchewan, and that is to get industry. The answer to northern Saskatchewan is no different than the answer to northern Saskatchewan and that is to get industry up there. What industries are going to be attracted to northern Saskatchewan? Mining, that is the industry that is going to be attracted to northern Saskatchewan, that is the industry that is going to produce jobs, that will give those people hope.

Yet when the Members opposite who come from northern Saskatchewan can sit idly by and not have the courage and the nerve to stand up and say, to the Front Benches to Mr. Blakeney, to Mr. Bowerman, what you are doing is wrong! It is hurting all of Saskatchewan, but is hurting our people even worse. I don't know how they can face their consciences. I don't know how they will face their own people, to go back up there and say, just so we can hold our job, just so we could get a few trips, just so we could curry favor with the bulldozers on the Front Bench, the Cabinet Ministers, we didn't even have the nerve to stand up and be heard in this debate. We sold you out, we sold you out for what, so that maybe we could curry favor and hold this little job as an MLA.

I want to tell them something. They will fail. The people up north are pretty direct. You may think they don't know what is going on here, they may be inundated and flooded with propaganda from the radio stations and all the paid propaganda up there. You can only fool them for a little while. You never fool them for very long. You had one Member of the CCF and he was defeated. Now you have two Members in the NDP and I predict, if they don't show the independence that the people want them to show when they elected them. The Member for Cumberland (Mr. MacAuley), he is an independent individual, he has a lot of respect on both sides of the House, he won't keep that respect long if he doesn't speak out about this outrage.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question and if they hold these hearings and if they listen to people, people in the North, people in the South, ordinary people, they will hear something crystal clear if they want to hear it, if they are honest enough, open

enough to hear it and that is that the majority of people don't want them to proceed with this huge risk and they don't want them to proceed not for now, not because it will hurt now, but because of what it will do to the future of the province. Do you notice one refrain that is occurring in all these letters and we hear it over and over wherever we go, who's next? They say, okay they've got the potash, they've got the oil industry, they've got the timber industry and they are in the process of getting the farmer. This is what you hear from ordinary people. Who's next? They are frightened of you people . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — You are frightened.

Mr. Steuart: — Me, oh, you can't nationalize me. I got out.

Mr. Rolfes: — What you have doesn't belong to you.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, what I have belongs to me, Mr. School teacher. And I earned it. And you've got nothing to nationalize. The only . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — It shouldn't.

Mr. Steuart: — Shouldn't, oh, is that right. Well, if you'd care to get up and speak in this House and tell me what I have that shouldn't belong to me. I would be glad to hear it. I'll stack my record up as a citizen of this country and this province against yours any day in the week, any day in the week.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Getting up for a few years and bamboozing a few students at high school doesn't really qualify you (a) to be a Cabinet Minister and (b) to be an authority on being a good citizen or being anything else. So I suggest you must close your mouth and open your ears and either study how to play Bingo properly or listen to what I've got to say and maybe you'll learn something.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And I might say in passing that one of the greatest miscarriages of justice was passing over almost anyone else on that side of the House to make you a Minister of the Crown, even poor Leonard Larson would have done a much better job than you are doing. Leonard, I don't know why they bypassed you for poor old Rolfes over there, I'll never know and neither will the people who are forced to live on welfare because that Government won't give them jobs and keeps driving industry out.

Mr. Rolfes: — How about selling some more oil wells.

Mr. Steuart: — I know your attitude, Mr. School teacher from Saskatoon. You'd have them all on welfare because it makes you feel like a big man, walking down the street, they are all working for me. The old iron fist.

Mr. Rolfes:— You got the short end of it.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I would have sooner got the short end of it, I take one look at you and you should sell out before the price goes down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — It all went into length and not into brain, that's the only trouble, I'm not sure you're playing with a full deck. But anyway please don't continue to interrupt me and prove what we already suspect and that is your total ignorance. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, back to the most serious subject of this amendment, which I really didn't intend to stray from. I was so upset by the interjections of the Hon. Minister over there and it did upset me a minute and I must admit I did stray for a moment or two from the amendment to Bill 1, which I might read again but I don't think so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province are saying, well, why are the Liberals holding up this Bill? Why are they continuing to talk and talk on this Bill? Why are they filibustering? They are saying something else. They are saying why aren't the Conservatives taking part in this Bill. In fact they said it so often and so long over the holidays that the Conservatives decided they would take part and they put a big ad in the paper. Well the Conservatives always do something if there is an easy way to do it. You just put your hand in your pocket and you just phone up a few of their rich Tory friends and say, let's put an ad in the paper. They haven't said anything in the paper, they never said anything in the House but they say, "What's next, who's next?" Well, in that they are right. That's the thing that people want to see. Then they say, "What can be done?" Then they make the bold announcement, "The Progressive Conservative Members of the Legislature have clearly stated their opposition to the Government's proposed takeover of the potash industry." Where in God's name has the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan ever stated that except in that same paid ad that they took in the Star-Phoenix and the Leader Post. You know you can read this and it sounds sensible. I like everything they say in this ad, but it comes rather strange from a party that has hour and hours, some 33 days to get up and make their position known and they failed to do it.

So they felt constrained by the abuse, I am suggesting, and the criticism they received from their own Members of the Conservative Party, first they take this ad and now the word I get is they are coming into this debate. I hope they do and I think they will have something concrete to offer. What they say in this ad I can't disagree with. But I do disagree with using that forum without using this forum. I say to them clearly, this is what they were elected for. They were elected to first put forward strongly and diligently as they can, their feelings about legislation in this Legislative Assembly. Then if they feel that they can add something to it, then letters, public meetings, advertisements in the newspaper and so on are legitimate. I don't disagree, I don't say they haven't got the right to do this, they have got every right to do it, of course, but I say that their first responsibility was in here. I should like to recall what the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver)

stated clearly when these Bills were first proposed, and that is, that he did not intend to oppose these, he intended to oppose them, I want to be fair, they have never stated anything else, the Conservative Members of this House, those that have spoken have stated that they are in opposition to Bills 1 and 2. So what did they say. They say now in this ad that they are clearly opposed to it and that they are going to take certain action. But the Conservative Leader of the Party said we don't propose to debate this very long because we want to see the Government pass it. We want to see the Government pass it. Why did he want to see the Government pass it? So he would be able to hit them over the head with it in the next election. And then somewhere in here and in his corridor speeches he said, we don't want to play politics with this Bill. Could you tell me any greater form of playing politics than to sit quietly by and in the hopes that the Government passes a piece of legislation that you say is abhorrent and that you're against, and hope that they will pass it and subject the people of this province to it for three and one-half years, so that you might be able to make some political capital out of it three and one-half years down the road in the next election. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very poor and shoddy performance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Another letter came in. The letters are rolling in. As I was saying the people ask why we are opposing it. Well, we are opposing it because we hope that public opinion will mount and enough evidence would come in for this Government to change its mind and withdraw the bill. Surely that is the job and the responsibility of the Opposition. Now when the Government brought these Bills in, it was just before Christmas, it was at a time when people are preoccupied with a great many other things, certainly politics would be away down on their list, Christmas shopping and holidays and all the other things attendant at the time of the year. It wasn't by chance the Government brought these Bills in, they didn't do this out of the blue without thought and without plan. They brought it in and it was very clear at a time when they thought that they could get it through without many people noticing it. We decided then that we would keep this Bill past the Christmas holidays so that public opinion would have time to be mustered and to let the people opposite know that they weren't in favor. Now that public opinion has been mustered, the letters have come in, the phone calls have come in, the editorials have been written, people have taken a stand, Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade, working people, they have given the Government a clear signal that they don't like this. But the Government has adamantly refused to listen, the Government has indicated very clearly that regardless of the signals sent forward by the ordinary people of this province, regardless of public opinion, they intend to press on. Bulldoze and use their majority.

Now as the Member who spoke before me stated that 15 Members attempting to carry this load, doing our best to carry this load, that there is a limit to how long you can debate any Bill and how long you can hold any Bill up. We don't apologize for holding this Bill up, we are proud of it. We have all spoken as he said, twice some three times and there is a limit to how many proper amendments you can introduce on second reading and we produced two and I think that's the limit. So we are coming to the end of this portion of the debate but there

is a debate on Committee of the Whole and there is debate on third reading and then there is Bill 2, the companion piece to this terrible piece of legislation, Bill 1. So our hope very clearly was to muster public opinion in the hope, as it likely turns out vain hope that the Government would withdraw.

Well, there is another position that we wanted to establish and we said this in the beginning and that is that if the Government wouldn't withdraw these Bills, at least they would back off, we've got nine potash mines. Now they talked about taking over at one time all of the potash industry. In the Speech from the Throne they talked about all or a major portion of the potash industry. Now all is nine potash mines, the major part of the portion of the potash industry and the portion could be four or five mines, depending on the ones that they take over, Esterhazy, IMC, then they would need only two other mines and they would have the majority of production. Well, now we know that they are not talking at the present time, they are not eyeing the International Mineral and Chemical mine at Esterhazy. They have their sight set on the Alwingsal mine at Lanigan. They have always had their eye set on the Sylvite mine at Rocanville and the Duval mine at Saskatoon. These three mines together have a capacity of about 400 million tons of product. The total capacity of the industry is a little better than 10 million tons a year. So they are talking now less than the majority, they are not talking any more about all of the potash industry, they are not even talking about one or two mines. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that our filibuster has made some progress. We have enabled the people of the province to be heard long enough and loud enough that the Government opposite has backed off in a major way, I suggest, from their original position. Certainly now the talk of one or two mines is a far cry from the majority or more than half of the potash productivity, or even as they were talking loosely at one time, all of the potash industry. So we have made some progress. We are not all that happy with it because our goal still is and we will still continue in Committee of the Whole. If they fail, I hope that they will reconsider and pass this amendment, we will continue our opposition in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, we want to point out to you and to this House that in this debate, we are now in the 34th day of this Legislative Assembly and with the exception of maybe, ten or eleven days of Private Members' Days, Private Members' Bills and resolutions are considered, we have debated these two Bills almost as long as we debate Government Bills in a normal session. A normal session in this Legislative Assembly can be 42 to 45 days or at least it used to be, it wasn't too long ago. We have had some shorter, but an average isn't too far from 42 to 43 days. So we have debated only two Bills for almost as long as we normally debate 70 or 80 or 90 Government Bills, sometime 100 Government Bills and for as long as we debate a Budget and the Estimates, plus all the questions and answers and resolutions. And yet in that time in this whole length of time going back to the early days of November when it started, through November, through December and now into January, the Premier of this province has yet to stand up in this House and have either the decency or the common courtesy to make this thoughts known to give us the advantage of his thoughts as the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the party opposite. This is a most disgraceful performance of any Premier in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan engaged in a task or policy or project of the magnitude or the importance of Bill 1 and Bill 2.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is totally and absolutely unacceptable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — It is bad enough that this Government opposite has refused to give us or the public, more important than we are, any facts, any figures to back up the validity of the Premier's glib claim that this is a necessary and a good business deal and see that this huge debt that he is taking on and placing on the back of the people of this province, that this is a self-liquidating debt. Not only has he not produced one shred of evidence that this is even feasible or sound, he has not even had the common courtesy to even stand up in this House and talk about it. He has talked about it to the Press, he has talked about it on the radio, he has gone down to small towns, to Yorkton and to Saskatoon and he has talked to the public, he appeared on television, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. I should like to remind him that he was elected as an MLA first, then as a leader of the majority party, he was chosen by that party to be the head of the Government. You talk about contempt of the Legislative Assembly. I say there hasn't been a Premier in the history of this province who has shown and is continuing to show more contempt for the Legislative Assembly and the people of the province than the same Allan Blakeney. Never in his seat, doesn't even bother to sit here. Darts in, sits there to see if there will be a question once in a while, if there is he brushes it off in some half flippant, ill-considered answer and then darts out again. And I know his excuse, his excuse is "well they are irrelevant, they are repetitious and they are filibustering, why should I, the high-priced, high-paid Premier of Saskatchewan sit and listen to that drivel." But he hasn't sat here from day one, he hasn't even the courtesy to stand up and make a speech. If he just got up and explained his position to the Members of this House, 20 minutes or 30 minutes or a half hour and then said, okay, I have made my position whether you like it or not.

Mr. Speaker: — I have been here quite a bit of the debate and I would think that the Leader of the Opposition's remarks are not relevant to the matter that is under discussion at this time, namely the amendment and I have had some trouble following him recently and I wonder if he could adhere closely to the amendment that is before the House.

Mr. Steuart: — I certainly will, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that in this amendment in asking the Members of the Legislative Assembly to vote for this amendment, which first, we recognize it's the Bill to which this amendment refers, it's of the utmost importance. No one denies that. I haven't even heard the Premier in his public comments, nor the Attorney General deny that this is a Bill, a tremendously important Bill, and will have a great bearing on the future, for the good or evil of the Province of Saskatchewan. But again I come back and say that as the Premier of the province, and the Leader of that party, someone entrusted with the highest office, in the gift of the people of Saskatchewan and when dealing with the most important Bill, or one of the most important Bills ever to come before the Legislative Assembly certainly envisioning the largest amount of money ever taken on by any government in the history of this province, the Premier's responsibility would be to come in and at least give his thoughts on this amendment and the Bill in

general. I should think he would support this. I would hope he would. It's not a very great hope because a man who won't even come in and speak on it, a man who won't face his responsibility as Premier is highly unlikely to support an amendment like this that would allow people in the province generally to examine his position. When he won't even tell the elected representatives what his position is, then he is highly unlikely to submit to the democratic process of telling the people of the province, except in very well controlled circumstances.

But this is the key to why he won't speak in this Legislative Assembly on this Bill. He wants to speak where no one can get at him. He wants to speak — you notice they dropped these little meetings they held all over the province. After he held a couple and he was ridiculed and laughed at, that's the last they saw of the Premier. He can't stand that. That's why he isn't in this House speaking on this amendment, Mr. Speaker. He can't stand it because someone else will get up and talk back to him. The Premier of this province has decided that the way to stay as Premier of this province is to hide. This is what he calls a low profile. To only come out when he is literally forced, and then talk in a very mild way, just talk in generalities and in a manner that will never upset anyone and take this sort of a "nice Nellie" attitude and so far the results from his point of view, politically, have been very successful. But I say to him, in his absence, to the Attorney General who I hope will pass it on to him, that he may get away with it. He has got away with it so far, but he knows in his heart that he is shirking his responsibility to the people of this province, to this Legislative Assembly, and in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we challenge the Cabinet Ministers opposite, and the Government. First we challenge them with this amendment, to have the courage and the decency to hold public hearings and let the public be heard. Give us the facts, give them the facts. And we challenged them to debate us in five or six centres of this province. I got a letter back from the Premier and he refused the debate. He gave the most astounding reason when one considers his performance or his lack of performance in this debate. He said the proper place surely to debate important matters like this is in the Legislative Assembly, and I agree.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Why isn't he here? Why isn't he debating this amendment. What's he afraid of. He was just elected, a very large majority, a large majority of members, not a large majority of votes. He has got four years to go, three and one-half years to go. What is Premier Blakeney afraid of. Are we going to see a new type of administration. The only time that you see the head of the administration is under these very carefully controlled circumstances where he can put forward the image, where he can put forward the line that the Dunskey Advertising agency from Montreal has tailor-made what they think the image of a calm, careful, thoughtful Premier should be and never give anyone in the ordinary democratic process the opportunity to question him, or to make him depart from his prepared text. In other words, to let his hair down and take the people of the province into his confidence and act like a normal Saskatchewan human being faced with a most serious problem in embarking on a major policy and project that will change the future for good or bad of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think the reason basically that the Premier is not here and he won't take part in this debate, and he hasn't, nor have most of the Members opposite. Again, it's very sad commentary. This is the greatest financial risk ever embarked on and no one questions that, whether by that Government or any government in the history of this province. We have yet to hear from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek).

You know, something happened to this province. It used to be the Treasurer. Just an ordinary Saskatchewan province made up of ordinary dirt farmers and small businessmen, and working people. In those days we had a Provincial treasurer. You know it is amazing the Provincial Treasurer used to stay here. I can remember hearing that Clarence Fines lived right in this House. He had a great responsibility. When I was Treasurer, good or bad, I stayed in the House and took part. Whenever anything came up of a financial nature it was considered mandatory that the Treasurer was here and listened and took part. But now it's a Finance Minister, and I guess once you become a Finance Minister you are up on a very much higher level. You don't have to attend in the House, you don't have to concern yourselves with the mundane affairs of this Legislative Assembly. You can ignore it. And you don't have to answer to the people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that maybe they will have to answer to the people eventually.

Another individual in this House whom I find amazing — his performance. Again, we haven't heard him, along with the Premier who now comes in, he usually manages to come in a few minutes before 5:30 o'clock and few minutes after the House opens and then he is gone. Not interested. Either they are not interested or afraid to take part. Also is the Minister that they put in charge of this gigantic undertaking, the Member for Biggar, Mr. Cowley. Now Mr. Cowley in the time he has been an MLA has proven himself a very able debater and has been an able Minister by the standards of the Government opposite. Not the toughest league in the world I might say, but he has done relatively very well. So It can't be that the Premier or the Finance Minister or the Minister in charge of the potash industry are afraid to come in here because they are afraid to debate us — they are very able debaters. It can't be that. It can't be the reason that they have turned the Bill over to Mr. Attorney General to put through because they don't know the Bill and they are afraid to handle the Bill or that they are inexperienced. That can't be the reason. The reason they are not participating in debate on this Bill or they won't come and take part in this debate is they are afraid they might have to tell the truth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That's the reason. They are afraid that if they get up here and get involved in this debate that somewhere they'll either let it slip, not by design, they'll let it slip or they will tell the truth about this deal and that's why. Oh you can giggle and laugh Mr. Premier, but I challenge you to enter into this debate. I challenged you to debate and you wouldn't do it. You said (I got your letter) you said, "this isn't the proper form to debate the potash question, but in the Legislative Assembly, we were elected to do that). By God you have forgotten that. You have forgotten that since you were elected. You are a disgrace to your party and you are a disgrace as Premier. You are bringing

in a Bill that will change the future of this province and haven't had the courtesy to even enter into the debate.

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

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I notice a little lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek). He wasn't here this afternoon to hear my cogent, relevant, short, devastating speech. I'm sorry I didn't notice the time slipping away this afternoon or I might have closed my remarks earlier because it's the last thing I want to do is drag this debate out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But I did notice on the CBC news which I watched — I thought it was Disney Land by mistake — that the Conservatives were entering the debate, all seven of them. So I welcome them to the Legislative Assembly and will look forward to their thoughts. I didn't hear anything about the NDP unfortunately.

Mr. Speaker, just very briefly summing up.

Mr. Romanow: — You said that at 3:30, Dave!

Mr. Steuart: — Well, seriously I wish they would take another look at this amendment. I think that it would be in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan. I am very sincere when I say that there has never been in my time in this House a piece of legislation that has concerned me as greatly as Bill 1 and Bill 2. I think that the Government is wrong. I think that I don't know how they have worked themselves into the position that they have, but they are tampering with a situation and an industry over which they have total regulatory control now, but about which they know apparently very little. It's not an industry that they can control and if they would reconsider and support this amendment. There's nothing wrong with that. There's everything right about it. It would give them time to stop and think. It would give them time to listen to what other people have to say. I recognize that what we say on this side of the House is suspect by them, but I am sure that they would hear from people who have an independent political point of view and I think that they would be impressed by them. I think that while it is late, it is not too late and I would urge Members on that side of the House to look at this amendment out of the context of politics and in the context of what is best for the people whom they represent, and support this Resolution. It doesn't mean the defeat of the Bill. It would not mean a vote of lack of confidence in the Government. It would merely mean that you were fulfilling the responsibility of the people who elected you, in saying that there isn't this much rush, it is reasonable that we listen to people, it is reasonable that we go slow. I suspect that the MLAs, other than Cabinet Ministers, on that side of the House who support the Government, or who have supported the Government up to this point, have been given no more information than we have. I suspect that they have just been given the bland assurance of the Premier and the Cabinet Ministers that this is a good deal and that it will in fact resound to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan now and in the future. Yet I am sure that many of them, many of the thinking Members on that side, especially those who have had businesses, their experience in business,

farming, have as we do, serious doubts. I would hope that they would consider this amendment and support it, as I would ask all Members to do so. I will support the amendment, I will of course oppose the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the amendment proposed by the Members to my right, I should like first of all to call attention to one aspect in this amendment which has been briefly mentioned, but very briefly, and that is the fact that the amendment proposes the creation of a Legislative Committee which leaves out the representatives of almost 30 per cent of the people of this province. That surely is an oversight on the part of the person who made the amendment.

Mr. Merchant: — No, it's value of performance.

Mr. Collver: — Well that's perhaps true. But nevertheless, as Members had mentioned before in this Assembly, I have been perhaps guilty on one previous occasion of convoluted logic and you may perhaps get just as big a charge this evening as you did the last time in the convoluted logic that I use to arrive at our conclusion on this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we believe two things about the delaying of this particular Bill. To delay it in the way that this amendment suggests is really to suggest somehow that if it could be shown to this committee that somehow nationalization of the potash industry could be proven to be a good business deal, could be shown to make money for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, then somehow that would be all right and somehow we in the Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan should then in some way think, well, that's not so bad. If we could only put it out in committee and delay it for a while and have a bunch of experts come in and a bunch of money people come in and tell us that maybe if we borrowed the money, maybe if we borrowed it at a good rate and could make a terrific amount of money on potash that that would be all right for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Now we believe that that somehow is an erroneous suggestion, because it fails to take into account the fact that there is an increased centralization of power implied in the nationalization of the potash industry. That the Members of the Treasury Board will have direct control over the lives of thousands more citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan if the potash industry is nationalized in our province.

Furthermore, what about breaking our word as a province. Now it has been suggested by some speakers in opposition to the potash takeover that if only we could prove that this project were feasible then somehow we should perhaps proceed with it. Or at least delay it and get people to put forward this word. Now that's a gamble that we in the Progressive Conservative Party do not wish to take. We believe and have called for the Government of Saskatchewan and the NDP and the Members opposite to withdraw this legislation now because the damage that you have done to the investment climate in the Province of Saskatchewan is disastrous. And it can't be worsened by the enactment of the legislation. The introduction of this kind

of legislation has destroyed the confidence, not only of the investor outside the Province of Saskatchewan but of the potential investor inside this Province of Saskatchewan. The question on people's minds, Mr. Speaker, throughout the province of Saskatchewan is, who is next and what is next. What is going to be the next step of this Government? And unless they withdraw this legislation that feeling, that attitude, that atmosphere will remain in the Province of Saskatchewan as long as the NDP is in power and, therefore, we have said — withdraw the legislation now and get rid of some of the damage that you have done or call a provincial election and let the people have their say.

In terms of breaking our word, Mr. Speaker, to legitimate organizations, to legitimate people in the province Saskatchewan to whom we gave our word not only from the Premier of the province, but also by contract. One can only say to the Members opposite, for shame!

And what about, Mr. Speaker, the workers who become civil servants against their will; what about those people who were not given an opportunity either through their trade union, by a card system of vote or whatever other kind of vote is superimposed by that trade union, but by no means were they given the opportunity to decide whether or not the employer of their choice would suddenly become the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we don't think that is good enough. And to delay this legislation, to call for a committee, to call for studies, to call for hearings, merely plays into the hands of those who would attempt, perhaps, to use the threat of this legislation to do one of two things, either to force legitimate citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan out of the courts or, second, to force them into selling out on terms that are not conducive to them as selling out under normal negotiating conditions and then never enacting the legislation at all, but merely getting away, in a sense, with murder.

We believe that that kind of delay is wrong. Now there is another thing that we believe as well, Mr. Speaker, and that is pertaining to the use in the parliamentary system of the filibuster.

Mr. MacDonald: — You should have told that to the pipeline.

Mr. Collver: — Well, pertaining to the pipeline debate in 1957 there are many observers who believe that the increased use of Order in Council in the Government of Canada and the changes in the rules to the detriment of parliament called to attention over the last number of years by our former Leader, John Diefenbaker, there are many observers who believe that those changes in rules and that the denial of the right of parliament has been occurring increasingly over the last number of years and stems directly from that pipeline debate. That as a result of that pipeline debate there has been a decreased sense of the necessity of parliament. Now, perhaps, one is not ashamed to admit that perhaps 20 years ago that one's own Party can make mistakes and one hopes that in tomorrow's debate that the Members to my right might possibly be prepared to admit that their own Party makes mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of the use of the filibuster in the congressional system in the United

States and compare that to the use of it in the Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, the people who use that particular example and that particular comparison obviously do not understand the basic and fundamental difference between the parliamentary system and the congressional system.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about it.

Mr. Collver: — I will do exactly that. Briefly, in the congressional system the executive branch of government is not directly responsible to the Legislative Branch and if the Legislative Branch uses the filibuster as a technique to block money bills or to prevent certain problem legislation, it does not materially affect the operation of the government. But in the parliamentary system the Executive Branch is directly responsible to the Legislature and is, in fact, involved in the Legislature. And as a result a filibuster in the parliamentary system should be used very sparingly and very sparingly is about as strong as I can put it.

Now there are reasons for it, of course, there are reasons for it and no one would not deny the right of the Members to my right to their right of free speech and the right to speak on whatever motion, or bill, or amendment they set their minds to. I am not being critical of them in their use of the filibuster in this Assembly. The perpetrator of the problem are the people who introduced this onerous legislation to begin with. Surely they anticipated that the Members to my right, or that one of the Parties on this side of the House, would object vociferously and violently to this legislation. And surely they discussed this in quite considerable detail prior to introduction of these particular pieces of legislation.

However, in terms of the use of the filibuster as a technique as a tactic, we did not agree with the use of those tactics on Bill No. 1, we did not agree with the use of those tactics in this Assembly at this time. Now that is not to say that we don't believe that for a reasonable period of time the legislation, the proposed potash legislation, should be presented to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, for a reasonable period of time. But to carry on as long as it has, in our opinion has a degrading effect on the Legislature and as a result, Mr. Speaker, and I know that it is difficult to understand, we oppose the potash legislation and we oppose the degrading of the Legislature at the same time. There are other tactics to use in fighting this Government. One of them was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition today and I am very pleased that he brought it to the attention of this Assembly and, in fact, to the people of this province.

He mentioned that in this particular advertisement paid for, — by the way, Members opposite, — with our own money that we don't have and have to borrow, not the people of Saskatchewan's money and not the Government's money, but with our own money that we had to borrow.

Mr. Malone: — . . . borrowed . . .

Mr. Collver: — Well, borrowed money is sometimes your own, don't you understand.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned today, Mr. Speaker, that somehow the points made in the advertisement that was placed in the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix by our party, somehow was never mentioned in this House and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that those identical points, in that advertisement, placed in those two newspapers in the week between Christmas and New Year's, those identical nine points were mentioned in the Throne Speech Debate on November 6, 1975 by me in my reply to the Throne Speech. And for the benefit of the Members to my right and in fact the Members opposite, I should like to repeat those statements now.

We believe this legislation is wrong.

Nothing much new then, Mr. Speaker, between November 6th and December 26th or 27th when the ad was placed in the paper. Nothing much new because identical material was placed in the newspaper. I should like to turn my attention, and I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will take out the advertisement and check to make sure that the nine points mentioned in the advertisement are in fact the nine points mentioned in the reply to the Throne Speech on the 6th day of debate.

I should like to turn my attention to the proposed potash legislation. We believe this legislation is wrong, fundamentally and basically wrong. It is wrong for nine reasons amongst others. First of all it is grossly inflationary. There is no way that a government can expend thousands of dollars per man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan without contributing to inflation. It indicates no leadership and no restraint.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have a copy of that advertisement.

Mr. Romanow: — You can have my copy.

Mr. Collver: — Have you got a copy over there. Thank you. Point number one in the newspaper article — it is grossly inflationary. 2. It is a bad business deal. Ask any person who has any experience in business today whether or not one should borrow at the highest possible interest rate to invest at the highest possible prices for potash.

I like that point number two, by the way, it is a bad business deal. I should just like to interject here, one, perhaps, brief story for the edification of the Members opposite because I am sure they realize that I have had some involvement in the business community and I should like to relate to you just a little personal experience about how business deals can go wrong.

In 1967, or 1968 a fellow who worked for me in Saskatoon came to me and said, "Dick, we want to get into the service station business. It is a terrific deal, we can really do well, this is a terrific location for a service station." Well, this fellow was a good salesman and he convinced me and we got into the service station business. And month after month, after month we lost money in that service station and after about one year or a year and a half the fellow came back to me again, and he was a terrific salesman, and he said, "Dick, the problem is this. The real problem with that service station is we are not doing enough volume. You've got to get a second service station. We will spread the management costs; we will spread out the fixed costs; we will get in and lease another service station from the

oil industry and we will really make hay with those service stations." And, finally, after considerable consideration I said, fine go ahead and lease the second service station. Within two months we were losing three times as much as we lost with one service station.

Mr. Skoberg: — Poor management.

Mr. Collver: — Wait, you haven't heard anything yet. After six or seven months of losing three times as much as we had with one service station the man came to me again and he said, "Dick, the real problem is this, we haven't got a highway service station. They are the ones that really do the volume; they are the ones that will really spread the management costs around; they are the ones that you should get into." And after considerable discussion and debate, and I told him time and again, my goodness we are losing three times as much, what in the world do we want with a third service station and he said, we have to have it; and we got it; and we leased it; and it was on the highway; and within two months of getting that third service station we were losing eight times as much as we did with the first service station. Three times and I am glad that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) made that suggestion about suckering me, because Members opposite are being suckered by somebody and I don't know who. You are being suckered into this arrangement and I don't know by whom. You are being sold into this arrangement and I don't know by whom. This arrangement that you are getting into to is, in fact, a bad business deal but it goes beyond that. It is taking away rights of people of this province; it is breaking your word. And, my goodness gracious, surely, here I am talking about somebody who is speaking for himself in that business deal. In that particular instance when I lost eight times as much with three as I lost with one, it was my money I was risking, not somebody else's, and I lost it. Well, for every deal that you get into my friend if you are ever involved in any kind of risk venture, for every deal you get into you are going to have to lose one, two or three to gain one. You can't lock yourself in because sometimes you make the wrong decision. Sometimes, no matter how many committees you have; no matter how good your advisors are you can't always pick a winner. You are going to lose sometimes and when you lose it is going to be on the backs of all of the people of this province instead of on your own back and on your own head.

It takes capital solely needed to build roads and bridges. It was suggested to us yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that roads and bridges that we would have to give them up in order to buy this potash industry. That we would have to give up in the North new roads and new bridges that are absolutely essential for the improved economic well-being of the northern part of Saskatchewan; that we would have to forego these in order to obtain the potash mines.

3. It takes capital needed elsewhere.

4. The Government would suggest that workers should be consulted by management prior to any major decision taken by the management or taken by those in charge of the workers and decides to convert thousands of Saskatchewan people into civil servants.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member should confine himself to the question of

the acquisition of the potash industry as to whether it is a good or bad deal.

Mr. Collver: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to answer the charges that somehow we had changed positions or had not spoken to the House and to the Assembly for the advertisement that we placed. That is one way of fighting and there are many other ways of fighting besides filibustering. We chose not to take that road. It was a tactical choice, we think the right one; we think the one that best protects the people of this province, protects the legislature and also fights the Members opposite in their proposed potash legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to repeat again, the convoluted logic that was mentioned to us about our support of the last amendment. Here, we have to decide between two evils, which are the two evils that we have to decide between? Whether to support an amendment that leaves out the representatives of almost 30 per cent of the people of this province? Whether we have to support an amendment that would delay, and in our opinion, play into the hands of the Members opposite by allowing them the luxury of seizing the potash mines without being held to account for them, or at the least forcing legitimate citizens out of the courts. Whether or not we support that kind of an amendment, or whether or not we take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the Government in this potash takeover, no matter what the amendment proposed, no matter how silly or how onerous it is to us, we, or the choice is that we vote against the Government on this potash takeover and it is our intention to support this amendment.

Amendment negated on the following Recorded Division.

YEAS - 18

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Steuart | Cameron | Larter |
| Stodalka | Edwards | Bailey |
| Lane | Clifford | Berntson |
| Wiebe | Merchant | Ham |
| Malone | Thatcher | Katzman |
| MacDonald | Collver | Birkbeck |

NAYS - 28

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Blakeney | Lange | Shillington |
| Pepper | Kowalchuk | Rolfes |
| Thibault | MacMurchy | Cowley |
| Bowerman | Mostoway | Matsalla |
| Smishek | Larson | Skoberg |
| Romanow | Whelan | Vickar |
| Messer | McNeill | Allen |
| Snyder | MacAuley | Koskie |
| Byers | Feschuk | Johnson |
| Kramer | | |

Mr. E.A. Berntson (Souris-Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, as I rise this evening to speak on Bill 1 I will just point out that I have just come back from a bout with the mumps, an affliction I would wish on no one here. But

during my convalescence it struck me that the disease is not too much unlike the disease of Socialism — that is, if left unchecked it could spread from regions of the head to other portions of the human anatomy, thereby swelling and festering and destroying the very desire to live.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berntson: — This didn't happen to me but I was left in a rather weakened condition, therefore, my remarks will be brief.

Mr. Steuart: — From the heart!

Mr. Berntson: — Yes, from the heart. I oppose this Bill for nine reasons, just in case somebody misread that ad, these reasons were pointed out in the Throne Speech, reply to the Throne Speech I should say. The reasons:

1. It is a grossly inflationary Bill;
2. It is a bad business deal;
3. It takes away capital that is needed elsewhere;
4. It converts thousands of workers into civil servants without consultation;
5. It breaks our word;
6. It centralizes power into the hands of a few;
7. It does not recognize or consider alternatives to a takeover;
8. It is not like other Crown corporations;
9. The Government does not have a mandate to perpetrate a takeover of this magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, these points will be expanded on by other Members of our caucus. As I said, in my weakened condition that my remarks will be brief. I would only add that I challenge this Government to withdraw the Bill or call an election.

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature, it is with a great pleasure and a sense of pride on behalf of my constituents and the residents of Saskatchewan that I am privileged to have this opportunity to say a few words on Bill No. 1. It is for these reasons that my remarks will not be directed to individual Members but to this Assembly in terms of co-operation, a willingness to respect all Members' views and a sense of responsibility in expressing my views and our Party's views.

It has been and continues to be my hope that then, and only then, the people of Saskatchewan could benefit from the best representation to government through their elected Members of any province in Canada.

So that the Members might better understand my views and our Party's views on Bill No. 1 I feel it necessary to make

a few short comments on the party that I represent in terms of a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with your approval I should like to remark on some of our beliefs as they relate to Bill No. 1, in terms of Government ownership and Crown corporations.

We believe that there are things worth conserving and things worth changing. We do not believe that everything should be conserved or that everything should be changed. That politics is not the most important activity of man and that the ends for which men live are not political ends, but rather moral, spiritual and intellectual ends. That our goals at all times consider human happiness. That there is not necessarily a political solution for every social problem. Social progress is based on the needs of people, not to form political theories and then change the people to fit these theories. We take the position that the best way to conserve that which is best and change that which needs changing is by reasonable political policies based on the social facts of life. We stand for a more general political view and not a specific and rigid political creed. We take the position that the purpose of politics in government is to maintain conditions which will permit individuals to achieve their full capability and the final goal of human happiness. We stand on the ground that governments should not become involved in everything and that there are areas of concern that legitimately belong to other social institutions, such as the family, the church and the voluntary associations. We stand for a strong government, but with government being the servant of the people, and not the people being the servant of the government. We take the position that the vital functions that government ought to perform are:

The maintenance of order;

The stability of social life;

The general betterment of the people in areas where private initiative is insufficient;

The fair and efficient administration of justice;

The improvement of public conduct by the example of government behaviour.

We stand on the ground that reasonable political policy must be based on the social facts of life and a reasonable desire of all men to enjoy the wide variety of benefits that civilized social life can provide.

The foregoing has been a very broad and, therefore, perhaps not too detailed accounting of our Party's thinking insofar as policy is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me relate our Party's thinking more directly in terms of Bill No. 1. And I should like to start at the very beginning and take exception to the name of this Act — The Saskatchewan potash industry does not need this Act to stimulate development. It needs only fair taxation. Taxes based on profits. As this Act will have very serious consequences insofar as future investments in Saskatchewan are concerned, I would suggest the name might be more fittingly be called "The Resource Anti-investment Act."

We all know the real reason for these expropriation plans. The real reason is to piece by piece get control of all major sources of wealth in the province. This is the first step in the master plan. It is the first war against capitalism. The first battle against free enterprise. Where do we go from here? To the largest generator of wealth — farming? If expropriation of Saskatchewan assets must come to pass, then the very least that should happen is that it can be done fairly and completely alone. There is much in this Act to show the Government has no intention of doing so. There is much evidence to show that the Government intends to devalue the Saskatchewan assets to desperation prices, to effectively confiscate the assets they wish. There is much evidence to show that Section 45(2) is a complete farce. Why does the Act not outline what assets are to be confiscated? Why does the Act not say "all" the Saskatchewan assets? Control the industry by owning links in the production chain with only a minimal investment to make it appear like compensation. If the Government is going to take over the potash they should be specific in what they will take over, and be open with their intentions. The Government has fantastic powers in this Act, the power to choke any producer by applying pressure in a strategic spot. The power to devalue assets as completely as it wishes.

The Act gives the corporation unlimited power of search and seizure, power to dig and probe, power to examine assets — real and personal. Why? There can only be one reason. To devalue the property. To create a willing seller to a willing buyer. Does the Land Bank take soil samples, test the wells, measure precipitation, check the books and examine the hired man before it makes an offer to purchase one of their buddies' farms? If we mean a willing seller to a willing buyer why do we need a team of devaluators with the right to search and seizure?

The Government knows what a mine is worth today. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has determined what a mine is worth. They have worked out a preliminary mine design, they have obtained preliminary proposals for shaft sinking, equipment supply and they have made very detailed estimates of the cost of a mine at today's prices. They have spent a lot of the taxpayers' money to do it. Why don't they let us in on the facts?

The engineering work estimates and feasibility study was completed in the spring of 1975 - almost a year ago, and the Government has yet to make the results known. The feasibility study for the new mine was reviewed for the Corporation by Dominion Securities last May and the results kept hidden. Why, because costs have escalated so rapidly that a new mine wouldn't fly that's the reason why. It is interesting to note that the Government knew this before the last election but chose to hush it up while the Hon. Minister of Agriculture got elected on the basis of an olympic size expenditure in his riding. When will it be under way? The point is that the Government knows what it costs to build a mine, it knows what the fair price is. Why does it not let the public know, why does it not let this information become the base for establishing prices of mines they will expropriate so they can honestly say they are expropriating and not confiscating assets.

There are many other confiscatory aspects to the legislation. If the Government will not pay a company for the expansion potential of that mine, they are confiscating that potential. Section 45 (6) (7) (8) are good examples of how this

Act allows the Government to confiscate savagely business opportunities. Evaluation of related businesses are not compensated for. Who gives the Government the right of theft? Yes, this Act gives the Government extraordinary power, the power to devalue assets, the power to search and seizure and the right to steal and even the right, retroactively, to correct mistakes they have made. Don't we all wish we could go back through life retroactively correcting mistakes we have made.

If this Act becomes law, will it also give the province the right to pay for the assets they expropriate? With phony money in Saskatchewan bonds, that may become worthless as a result of this shaky business deal. What happens if in our zest to expropriate American assets, we lost American markets? We know the Government has no conscience when it comes to dealing with our neighbors to the south but what happens if they decide they can do without our potash? Let's not kid ourselves there is enough potash in the United States to make themselves self-sufficient within eight to ten years. Sure they would deplete their resources quickly. But how long would it take to sink the industry in Saskatchewan and the province along with it? Don't look to the export market for help we are losing that now, thanks to high taxation. Canpotex, the industry's exporting association has reduced sales estimates for the 1975-76 fertilizer from 3 to 1.8 million tons of potash. The Russians and eastern Europeans are taking over, Russia is even selling potash to the United States and will soon be moving 1 million tons into the United States.

We need the United States market badly, we need United States investment badly. Why are we so keen to kick our neighbors to the south? Just another reason why this proposed takeover is a bad business deal, bad for the potash companies, bad for Saskatchewan and bad for Canada.

Having discuss the proposed governmental takeover of the potash industry in Saskatchewan, with several individuals and groups, the following opinions and suggestions have been put forward.

One man suggested that instead of spending \$1 billion on an industry which is obviously functioning relatively smoothly, why doesn't the Government use that same money to rebuild the rail lines which are up for abandonment, turn them over to the use of both railway companies. According to an estimate made by the CPR the cost in 1976 prices to restore the Medstead subdivision to operable condition, to handle the large hopper cars, 263,000 pound cars, is roughly \$100,000 per mile. Ten miles could be done with \$1 million, \$1 billion would do 10,000 miles. Now the total mileage under application for in the whole prairie region, abandonment is 6,000 miles. Of this no doubt some should be let go or is already not being used. Therefore it is quite obvious that this billion dollar figure which also is only an optimistic estimate as far as buying out the potash industry is concerned would relieve the railway dilemma in the entire prairie region.

Another point made was in light of the outcome of the recent British Columbia election and the ousting of the Labour Party in Australia plus the continuing occurrence of economic crises in Britain together with the local opposition, the Blakeney Government might see fit to withdraw the legislation. The potash companies could also see the threat of this Government's action as an ever present whip over their heads and be a little less

tough in their attitude towards government taxation.

An employee of the Kalium Potash Mine, just west of Regina, when asked about the reaction of both labor and management replied that neither were in favor of this takeover. The management side for obvious reasons and labor because as soon as the plant becomes a government corporation they would become government employees and thus become members of the union of government employees and this was the last thing they wanted. He said that labor management relations at their plant were quite satisfactory and they were reluctant to have any union forced upon them. He also said that a new hole under the drill at the time of the Speech from the Throne announcing the Government's intention was immediately scrapped and all expansion plans temporarily postponed. In his opinion, the potash industry has already been set back at least a year and that there was no desire on the part of their company to continue any plans for expansion.

A comment was made today by a Member to the right, that potash doesn't get mouldy. I agree with that, but I think it is very important that a decision be made on this Bill 1, on the Government takeover of the potash industry, that it be decided either it is going to be put in or it is going to be pulled out but it has to be decided one way or another and it has to be decided now for the reasons that we are in a part of this world that is not starving and there are a lot of people in this world who are. Potash is used for fertilizer and I think it is important to get the potash out of the ground and get it in the field where it belongs, so it can bring about production in this world.

I don't think it is a good thing to delay this whole thing on and on for another year or so. Whether potash gets mouldy or not.

Another comment from a fellow farmer on his reaction to the Government takeover brought this reply. No, the Government should stay out of it entirely, that he had never seen any instance yet where the Government could run a business as effectively or as efficiently as could the private operator. Now that is his opinion, not mine. I think there are some places in business and government that Crown corporations can be effective. He repudiated his previous affiliation with socialism and that he could see the folly of it. He is an immigrant from England about 45 years ago and still has strong interest in the old country. He blames socialist government for the economic plight of Great Britain entirely which is a common and obvious conclusion.

Personally I would be against the Bill on general principles. I am frightened by the magnitude of the whole affair, I can see it as a deterrent of future private investment or enterprise. We never know who will be next to be swallowed up in the avalanche of socialism, with few exceptions it is the guy with little or nothing to lose who will back such a move. Truly human nature has not changed. If we can't achieve ourselves don't we want to tear down the successful?

The main issue is not whether or not the Government can make it in the potash industry it is the insecurity shadow which it cast over the entire economy that will cause the most harm. Every industry will be operating under the fear that there just might not be any tomorrow. Why expand? Why plan and invest any more time, talent or money, the Government could take us

over at any time and put us out on the street.

If I might just interject at this point, two days ago I received my licence to ship milk to the Dairy Producers' Plant in Yorkton. A licence to ship milk. I never had to apply for a licence when I started into that business. I started from nothing and worked my way up and never thought that I would have to account to the Government for my next move. I can see clearly now that I will have to.

An Hon. Member: — What is your point?

Mr. Birkbeck: — If you are prepared to listen, I am prepared to tell you what the point is. The point is that that Act hasn't even been passed yet and I have the licence hanging on the wall in my office.

The prime example of state ownership has got to be Russia. If we can believe what we are told, they are plagued with poor production, inefficiency, irresponsibility a lackadaisical attitude, the works. "They are hirelings who care not for the sheep." John 10-13. We in Canada are out-producing them on a per capita basis because we are our own laborers. That is what I should like to think. We don't get paid for going out to plant a crop, nor for tending our dairy herds but only when we get a bushel of wheat or a can of milk to the market do we get paid. We must not only work, we must produce or go hungry. This is the secret of our economy, it has made us productive and efficient. Humans, need a motivating power. We work best when we are working toward a goal and this goal must be something more satisfying than big bi-monthly pay cheque.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel I have sufficiently expressed my own personal views and our party's views on behalf of my constituents and the people of Saskatchewan. As has been stated many times already, the Government does not have a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan on this Bill. I can only say as a Member of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and a Member of this Legislature, withdraw this Bill now or call a provincial general election tomorrow!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise in this debate and give you another view on the potash takeover. On December 29 in Saskatoon, there was a meeting called the Potash Meeting. The speaker was John Richards, former MLA, a Waffler. I wonder if this Government are presently all Wafflers, they are doing everything he suggested while he sat in this House. It was an interesting meeting and I now understand why the NDP are moving the way they are. In 1971 Mr. Richards said, "Caucus discussed potash takeover." In 1972 again they discussed it. In 1973 they debated it very long with caucus. It was decided that they would not go forward with it, it was going to cost them an election. But Mr. Richards also said that a former Premier of this province said to him when he asked him why don't we nationalize the potash? The former Premier's statement was, because then we would never be here to put in Medicare.

Mr. Richards spoke for two hours. I took many notes. And as I informed Mr. Speaker, on returning to this House, I was

going to present these notes here.

Many years of argument among caucus. That tells me that they are divided on it themselves. How come? The 1975 election is over and we have a potash Bill on our hands. We are going to nationalize the industry, an industry that got a promise in 1950 from a former Premier that they would not nationalize it. An industry that was discovered in 1914 in this province and again in 1943 the wealth under the ground was discovered. In 1950 the Crown decided they were not going into the potash development and gave their commitment to the industry. Today the commitment is broken. It seems that this province does not believe in giving its word and keeping it.

I wonder if the Waffle has a new leader but he hasn't said it officially. The one outstanding thing that came from this meeting that bothers me to this day and I see it in British Columbia, as a new government has a mess to clean up. Mr. Richards seems to think that this is the last NDP Government for many years to come. I hope he is right. I also think that he made one other thing clear. He said if you are going to have to go out, leave the other guy in a mess. And that is what this potash takeover will do. As the previous speaker has said, think, gentlemen, think what you take this province down the road to. Withdraw this Bill or call an election!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.M. Ham (Swift Current): — I too am happy to join this debate. None dare call it conspiracy. I have not been sick as my colleague was, but I am sick at heart for the people of Saskatchewan for the introduction of this Bill, Bill No. 1.

My party has stated it in the strongest terms our opposition to this Bill. I totally agree with these statements and as a representative MLA I will state why I, also, oppose this Bill.

1. It is grossly inflationary at a time when leadership and restraint are absolutely necessary. There is no way a government can expend thousands of dollars per man, woman and child without contributing to inflation. It indicates no leadership and absolutely no restraint.
2. It is a poor business deal. If capital is to be spent then it should be spent on Level IV care, road improvements and other necessities that are required. Borrowing vast amounts of money at the highest rates of interest, even when potash prices are high, does not make good business sense.
3. It converts workers into the civil service, whether they choose it or not. Thousands more of Saskatchewan workers will owe their day to day livelihood directly to the government.
4. It centralizes power in the hands of a few, namely, the Executive Council.
5. It breaks the word of T.C. Douglas and it breaks my word as a Saskatchewan citizen.
6. It is not a monopoly utility as many have suggested such as SPC or Sask Tel. The market cannot be controlled and therefore cannot be compared. If SGIO has a bad year with too

many claims the Government simply adds two or three cents to its gasoline tax, but if potash is controlled by world price and if the world price falls, where will we get the money to keep the industry going — billions and billions more in taxes.

7. It could indirectly place a debt of approximately \$1,000 on every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

8. The vast majority of Saskatchewan is opposed to this Bill.

9. The Government of this province did not have a mandate on June 11, 1975 for this expropriation. The NDP made no mention of this potash takeover in the election only six months back. And while they received 40 per cent of the popular vote, they hid their intentions from the people of Saskatchewan and from the voters.

The damage that this Bill has done to the province is beyond repair. What's next? Who is next? I repeat: withdraw this Bill or call an election to allow the people of Saskatchewan to decide.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on Bill No. 1. I should think that the Hon. Member opposite, the Whip of the Party opposite, would do his Party a favor by making sure that all Members are in fact in their seats tonight and listening to what I have to say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bailey: — It did not become apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, until this morning and following last Friday in the House, that I was so very important to the Members opposite.

I had a phone call this morning which indicated to me that my name had appeared in a rather notable publication, as a matter of fact he was sure he saw it in this publication upon two occasions. Not being a recipient of this paper — he told me the name of the paper and it happened to be the Commonwealth. So, if in fact, Mr. Speaker, I am not important to the Members opposite perhaps this evening as this potash debate drags on, that they will be kind enough to lend me an ear and listen to what I have to say in regard to this. I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Members opposite if the arsenal that was used last Friday was any indication it may well be that they would lose the battle and we could win the war.

The Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) made a television appearance last Saturday night. On being interviewed, Mr. Speaker, he suggested during the interview that part of the delay for Bills No. 1 and 2 not being passed at this time was the fact, as he said, we now have to Opposition Parties. But he failed to take upon himself any responsibility whatever for not providing any intellectual advancement to this House in the way of information, in the way of participating within the debate or anything else.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks my party has been criticized at length for not becoming involved in long discussion in this House. Mr. Speaker, there were two occasions when I happened to notice that the attendance in the House was possibly at its lowest. And that happened to be when the Member for Milestone-Bengough (Mr. Lange) was speaking, his own colleagues couldn't listen to him whatsoever and they had a sum total of 14 Members in the House that evening.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, it is not this side of the House, it happens to fall on that side of the House for not paying any attention to what is going on. When my colleague and my friend for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) made his contribution in this debate, there was an amazing total of four of his colleagues in the House.

Now we should have to listen carefully to the reasons. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use a great length of time, I doubt if I will need that. One of the things which we meet with when we go back to our constituents, when this was first introduced in the Throne Speech Debate — hundreds of people come up and said, and this happened in every corner of this province — they want to know, why potash, why is the Government now moving into potash? You have to remember that the people out in the country, I doubt if they know if there are two potash Bills, but they are asking a very simple question: why potash, why potash at this time? Isn't the industry going well?

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) mentioned a point that it well could be Waffle pressure — and if the Whip is going out to bring the rest of the Members in, I would really appreciate that. Why would a government move into potash at this particular time.

It is a very difficult question to answer for the general public, but I want, for one moment, to take Members of this House, on that side of the House, and on this side of the House, let's go back to the month of June, 1975. Let's go back to a period of let's say, ten days, following June 11th and let's imagine ourselves at least Members on this side of the House, that if we could be placed somehow in the executive room of some office here in Regina and if we could listen into the discussions as the post-mortem of the election took place.

Obviously, with inflation upon us, Mr. Speaker, the election of 1975 of June 1975 was undoubtedly the most expensive election that that Government had ever engaged in. From my own experience the number of workers campaigning in the election was probably at its highest. I know that in my own constituency of Rosetown-Elrose an old friend of mine appeared on the scene as well as a number of new faces that nobody seemed to know, the presence of one, Tommy Douglas.

But the rule of thumb, Mr. Speaker, is when the economy is in an affluent stage, the rule of thumb in elections and in politics is when the economy is good, the government in power does not lose in its popular vote. That is a rule of thumb. So as they begin the post-mortem following the June 11th election, having spent the most money of any election, having probably engaged of the highest number of workers, they dropped, Mr. Speaker, from 54 per cent roughly speaking of the popular vote to 40 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my reply to the Throne

Speech, it is quite conceivable that the real issue in the potash takeover is purely and solely political; not necessarily for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. Let's listen in, further to the conversation following the election.

We have to have an issue, they say. We have to have an issue! If in the time of prosperity we go down 13 per cent, we have to revive that. Well, our Members opposite are pretty good at emotional issues. I noticed that in the House in the short time that I have been here. We have seen examples, in the House, of this so we will create an issue. And what better issue could you create in Saskatchewan than talking about something that is big; talking about something which is bad; talking about the big, bad multinational corporations. And if we can add in there and sell this to the public, that not only are they big and they are bad and they are multinational, they didn't even pay their taxes. Perhaps we can create enough public sentiment from that which we lost from the election, that we could regain our prestige in the province.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of the combined wisdom from all the people they have in advisory capacity on that particular side of the House, I am sure this is the way and full intention of moving in the way in which they did. But how do they proceed? How would you proceed on such an issue?

Certainly you wouldn't make the announcement in September as that would allow the population, so quickly, after an election to become too much embroiled in the public debate. And so the decision was, Mr. Speaker, that, very craftily designed, it would be written in the Speech from the Throne. And at that time, was the time in which this Government made its biggest mistake.

How were they going to proceed? Write it into the Speech from the Throne. It not only shocked people in Saskatchewan, this announcement came out in the news and the press picked it up and it shocked the people of Canada and, indeed, it shocked the people of the world and particularly the people of this continent. Now, we have to advertise, too. How are we going to advertise Mr. Speaker, I made mention of this earlier in the House. I think Members opposite should take a real close look at their advertising campaign.

If I remember correctly at the bottom of this huge page, these large full-paged ads that they run, they put down the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the least they could have done, because of the issue which they created for their own political advantage, for their own party, the least they could have done was to say that these ads were being sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan. That is the least that they could have done. And if they had been entirely honest they would have put down that these ads were being sponsored by the NDP Party, being paid for by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it has already been mentioned in this House several times. The Government moving into the potash industry is not about to create, outside of a few executives who are completely controlled by this new Corporation, it isn't going to create any new employment. I think that this is one of the dangerous points. When I see the number of young people in my time and people who went to school with me, who moved out of this province and have never returned, I think the Government would be much wiser in putting their money into another type of venture which would, in fact, increase the total wealth of this province.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have been absolutely silent on the cost. They have been absolutely silent. Mr. Premier I can well remember in the 1971 election campaign, and there was one ad, I don't know whom you hired, but there was one ad that impressed me above all other ads during the 1971 campaign. I think you people opposite should remember there was a stack of bills which came on the screen and a fist came down and said it is a bad deal. And if I remember correctly, in following this Legislature at that time, you people were in Opposition and you hounded the Ross Thatcher Government so you could get some information and you got it and then you came on in 1971 with an ad of a hand coming down and taking away a pile of bills. The Attorney General will remember that ad. And then the fist coming down and saying, "it is a bad deal."

Where is the Minister in charge of the potash Corporation? Why haven't we received any information? Perhaps the Opposition Parties would like to go on now with some facts with a fist coming down to the people of the province and saying, it is in fact, a bad deal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a Budget coming up. I have an idea that it is going to be very difficult for the people of this province to look upon any increases in taxation and they are going to take a very dim view of increases in taxes in any department, whether it is related to the potash or not, because I can hear people all over this province saying, My God, they can increase taxes here but they are going out and spending a billion bucks or more to expropriate an industry that is already running well. Mr. Speaker, that will be the responsibility of that Government. May I suggest that it will be a responsibility that will weigh very heavily upon your shoulders in the years ahead.

There are a number of questions, Mr. Speaker, not that we do not have any information, we got guesses as to the amount. I found out something last week talking to a farmer. Apparently at some of the potash mines here in Saskatchewan the potash companies have gone out and have purchased land around, several acres, sections of land around, immediately around the mine site itself. And there were obvious reasons. So I asked this chap, what kind of a deal did you get? Well, in this particular case, and I might admit, Mr. Speaker, it is the only one whom I talked to, he is very happy of course, because they purchased the land for their own protection in case they wanted to move out and expand and put up additional buildings, but since that plant had been sitting there he had been allowed to farm that land. He has an unending lease as long as the company doesn't want it and, of course, he also has employment in the mine on his off season from farming. Now that is one thing that the Government hasn't considered or at least if they have considered it they haven't mentioned it to the House. With those several sections involved, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that that land would fall into the Land Bank and thus we would have two or three more people in the province surrounding each mine wondering what this Government was up to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we didn't get a full answer on the patent rights. We have been discussing from time to time the markets and the control of the foreign markets and certainly has been mention in this House many, many times, that the Government's intervention into the potash mines and the takeover of the mines at this time is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe that to be true.

I want to tell the Members opposite, all the backbenchers, that as an individual even though I happen to be part of the Conservative caucus, if I didn't believe that it was morally wrong for you to be involved in the takeover at this time, I wouldn't stand here and say so. I never could understand why the Members opposite have been keying in on me lately. The Hon. Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) talked about being a backbencher, I am a backbencher in the third party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point here. You know not too long ago the Minister of Agriculture engaged to some extent in a plebiscite, right or wrong, and my colleagues, have from time to time as they did again this evening, said, look, why don't you call an election. Now somebody says, Mr. Speaker, they say, what are you talking about, that's a half a million dollars or maybe a million dollars. I want you to bear with me just for a moment. I'll admit that's costly, I'll admit an election is costly, to set the Government machinery up, but I want to suggest to you this evening, if this Government comes back after that election and if you have a majority of seats in this House, I don't think the Opposition Members, maybe they'll be none of them return, but, those who are returned would not then have the right to stand up at this time and oppose either Bill, because an election at this time would be clearly understood by the citizens of this province that you were either voting for the nationalization of the potash industry or you would be voting against it.

Mr. Speaker, maybe it would turn out to be the best bargain Saskatchewan people ever had and I am convinced that it would. I am truly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an election at this time would, indeed, be the best bargain that Saskatchewan people ever had. But no, instead of that a party that has seen what has happened in New Zealand, a party that seen what happened in Australia, we have now witnessed what has happened in British Columbia, say, look, we don't have a buck they are willing to go and borrow a billion dollars and risk that on the hope that the government potash industry will be successful, that by the year 1979 that they can establish the rapport and the popular vote status with the people. And if they don't they are going to go down. That is the gamble that they are taking, Mr. Speaker, and I really believe that that is the number one issue in the potash takeover. You can't say that it is because the mines aren't operating well, you can't say that people didn't invest, you can't say that people didn't develop the potash mines, you can't say that it hasn't given jobs to Saskatchewan citizens. You have a very difficult job in finding a logical argument against the potash mines.

Let me ask you this, why won't the Government listen to reason? I am not asking them to listen to the Official Opposition, I didn't say what you are thinking, Mr. Attorney General either, and I am not necessarily saying that they should listen to the Conservative Party but will you listen to the people. Would you be prepared to listen to the people? And there is no reason that the Premier as head of that Government opposite with the these two most sweeping Bills of confrontation and everything else surrounding these Bills that have ever faced the Saskatchewan people. We believe it is morally wrong, I think you can't see why we believe it is morally wrong. An election at this time and let me repeat, it would be the biggest bargain that

Saskatchewan people ever had. Therefore, I request and I beg of you, never mind the Opposition parties at this particular time, go to the people and see what the people say and if you are in the favor of the people and if you win the majority, fine, there will be no further discussion of potash and you can proceed with it.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I will try in winding up my opportunity to speak on this debate to be as brief as the Conservative caucus has been. It is with regret that I find that this will be the last opportunity that I have to talk on Bill No. 1. Unfortunately, the Conservative Members in their reconsideration to speak in this debate have not taken the opportunity to move an amendment to express to the people of Saskatchewan that they, too, are concerned about what direction this Government is going and that they, too, are prepared and willing to have one of their caucus members sit on the committee which we had suggested in our previous amendment.

I should like as well to take this opportunity to congratulate the three Conservative Members on their maiden speeches tonight. While they were brief I think that they did an excellent job. I should like as well to congratulate the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) for once again reading his Throne Speech into the record on Bill 1. It was interesting to again have the opportunity to hear that speech. But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Bailey), I think that he did a creditable job tonight and his caucus indeed can be proud of what he said. While I disagreed with some of the things that he stated in his comments I still credit him for the job which he did.

He went on to say that the people should have an opportunity speak and that an election should be called. This is rather a silly suggestion because there is nobody in his right mind ever going to believe that a Government only six months after an election is going to give up the power which they now hold. The chances of an election, are just like my colleague from Wilkie (Miss Clifford) stated, like a snowflake in July. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion which we made to allow the people of Saskatchewan to have an opportunity to voice their opinion was a logical one. A logical one in which the Government opposite was still able by adopting our resolution, to hang on to power and still be able to give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity voice their concern and their ideas about this potash takeover.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather disappointed in the late arrival of the Conservatives in this debate. Whether it is fortunate or unfortunate depending of how you take it, I come from a relatively strong Conservative family, there aren't too many renegades such as myself in that family, but, Mr. Speaker, those members of my family are like the Conservatives of John Diefenbaker and some of the other Members of the Conservative Party throughout Canada. They believe in standing up for what they believe in, they believe in standing up for what is right and they believe in fighting, Mr. Speaker. Fighting not only on behalf of their constituency but on behalf of their party and on behalf of what they believe in. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present Conservative caucus in this Assembly is not truly representative of the Conservative Party, all that they have done is borrow their name. They have decided to enter the debate at this late date and one has to wonder why. Let me say

it is because an error in judgment was made within their caucus. That error in judgment was, we have got to be different from the Liberals, we have got to be different.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — We can't let the people of Saskatchewan think that there is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. And what happened tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a clear indication that there is a difference. The Conservative Party by speaking tonight admitted that we were right and they admitted to the people of Saskatchewan that they wish there was no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives and I welcome the Members opposite . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General wanted to vote this off tonight and if I continue to get applause like that I am sure that we could keep it going for quite a while.

The point, Mr. Speaker, which I was trying to make is that we filibustered this particular Bill, it was difficult because we did not have the co-operation of the Conservative Members and I think, Mr. Speaker, that had we had that co-operation, had we been able to unite the Opposition on this side of the House, the people of Saskatchewan would realize that at no time in the history of the province have we had a piece of legislation as drastic as this one and the fact that two different kinds of parties though they may be sitting in opposition can set aside some of their differences and work together to ensure that legislation like this does not pass.

Mr. Allen: — You need a little more discipline over there.

Mr. Wiebe: — Do you want to enter the debate Mr. Allen or have you already spoken.

Mr. Speaker, I might go on to say that for the life of me I cannot understand the reasoning behind the leader of the Conservative Party when he said he wished quick passage of this particular legislation. It is true that the damage has been done by just mentioning this particular Bill in the Throne Speech Debate but also might I say that we can prove to the rest of Saskatchewan and to the rest of Canada that had we been able to combine our efforts in this particular debate, and had we been able to, through the people of Saskatchewan, convince this Government that the direction in which they were taking was wrong. Had the Government accepted our amendment, I believe then that the people in Canada, the business industry would have said, look, there is still hope in the Province of Saskatchewan that we, in turn, can still come into this province even though the NDP is still the Government and while they may try to impose their particular political philosophy by ramming legislation through this House that they can have a change of heart and maybe, we, as private industry do have a chance and can exist in the Province of Saskatchewan. Had we accomplished this, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we would have lost the industry that the Conservative caucus seems to think that we have lost.

And if this legislation does pass, if it does become law, I might point out that before this particular Bill can have any effect that Bill 2 must be passed as well. Our efforts, I imagine, will be just as strenuous in that Bill as they were in this one.

But had that legislation been withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Saskatchewan would not have completely lost all the investment which we need to further develop this province, which we need to take the burden of operating a government and its programs off the backs of the farmers of this province and put it on the back to be shared with our natural resources which the good Lord has given us and which we should be using to our fullest extent. Again let me say, had the Conservatives not been more concerned about politics, about trying to be different, and trying to take a different approach, but had they been more concerned about future development in this province, had they been more concerned about uniting with 60 per cent of the people of this province and saying to this Government, no we don't like this legislation. Instead they came into this debate at this late date to try to justify their actions to their constituents and say, yes, I participated in the potash debate. But will they go on to say that they did not contribute to the delay or the stalling or the convincing of the Government to withdraw this particular legislation. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we reach Bill 2, another Bill which, as I said, a bit earlier is one that if it does not pass, Bill No. 1 is meaningless because the Government cannot go ahead with Bill No. 1 if Bill 2 is defeated. Let me say to the Conservatives that we represent on this side of the House, 60 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan. Let's not use the same tactics as we did in Bill No. 1. Let's show the people of Saskatchewan that we can get together, that we do represent their interests and the best interests of Saskatchewan and that they, in turn, will put aside what differences they may have and join with us in fighting Bill 2, hoping to encourage the people of Saskatchewan to make their views known, make their views known to this Government and hopefully a change of heart will bring about the withdrawal of Bill No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is rather regrettable that I will not have an opportunity to participate again in the discussion of Bill No. 1, because I should like to take the opportunity to go into it much further. Last week after the House had its Christmas adjournment I took the opportunity to write to each and everyone of my constituents explaining what is going on within this Assembly. Up until that point I had not written them because of Christmas and New Year's. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) accuses me of not telling the truth in that particular letter to the Member opposite and let him and this Assembly judge whether I told the truth or not. That letter reached my constituents in the mail about Thursday, and the letters have been coming in since that time. And let me say that if the people are given the opportunity to express their views that they will respond and that the longer that we can keep this Bill before the people, the better chance they will have of understanding it. I hadn't planned on reading this particular letter but on the urgency of the Minister of Highways, his accusation that I may possibly be misleading the constituents which I represent, I feel that I am compelled to read this particular letter. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it starts out and I quote:

Dear Friends: the fall Session of the Legislature

adjourned for the Christmas break on December 23rd and reconvened again on January 5th.

Mr. Minister of Highways what is untrue about that particular paragraph? I go on to say:

The NDP Government's proposed legislation to purchase or expropriate some or all of the potash industry in Saskatchewan is still before the Legislature for consideration and debate. The Liberal caucus is opposed to this legislation and is the only party that has fought against it.

Up until one hour and a half tonight, Mr. Speaker, that particular paragraph was true. I must remind you that it went out prior to the entrance of the Conservatives in this debate. It goes on to say:

Opposed for many reasons. We are of course philosophically opposed to the Government becoming involved in any industry unless it can clearly demonstrate a public need to do so. The Government has not demonstrated this need and furthermore, it cannot. Would it not be better to invest that money in creating new industries, new jobs to create a better tax base so that all Saskatchewan residents could enjoy lower taxes. We have suggested many alternatives such as a refinery for heavy crude oil to protect and build our oil industry in southwest Saskatchewan. Would it not be wiser to begin again further development of the irrigation project at Gardner Dam to aid and protect our agricultural industry.

It goes on to say:

What about future development? This legislation alone will drive away any future investment in our province.

It goes on further to say:

We are also opposed for other reasons. We feel that the legislation is unnecessary in that the potash companies are already paying by way of taxes to the Provincial Government approximately \$130 million per year which amounts to between 70 and 80 per cent of their net income. No other industry is taxed to this extent. We are opposed because the anticipated cost to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan is staggering, over \$1 billion, more than the entire budget of Saskatchewan for the last fiscal year, more than the amount spent for all goods, services and programs of the Government, as well as all the salaries paid to all the public service. The yearly interest on this amount if it is to be borrowed could be well over \$100 million. Money that will not stay in Saskatchewan to be put to work for the benefit of Saskatchewan, but instead will be paid to the international financiers who run the New York money market.

Members opposite, I'm half through, so if you will bear with me . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — It goes on, Mr. Speaker, to read:

There is no guarantee whatsoever that the price of potash will remain as high as it is now, nor that we can expect to keep the existing markets that have been built up mainly in the United States. Indeed, the opposite is likely to occur if the potash companies that are presently carrying on business in Saskatchewan will take the money that is to be paid to them by the people of Saskatchewan and invest that money in new developments in New Mexico, Montana, New Brunswick or other places.

The Russians have already entered the world potash market and have recently announced a sale to the United States.

The Government has not properly considered the implications of the proposed legislation. What the Premier has called a great challenge to the people of Saskatchewan is much more than that. It is an unnecessary gamble. A gamble that will give us little more than we already have, even if it is successful. The cost is too great considering the risk and if unsuccessful will burden the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for at least a generation for the debt that will be enormous and unprecedented for or a province with a population as small as ours.

Why the filibuster? The main reason that the Liberal Opposition is doing everything possible to delay the passage of the potash bill is so that the people of Saskatchewan will become aware of the implications of this legislation, the staggering costs, the risk involved, the amount of money already being paid by the potash companies to the province with no risk to the taxpayer, and also the loss of future development.

We believe the people of Saskatchewan can make up their own minds as to whether or not this legislation is desirable.

This Government only received 40 per cent of the popular vote during a recent election, and at no time did they seek a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to take this action.

One might ask, what will be next?

It is not, however, too late for you, the people of Saskatchewan, to make your opinion known to the Government. I would ask you to write to me, and to the Premier at the Legislative Buildings in Regina. Let us know what you think of the proposed legislation. If the Government sees that public opinion is against this takeover, hopefully that with the pressure that the public opinion asserts the Government will come to their senses and reconsider its opinion and withdraw the potash legislation.

Yours sincerely,

Jack Wiebe, MLA,

Morse Constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

January 12, 1976

Mr. Wiebe: — And I challenge, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) who has not had the courtesy to stay in this House and listen to my reading of this letter in which he accused me that I misled my constituents. I challenge him to prove anywhere in this letter where I misled any of my constituents on what is happening in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Let me go on, Mr. Speaker, to read you one of the replies which I have on my desk today. It comes from a gentleman whom I know, and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, is not a member of my political party, nor do I know what his politics are. But I do know the individual, and I might point out that he happens to be a school teachers. It says:

Dear. Mr. Wiebe: In my estimation the Saskatchewan Government's attempt to take over the potash industry is a tragedy for the province. I concur generally with the stand you are taking in the Legislature.

Two concerns are prominent in my mind. First the takeover puts a damper on individual initiative and creativity. What could be less creative than taking away something that someone else has started?

Second, in my estimation this is poor stewardship for the province's financial resources as you point out that there are many new projects that could be developed with \$1 billion.

It is hoped that a happier solution to the potash question will be sought and found by the present legislation.

Yours truly,

I received another letter on my desk today. Let me go ahead and read this letter. This is from an individual I don't know. I have never had the opportunity of meeting him. It starts out:

Dear Sir:

In regard to your newsletter we received today, we are very much against this legislation. The potash industry does not belong to the Government because they don't know how to run it and know nothing about it. How come Saskatchewan has to have such a poor Government? Other provinces have come to their senses in time.

An Hon. Member: — Signed "My mother"!

Mr. Wiebe: — As I said earlier this letter, Mr. Speaker, is from someone whom I do not know and I do not intend to reveal the identity of the person who writes, but in case that the Attorney General may think that it might be from my mother, I would be quite prepared to show him this letter privately on the condition that he will not reveal the individual's name. Let me go on, Mr. Speaker, to continue with that paragraph.

How come Saskatchewan has to have such a poor Government?

Other provinces come to their sense in time, but as far as we are concerned Saskatchewan is going to the dogs. What else can a person do to make people see where our province is heading for?

Yours sincerely,

These are just some of the examples, Mr. Speaker, of the concerns which people throughout Saskatchewan have in regard to the legislation. I am very pleased that the Minister of Highways afforded me the opportunity tonight to read some of these concerns into the Legislature.

Again, before I sit down, I am extremely unhappy with the direction in which this Government is taking this province. And I shouldn't say "this Government", I should say my Government, because whether I sit in Opposition, or whether I am on my farm as an individual citizen, I supported them or whether I didn't it is still my Government. I must say, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, that I am not very proud at this moment of my Government. I am not very proud of the direction which they are taking this province, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government at the last moment, though I doubt, will have a change of heart and with that I say unfortunately, that I cannot support the Bill as proposed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have to give credit to the Member for Milestone (I don't know the name of the riding now - Qu'Appelle), credit for this line. He says "I have been waiting for this speech now for over two months". And that's true too. It has been a long debate on Bill 1. An interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, even in its last moments. We see yet still another call for a grand coalition of the free enterprise parties by the Member for Morse constituency (Mr. Wiebe), the grand coalition between the Liberals and the Conservatives in the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't know if that will ever come about. I know that they dream or wish that they had a situation perhaps like in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a very lengthy debate with lengthy speeches. I kept on thinking to myself what it was about the length of the speeches. What prompted the Opposition, the Liberal Opposition in any event, to go to such length on these speeches. Almost a mini-macho trip I suppose for all the future Liberal leadership candidates. Probably the length of time that the Liberals opposite would speak, one might say very well would be a yardstick for measuring future leadership candidates of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I thought that the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) can applaud on that because he would win, not quite hands down, but he would certainly have the lead in the early going. But I thought all along that the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) was really retiring as leader of the Liberal Party, but judging by today's two and half to three hour speech, I think maybe he is reconsidering and wanting to make a comeback.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I can tell the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and the Liberals opposite that if he does reconsider he is still the best one of all, the potential leaders or candidates for leader on that side. It's funny to see the Liberals in a way jockeying for the position of leadership. The Member for Thunder Creek . . .

Mr. Steuart: — You know what it's like, Roy!

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, I knew what it was like, a bit, the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) in the back rooms and the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) just to name a few. For this I must give credit to my colleague the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). He says that it reminded him like all of the passengers rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Full steam head captain! I said that they could all take a back seat to the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and I think that's been one of the difficulties in view as not only the pilot of the bill watching the performance and that is that while there is the leader, the Liberal caucus I think has exhibited at times a runaway approach to its tactics on this Bill. Basically, this probably because of the upcoming leadership campaign. A caucus I think unfortunately dominated by lawyers, most of whom . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, unfortunately dominated by lawyers . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Lawyers in competition with each other for the leadership and I think the result is that you see all sorts of decisions to fight for a day or two and not to fight for a day or two, it's going to be extended, and so forth.

The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon said that there is some progress made by the Liberals in this filibuster. He said in fact he thought there was some progress. He said the Speech from the Throne wanted to take over all the mines and then they moved back from that position and now they are moving to two or three mines and then he said if we have succeeded in convincing them of the folly of their ways then we have made progress in this filibuster. I would simply like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that the Speech from the Throne, which is an excellent statement of principles on this potash, and I would commend all Members to read it again. He said this. The policy on the potash is:

to acquire the assets of some or all of the producing potash mines in Saskatchewan.

Those are the words from the Speech from the Throne. And I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition, in case he has any delusions about the effects of the filibuster, that still is the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen here is a filibuster. As I say a desultory filibuster. One that skips. One that is aimless. I sometimes wonder if the leadership is a full explanation for it. I don't think that it is. I think, really, that the full explanation for the Liberal filibuster has been two-fold. Firstly, a real fear of the Progressive Conservative Party and the impact of this new third force on the free enterprise vote and, secondly, a fear, a confusion on what exactly the new society of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau exactly means.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, the Members opposite laugh, but when the Prime Minister says that free enterprise has failed, how best can the Saskatchewan Liberals show the Prime Minister to be wrong, but to filibuster for free enterprise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And the real motivation for the filibuster, I think, no one in the province ought to be confused, it is not the Potash Bills per se. I think that really the political position that the Liberal Party finds itself caught in, a party that is caught on the one hand by what appears to be a rising right wing, very conservative political posture in the country as adopted by Conservative Party, both provincially and federally. They are caught obviously on the left by the New Democratic Party and they feel that they are riding that fence. They don't know exactly where the policy of the program is to extend from there. A Prime Minister who confuses them, makes a statement and then refuses to elaborate on exactly what he means; a Prime Minister who has such things as today's newspaper, the President of the Royal Bank, not that I suppose he should be calling the shots, but certainly a very influential man, urging that the Prime Minister call an election on the new society. This is now, in Canada. I think that all of these factors are involved in this very sad situation that we see the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan today. A position of a party which has contributed so much, I think, to the country; a party that now in Western Canada is basically struggling to keep alive in Saskatchewan, very much struggling to keep alive in Saskatchewan — pressed on the left, pressed somehow, those traditions and connections that it had of a year yet gone by, in certainly some parts of Canada if not Saskatchewan. I think it is sad because these tactics really backfired. Rather than showing to the people of Saskatchewan that these are the people who have championed free enterprise, the filibuster after two and one half months has produced all of a grand total of about 12 letters that are printed in the Leader-Post, that I have seen by count and I may be wrong, maybe 15. Several in the hands of some individuals and that is about it. Here we see this caucus floundering as it is in this circumstance that they find themselves in.

The Leader of the Opposition today spent some considerable time talking about how hard it was in 1964 to take over from the CCF and restore the business climate and get this period of growth going again. All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition, it was hard in 1964, but it got harder in 1969 and harder in 1970

and in 1971, to the point where more companies went bankrupt and left the province, in those years of those Liberal times than at any time in the history of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Leader says that it is a giant step. He used those words today in the resource development, and that he is right. It is a giant step in resource development. He was incorrect in the extension of that statement, that it was a giant step to the development of all natural resources. That is incorrect. I think no matter how hard the Liberals and the Conservatives have tried, while we have bargained hard and there have been difficult negotiations in the forest, uranium and some of these hardrock minerals, the fact of the matter is that we have proven to the people of Saskatchewan, over 20 years the CCF, and nearly five years of the Blakeney Government, that we can work with private enterprise in the development of our natural resources, given the basic precept, that the resources of the province belong to the people of the province and they demand a fair return from those resources.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He is right when he says it is a giant step; a giant step for control of Canadian resources by Canadians and for Canadians in this very vital area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I get confused when I listen to the Liberal Party because not only are they caught philosophically and politically on this growing thing, the left and the right, and they are trying to ride two horses both going in different directions. I get confused about the arguments that they advance. On one hand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said, why you are mortgaging Saskatchewan to the hilt. He said, why you boys may be defeated in 1979, he said, but you're not going to be there to worry about the mortgage. You are paying so much for these mines. You know the colorful wording and colorful hysterics of the Liberal Opposition. Now that mortgaging of Saskatchewan reminded me of the phraseology throughout the entire debate used in the 1962 medicare debate. You see what I am saying that is sad about the Liberal Party. They have filibustered so much on this Bill that they have got themselves in precisely like they did in 1962 in medicare and now many of them are ashamed to have taken the position that they did on medicare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I say to the Members opposite that there will come a day before 1979, maybe even after 1979 when the position taken by the Liberals and the Conservatives in opposing this act of repatriation of Canadian resources, will be as regretted by them as some of them now regret having taken the opposition for example in the area of medicare operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) in his remarks asked us to admit "candidly and honestly," were,

I think, the words he used, he said that the Liberal position with respect to multinational corporations is not really much different than yours, the NDP is what the Member for Regina South meant. Well, I think we had to take that as the least credible statement during this debate.

I was wondering throughout the entire debate what it is that the Liberals and the Conservatives would offer to the people of Saskatchewan as to the solution to this potash issue. What is the solution? The only solution is when you boil down the sum and substance of the Tory and the Liberal argument is that have it entirely the way of the potash companies. That's the only solution. There is no other alternative that they have offered. They've said fair play. They've said, oh, if they only could sit down. The Board of Trade in Saskatoon said, oh, if only they could sit down and talk to the potash companies, they could work out some agreement. They have overlooked the fact that we have been sitting down for two or two and one-half years with them on negotiations. But when you press Liberals right up against the wall and you say, okay, those are the facts; when you press the leader of the Conservative Party and the Conservatives right up against the wall and you say, those are the facts, what would be your solution to the impasse, they don't say it quite totally but implicit through the entire argument is that their solution to the argument is that we should accept the word of the multinational potash corporation without exception, without question. They keep on throwing out these percentages of 83 per cent. They see that the potash companies have tabled these financial reports about 80 per cent and they base their entire arguments on that. The only solution that they have offered to the people of Saskatchewan is to take the multinational corporation line. Yet the Member for Regina South gets up and says, now honestly you've got to acknowledge, Mr. Attorney General, your attitude and our attitude on multinational corporations really isn't different. Well, I want to tell the Member for Regina South that it is different because I don't accept the multinational corporations' line.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now the Member for Regina South is newer than brand new Liberal. He says, do you know what you really should do, you should regulate the potash corporation, you should regulate resources, don't take them over. That's what the newer than brand new Liberals say now in 1975. The Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Qu'Appelle when he was in the House in 1971 when we tried to regulate, for example, the forest industry, you should have seen the opposition that we got on the amendment to The Forest Act.

Mr. Steuart: — I should hope so.

Mr. Romanow: — The Member says, he should hope so, because that's their position. You see you can't have it both ways. And the Member for Regina South when I say about a party and a caucus that is wracked by all sorts of leadership and other instincts for survival, one Member saying regulate, the other Member saying don't regulate. How in the world can you base your resource policy or ask the people of Saskatchewan to accept that as a Liberal resource alternative for the situation that we are in?

The Member for Regina South, says, you know these multinational corporations they aren't malevolent or sinister he says. They are people. People who are neither bad nor good, just people. Just good old, down on the farm plain folks are what these potash companies are. I ask the Member for Regina South or any Member, I wonder if anybody in this House could buy one share in one potash mine in Saskatchewan. Just think about it. One share in one potash mine. We, the people of Saskatchewan own this potash resource and I don't think there is one of us in this room who could buy even if I wanted to let alone if I had the money to buy one share in one potash mine. That's whom these Members opposite are defending, Mr. Speaker. No one in Saskatchewan can buy a share in one single mining operation. No one in this province can invest directly in the development of our own resources. Nobody can. We know it. You know it, the potash companies know it, and I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition the people of Saskatchewan know that as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But to hear the Member for Regina South talk, why they are just good old plain ordinary people, just like you and me!

Mr. Speaker, Liberals opposite say why don't you tax them like you should tax them on profits. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Regina south, the Member for Lakeview, all the Liberals, know that if we taxed the potash companies on their declared profits we wouldn't nearly have the present \$130 million, which you claim we will be losing by this Bill 1 and 2. I want to tell the people of this province that in the years 1970 to 1973, admittedly not the best years, but that's a four year period. I don't have the figures for 1974 but I will tell you when I get that in committee and it's not going to be far off. But the years that I do have 1970 to 1973, the corporate — I want the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to listen to this particularly — the corporate income taxes paid by all of the potash mines in Saskatchewan in federal taxes was less than \$30,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I tell you the source of that, look it up for yourself, Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards), Statistics Canada, miscellaneous non-metallic mining bulletin. You look at the figures and you'll see them broken down year by year. I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that that is the position of the Liberal Party opposite. Yet the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) during the course of debate he says, we are the executioner. Do you remember that colorful word, Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate, "executioners." "Executioners." Why? Because the Blakeney Government had the guts to ask for financial statements of the companies and the guts to say you have got a fair return on your potash companies and the Member for Wascana says, we are executioners.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That is very colorful language. The Member for Wascana is prone to that. He says we are like Churchill asking Hitler for production statistics when we asked them to produce their financial statement. Well, that may be so but it would be

more accurate to say the Liberals are like Chamberlain returning from Munich saying to the potash companies, "Peace in our time."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Peace in our time to the potash companies that's what the Liberals and Conservatives have to offer the Province of Saskatchewan. No, we won't ask for your financial statement because that's harassment. No, we won't tax you because you might not dare expand, but we are going to make peace, peace with you in our time. They are going to rush in to save something. Well that may be the Liberal and the old lone Conservative Party approach but, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell this House that it is not this Government's nor the people of Saskatchewan's approach.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley during this debate, the deputy leader, also made one other interesting comment which I am going to repeat, indeed, not only in this debate but from here on in like he will about Bill 1 and Bill 2. During the course of his epic effort, his heroic effort, he said that he would like to see the people taxed a \$70 annual medicare and hospitalization premium. He made that point over and over again. He said that we don't need to give back that tax to the sick or to the poor or to the old. No, he said, I want to get that \$70 placed back on them. He said, that he invites me to repeat that publicly. I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that he said that and I am going to repeat it publicly, because that is exactly the position of the old line party, Mr. Speaker,. You can boil down two months of debate to that pick of priorities. If the Liberals and the Conservatives had a choice between taxing the sick and taxing the potash companies, they'll tax the sick and give the potash companies a break.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to tell the Members opposite who call for an election, they'll have an election sooner than they'll want and they'll have to face up to that comment, the Conservatives and the Liberals opposite because that is exactly the position that the free enterprise parties are taking here in this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment or two also about the question of the Coopers-Lybrand Statement which was tabled during the course of this debate by Mr. Carpenter on behalf of the potash producers. I want to tell the Members and the people of Saskatchewan that after listening to this debate there are many fundamental contradictions in the position taken by the Liberals opposite and by the Conservatives. I want to point out another one which is basic to this argument. Let's analyse this. On the one hand the Opposition, including the potash companies for whom the Opposition parties are the spokesmen, they tell us that we do not need to expropriate the potash industry, some or all of it, because we are getting all the revenue in taxation now or to paraphrase it another way, why take the cow when you are already getting the milk. But they also tell us that we are taxing the industry too heavily at the same time. On the one hand they say to the people of Saskatchewan, look at all the money that the people of Saskatchewan can get

but on the other hand they say, they are taxing the potash companies too much. They tell us we are taxing the industry too heavily. How can the industry expand, they say, if they are taxed at such a high rate. Well, you can't have it both ways Liberals and Conservatives. What is it to be? Should we continue to tax the industry as we are and use the revenue as you say we should. I would remind my Liberal and Conservative friends that the potash companies have given the rate of taxation as the sole reason for not expanding and you have agreed with them. By your equation this would mean lots of revenue and expansion. Or could we take the other position? Should we cut the tax rate to the 50 per cent level, which is what the companies say they need in order to expand, a great loss of revenue and perhaps some expansion in exchange. Mr. Speaker, you can't have the cow and the milk too under the argument that is advanced by the Liberals and Conservatives and by the potash companies.

If you look at the Coopers-Lybrand Statement for example or the statements made by the potash companies, their fundamental position is that they won't expand because they are taxed too much. Yet, the Liberals are saying that we don't need to take this step, that we are getting all the revenue on the one hand but on the other hand in another debate and in another forum, they are saying that we are taxing them too much and they are not expanding. You can't have it both ways. There are only one of two things that we can do, Mr. Speaker. We can either take the potash industry's word. We can either take the word of the Liberal Party or in the further alternative, we can do what we have, in fact, determined to do by Bills 1 and 2.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate at length the argument on denial of free access to the courts. I am not going to get into that because I think that no one believes that this Bill is motivated in retribution for the action of the law case. No one believes that, no one apart from the politicians on the opposite side who believe that for political purposes. We have said that over and over again. The issue is not the law suit. The issue is that there is no expansion. The issue is that we need to expand. There is an impasse, and of the alternatives available to us, it would be a crime for all the people of Saskatchewan not to have acted in the way that we did act. We have said that and we think that the people of Saskatchewan understand that to be a fundamental case.

Now I want to say also, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes left to me just to deal briefly with a few of the arguments on the question of the constitution and disallowance. The Member, I forget who it was, Wascana, South, said that the Bill could be unconstitutional because it deals with the operation of a federal company in the province. I want to tell the Member that not one word in this Bill singles out federal companies for any discriminatory treatment. The Bill deals the same with all the companies.

A second constitutional consideration was raised, by I am not sure which of the lawyers on the opposite side, that the Federal Government may try to tax provincial Crown corporations. Well, this of course is no surprise to us because I have had a warning that this is a possibility. The Liberals opposite have said that this taxation would be to prevent "balkanization," is the word that is used. The Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) has even gone further in describing our relationship with the Federal Government. I want all Members to take careful note of this. He has described the provision to disallow the deduction

of provincial royalties on federal corporations tax as a "a short, small, deft move by the Federal Government." Note those words, Mr. Speaker, "short, small, deft move." That's what he says. The Member applauds when he called this a "small deft move." A small, deft move that could seriously restrict the rights of the people of Saskatchewan to obtain full and fair return for the natural resource and costs millions of dollars to the people of Saskatchewan. That's what the Member is saying, "a short, deft move." Let me say clearly what this province's position is. Section 125 of the BNA Act says clearly:

No lands or property belonging to Canada or any province shall be liable to taxation.

Mr. Speaker, it is the Government's clear, legal interpretation that the question of Crown corporation taxation is beyond doubt with respect to that particular point of view.

But the point that is interesting here during the constitutional debate is that the Opposition is so wedded to the concept of free enterprise that it permits its political bias to overrule the black and white of the law. I think this was revealed to me more than anything in the statement made by the then Minister of Justice, the Hon. Otto Lang on November 26, 1974, when he spoke on the issue of taxation on Crown corporations in the House of Commons and he said this. Please take note of this Mr. Leader of the Conservative Party:

The point which I consider to be of importance . . .

This is Mr. Lang speaking.

. . . is that we could indeed tax a Crown corporation within a province if it engaged in activity which otherwise we were taxing in other provinces. This should be accepted by everyone in the House who does not believe that our constitution was not specifically aimed at promoting socialism in the provinces. If it were otherwise (Mr. Lang says) every step toward socializing an industry would remove that industry from the federal taxation scene and there would be a clear emphasis toward socialization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that our constitution was not written by socialists perhaps is clear but to say that the constitution must be used in Mr. Lang's terms to prevent socialization is something that only the Liberals could devise and I simply say that we don't accept that view of the Canadian Constitution.

And then the Member for Regina South talked to us about the question of disallowance. He reminded us that disallowance has been used 114 times and he said disallowance could be used in this legislation. I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that it wasn't this Government that raised the spectre of disallowance. But why is it that the Liberal Members in Saskatchewan raise disallowance. Not one word from any Liberal anywhere in Canada on a provincial Bill of disallowance, for example, Bill 22 in Quebec. I am not saying it should or shouldn't be disallowed but one controversial, fundamental in the constitution, not one word. Here we have a Saskatchewan MLA or MLA's arguing about disallowance and the spectre of disallowance something which they say is there before us. Well, I don't think that is going to happen. I think we are seeing two groups in the Federal Cabinet.

One by Mr. Macdonald, the present Minister of Finance who are prepared to sit and talk with the Government of Saskatchewan to work out something, and one represented by Mr. Lang and the Liberal caucus provincially who are at Mr. Lang's beck and call who would perhaps indeed see disallowance as a threat or the deft move involved.

That is an interesting development, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the voters of Saskatchewan will support a provincial party that does not support provincial interests. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the voters of Saskatchewan wanted a Federal Liberal Party they can keep voting for Mr. Lang in Ottawa but I don't think they want him in power here in Regina too, come 1979.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now let me close, Mr. Speaker, by a quick minute or two on the Progressive Conservative position. What's next, who's next? We have heard from the party theorists tonight. We have heard from businessmen who are not able to succeed in gas service stations. Who's next, what's next?

I want to read a quote to you:

Many of our people do not realize and do not fully appreciate that we have socialized our timber industry and our fur industry. We have also socialized our fish industry and if the program of socialization and control is to be continued, the next group that it must be applied to, there are those who produce the grain and the livestock of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Said in 1975 or 1976? No, said in 1945 in this very Legislative Chamber. Little did I think 30 years later that here we would have the Conservatives offering their little bit to this debate using such terms as a "socialist sickle," "the master planners," "the banana republic" and "the farmers who are next." Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have caught up a long time ago to those scare tactics by the Conservatives and the Liberals opposite. They are not going to be fooled by this operation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, we see here a situation which is not credible. Increased taxes, they say not related to the cost of potash takeover, morally wrong they say, morally wrong for whom? For the potash companies? Whose sense of morality?

Mr. Speaker, just look at our New Deal 1975 and all will see that the question of a fair return for resources is something that we have always stood for and fought for. Mr. Speaker, that is what Bill 1 represents, a fair return for resources, control of our resources. The Liberals and the Conservatives will pay heavily to the people of Saskatchewan for their alliance with the multinational corporations against the interests of the common man in this province. I guarantee you that in 1976 or 1979. I guarantee you that. If only we can keep the Liberal Party afloat to 1979, I think they will be around to see that.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, proud of my Government, proud to be part of a government that has taken this bold move for all Saskatchewan and Canada. I move second reading of Bill 1.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

YEAS - 29

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Blakeney | Lange | Shillington |
| Pepper | Faris | Rolfes |
| Thibault | Kowalchuk | Cowley |
| Bowerman | MacMurphy | Matsalla |
| Smishek | Mostoway | Skoberg |
| Romanow | Larson | Vickar |
| Messer | Whelan | Allen |
| Snyder | McNeill | Koskie |
| Byers | MacAuley | Johnson |
| Kramer | Feschuk | |

NAYS - 19

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Steuart | Edwards | Larter |
| Stodalka | Clifford | Bailey |
| Lane | Anderson | Berntson |
| Wiebe | Merchant | Ham |
| Malone | Thatcher | Katzman |
| MacDonald | Collver | Birkbeck |
| Cameron | | |

The Assembly adjourned at 9:35 o'clock p.m.