

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eighteenth Legislature
36th Day

Wednesday, January 14, 1976.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

GRANTS FOR CABLE TELEVISION

MRS. E.G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Shillington) and I don't believe he is here, so I will see which Minister will answer. How much money has been given in provincial grants to groups who are preparing applications for cable television?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question and provide the Member with the details of it at the next sitting of the House. I am not sure that even if the Minister were here that he would be able to give that type of detailed information without doing some research on it, so I'll take notice.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Mr. Speaker, if it would be in order, if you would agree that I could present the two supplementaries so they could be applied to at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would question the validity of the question to begin with, if the Member will bear with me, because I don't believe that it is information that you would expect the Minister to have with him in the Chamber at this time, therefore, I think it should be a written question. Secondly, supplementaries cannot be posed unless an answer has been given. An answer has not been given, however, the Minister has agreed to provide the information at a later time and at that time you may ask a supplementary.

CABLE TELEVISION

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I also have some questions regarding Cablevision and possibly the Minister would take notice of those questions. I suggest that they are urgent, particularly in relation to the fact that the self-styled cable adviser has now been making some comments in the Press. Would the Minister indicate whether Provincial Cablevision Ltd., was quoted the same costs for Sask Telecommunication's cable signals as the cost quoted to the community groups? With respect to your last ruling, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is a policy question and I am not asking price, but the principle and the Cabinet and the Minister should know that. Will the Government to ensure that we have cable as soon as possible guarantee that regardless of the groups or companies getting the CRTC go-ahead in relation to the fact that we are the only province in western Canada without cable, would the Minister guarantee that they would

co-operate with anyone receiving cable and lastly, as my opening question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Government would agree that there are dangers in SaskTel, a part of government, having anything to do directly with the media and moving into the media regardless of whether the NDP or Liberals are in power? I suggest that there are dangers in that and I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether they propose to continue with the Sask Tel application for cable facilities and cablevision?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I could only say that the application of Sask Tel to my knowledge really relates to the question of the provision of the hardware, so-called, as opposed to the actual operating of the programming, etc. this has to be, of course, determined by the CRTC in the course of hearings.

As to the question related to co-operation, will Sask Tel co-operate? The answer is that we will have to await the outcome of the decision by the CRTC and make appropriate Government announcements at that time. I don't see any reason why Sask Tel couldn't or wouldn't co-operate but I think that that question may be premature. We would have to await the decision by the CRTC.

MR. MERCHANT: — As a supplementary, is the Minister, and I remind you that I asked to know whether provincial cablevision and the other private concerns were quoted the same price as the community services and that is very important. I hope the Minister may answer that. But is the Minister, in the remarks that you have made, indicating that there is some possibility that if this matter goes into private hands you will continue to deprive Saskatchewan of the right to cablevision? You won't say that you guarantee that you'll co-operate with private groups, am I correct in assuming that there is some real possibility that cable would be denied if the matter does not go into the hands of the community groups or community operations?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, again I think the Hon. Member is embellishing somewhat on the answer that I gave which I think was as neutral as it could be and quite properly so pending the final decision of the Canadian Radio Television Committee. The Member asks me to make a decision or make an announcement with respect to a decision not yet made and all I am saying to the Member is what I said earlier, that I would see no objections to it, but I can't give guarantees as I don't think anybody can at this particular stage. We have to see the form of the licence. We would have to see various conditions attached to the licence, what obligations are on Sask Tel and the like. Having said that may I express, if I may, my own personal, and I think this is the feeling of a lot of the people on all sides of the House, that there is a very good argument to be made out for community controlled, community operated, community sponsored cable television. And I think that certainly would be my preference, but that's a job for the CRTC to decide.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, while I don't purport to disagree with that, I wonder if the Minister would agree with me?

MR. BOWERMAN: — What's the difference?

MR. MERCHANT: — Well, I wonder if the Minister would agree with me that some day I'll give you a short course in grammar about how you pose questions? It's simple. I wonder if the Minister would agree with me that providing a province-wide licence is more apt to provide sooner — would bring cablevision to rural Saskatchewan more quickly, as the Minister knows the only community stations that have applied are some four or five, and would you not agree that a province-wide licence would be the fastest way to provide cable to the province? Because I'll be sitting down I remind the Minister again I hope you may be able to give me this answer, did Sask Tel quote the same price to all of the applicants?

MR. SPEAKER: — When order is called for which is quite in order, I find it very difficult to come to the defence of the Member in asking his question, because the Member insists on giving information and speculating when he is asking the question, rather than asking the question. So I find it very difficult to come to his defence and allow him to continue. I would ask the Member to keep those thoughts in mind and if the Member doubts what I am saying I suggest an examination of the record of questions you have asked in the House in comparison to questions asked by other Members and perhaps you can come to a conclusion about the manner in which you should ask those questions.

MR. ROMANOW: — I would just simply answer the Member that a granting of a province-wide licence per se may or may not speed up the cable television development in rural Saskatchewan. The province-wide licences, as the Member I am sure would acknowledge, are one aspect of this problem. The other very real aspect of the problem, perhaps even more important than the licence, is the cost which is associated with the granting or with the distribution of cable television to everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan. If I may harken back to the 1975 provincial election when the Liberal Party at that time, I may be in error here but paraphrasing somewhat loosely, promised cable television for every rural home. I think that that is just an unrealistic promise. By virtue of the costs that are involved in the granting of a province-wide licence that would not have helped in the realization of that objective. So there are many factors in it and I do not agree with the Member that the granting of province-wide licences alone will mean cable television for rural farmers or rural families.

MR. MERCHANT: — May I direct a, not a question but an inquiry of you?

MR. SPEAKER: — I am going to recognize the Member for Nipawin.

NAME ORGANIZATIONS GIVEN AID FOR CABLE TELEVISION

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question pertaining to cable television to the Premier. Have any grants or aid of any kind whatsoever been given to any organization that is presently submitting applications to the CRTC for cable television and, if so, what organizations have been given such grants or aid of any kind?

MR. SPEAKER: — I don't intend to answer the question. I think the Member for Nipawin perhaps missed it but that question was asked of the Minister and he has said that the information will be supplied.

MR. COLLVER: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the question that was asked was how much was granted to these organizations? I didn't ask that question; the question that I asked was, have any been granted of any kind, or any aid given of any kind whatsoever? That is the question that I asked and that is quite different from the previous question and not one that requires any details to be carried around in one's pocket.

MR. ROMANOW: — I am going to take notice of that question because I do believe that while there might be a slight distinction in emphasis from the question of the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, I did take notice earlier for hers and I think, to be fair, I have got to take notice of this and provide and answer as soon as I can to the House.

GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. As he is not here maybe one of the other Members could answer. I was wondering if the Minister could consider or would instruct the SPC that they pay grants in lieu of taxes to rural municipalities on their natural gas installations and transmission lines and roads in the same way as they do for their electrical installations?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — I am not sure that I should be answering for the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, but I think at the present time the Power Corporation is not in the process of considering the point of view that the Member expresses. These matters are under continual review and in the interests of equity the Board of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation does review these matters from time to time, but at the present moment I believe that it is considered in general terms to be a reasonably fair and equitable arrangement.

MR. ANDERSON: — As a supplementary, I would ask the Minister if in their considerations they would take into account municipalities that have natural gas fields in the municipality but they are not served in any way with natural gas outlets? They receive no natural gas service from SPC. How do I put it, these are rare but they do occur and would they be given special consideration to have a grant given in lieu of taxes because they do not receive any natural gas service and yet part of their tax base goes into natural gas installations?

MR. SNYDER: — The indication coming from the Minister on my right indicates that these installations are assessed with respect to municipal property and there is revenue accruing to the municipality in that way, I am given to understand. I don't know of

any immediate plans that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has for revising or updating present plans but those matters are under consideration on a continuing basis.

REPLY TO YOUNG VOYAGEURS PROGRAM

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) asked a question with respect to the Young Voyageurs Program on Monday last, asking the number of students that would be affected in Saskatchewan by the cut of the Voyageur Program by the Federal Government. I have the information for him today. The number of students, Saskatchewan students, would be 460 in 1976. The full number of Canadian students is 5,500.

MR. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — In way of supplementary, then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister did while he was researching that, find out what the federal financial share of that program is in Saskatchewan or at least was in the past year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the Saskatchewan budget is \$25,820 in 1976 of which \$11,500 is recoverable from the Federal Government.

MR. ANDERSON: — Well, in light of the fact that these figures don't, at least I would be positive, wouldn't astound the Government opposite, is the Provincial Government to the best of your knowledge considering picking up the federal share of this program in order that the Young Voyageur Program may be continued in Saskatchewan?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I don't think that the Minister of Education or the Government has completely given up on dealing with the Ottawa Government with respect to continuing this program. I think we will make our position known to Ottawa along with other provincial governments. It is amazing, I attended a conference as the Minister of Education in September, late September, 1975, in which we had assurances, and all provinces had assurances that this program would be continued on the basis of 1975 with inflationary costs added to it. I report the Minister of Education is at a council of Ministers of Education in Vancouver at the present time. He has indicated to me that he is raising this issue as an agenda item. I am sure that the Ministers of Education will be putting their case forward to the Ottawa Government with respect to the continuation of the Young Voyageur Program. It is an important program and I don't think I can respond any further to questions of the Hon. Member until the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) returns and he may raise them with him.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on Bill 2.

The Progressive Conservative Party has made it clear that we were diametrically opposed to the socialization of this industry. Our Leader has repeatedly said they were not in favor, in any respect whatsoever, of nationalizing any of these companies or, indeed, the whole industry.

In my speech I made as Mineral Resource critic for the Conservative Party the point was loud and clear that we were opposed to the so-called great schemes in socialism. Mr. Speaker, while we have continued to voice our objections to the tactics used by the NDP Government and have attempted to show that these tactics would ordinarily be found in banana republics, we have been perhaps misunderstood.

We refused to participate in the filibuster of Bill No. 1 which is now over; we refused to delay the passage of that law which gave the Government virtual power to confiscate the property of others at values, mostly, far below the fair market value. We explained why we wanted the Government held accountable for its actions, or otherwise have this Government withdraw the Bill.

At first glance our position would appear to be a paradox. If we were so opposed to this legislation, why did we immediately want it withdrawn or passed?

There is no question but that we were and that we are opposed to the legislation, but having said that we wanted every person in Saskatchewan and, indeed, the western world to realize that this NDP Government were taking everyone in this province on a trip into the wilds of socialism. Indeed, a trip just as potentially dangerous as if it was activated by drugs. It has even been suggested that this group of three or four people who run this Government are crazed with either grief or power or determination brought on by ineptitude and ignorance.

Mr. Speaker, this agrarian party of activists was taken over by an avowed and declared socialist from the Maritimes and it has lost touch with the common people. The party that was born out of frustration with the depression and the vicious political machines of Liberal Jimmy Gardiner, is no longer what it once was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — The CCF Party of Tommy Douglas long respected as a government honored and supported by thousands of ordinary people in this province, is no more. The NDP may be successors of the CCF, but they are not the same. As a result of the unholy marriage of the old CCF and the labor union bosses, the NDP was born, a party which has no concern for people, an NDP which has no concern for honor.

This Government and the doctrinaire socialists who control it are bent on destruction of the free market system and personal initiative. They couldn't care less about moral issues of truth and honor. Liberty and freedom are obstacles in their path and will only be tolerated if they can achieve their goals, if not, then as we have seen they cannot care less about freedoms and liberties.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we have said, either withdraw the legislation or call an election. People frequently have to be shocked into realization before they react. In the past we have faced a situation where people of the province couldn't believe that this Government was so socialistic, they said and many of us have heard it, that was not the party they had supported and their fathers had supported. It is for this reason that we had said that these Bills be immediately withdrawn or put before the people in an election.

It was the threat contained in these Bills that we were concerned about. We did not want this Government, by threatening to expropriate or at least to force legitimate organizations out of the courts and then negotiating the purchase, given the opportunity to then withdraw the Bill without having to suffer the consequences when it came to the next election. We wanted the people of this province to realize that this was no longer that agrarian party of the CCF. We want the people of the province to realize and to realize fully that this Government is dedicated to take over the control of each and everyone's life and to control, in all aspects the economy of this province.

We, in this party, believe in personal initiative and individual enterprise. We don't believe, for one moment, that three or four master planners should be able to dictate what is going to happen in the lives of every person in this province. I, for one, will fight and continue to fight any attempt at any suggestion that the Premier of this province and the three or four people whom he has gathered about him are more capable of controlling the lives of each and every individual of this province than the people are themselves.

We have every good reason to believe that it was their intention to threaten to expropriate these mines, then bring about a purchase of two or three mines then withdraw the legislation, then, pretending they had never intended to confiscate or expropriate any of these mines in the first place.

I had an opportunity during the Christmas recess, to discuss the matter with many of the people of the province and I have had numerous phone calls from people who did not support me or the Progressive Conservatives during the last election, who stated their unequivocal opposition to the actions of the Government. They further stated they could not possibly believe that this Government could have gone back on the words of Tommy Douglas and bring about the virtual confiscation of these mines in view of the facts that Tommy Douglas had given his word and the word of the Government of the CCF, that they would never expropriate companies who came here to undertake resource development.

That is why we say this Government is without honor and not to be trusted in any way. Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer that if you are prepared to go against your word then you are a person or organization which should be shunned as you can never again be trusted by anyone.

In the last election the NDP candidates roamed up and down this province, as did the Premier, saying, we may have the Land Bank, we may have The Natural Products Marketing Act, and we may have a number of other things. But you can trust us and we give our word that we have no intention of expropriating land or taking over the ownership of all the land in the province. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the resources companies could not trust the

Premier, and if he went back on the word of Tommy Douglas, then how can the people who live on the farms and work in the shops and the factories of this province, trust that same man who is not concerned about keeping the word of his predecessor?

We have been condemned in the last few weeks by both parties for not taking part in the debate. I should like to mention a debate that went on a few years ago, The Natural Products Marketing Act. The Members to our right did, I believe, oppose this Act quite vigorously. I would not have been surprised if there would have been a filibuster on that Act. Most of the farmers don't know it, but The Natural Products Marketing Act, in Saskatchewan whether he is a grain grower or whatever he is. They can licence him; they can tell him what he can grow; when he can sell it and if they want they can stop his vehicle on the road, search it, confiscate it, sell it and charge him anything out of pocket. The farmers of this province don't know what The Natural Products Marketing Act can do to them. This is the law and part of the Act today.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned that the people of this province were shocked with the realization that this Government would take such steps as they proposed with reference to the potash industry. Everywhere you go in the Province of Saskatchewan you encounter fear, feeling of anxiety and worry on the part of everyone. They have come to the realization that this Government is not here dedicated to help the people, but for the purpose of bringing about the complete socialization of this province. There is a realization among the people that they are losing their freedoms, freedoms that have been gained over many centuries and are now being taken away by the state. The question is being asked, and you are hearing it again in 1976, the question is being asked on every street corner and every corner of this province, who is next? If they would do it in the oil industry; if they would do it in the potash industry; if they would purchase drug companies, what is preventing them from getting into every type of business and every type of enterprise and eventually bringing about a totalitarian state where people are even afraid to voice criticism on what is going on?

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that many Members of the Government opposite maintain that they are interested in these freedoms, but they have threatened economic means to silence those who are opposed to their political philosophy. When an organization such as the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce voices its objections to the annihilation of the potash industry, members of the totalitarian socialist philosophy said, we will cut off any grants, we won't allow the head office of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation to be located in Saskatoon, because they dared to speak against us. As we have repeatedly said, the time will come unless this Government is halted in its mad pursuit of socialization, whereby virtually every person will be working for the Government of Saskatchewan, and who would dare to speak out against them. If they refuse to have the head office of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan located in Saskatoon because somebody opposed the philosophy of the Government, then are they not imposing their will on the people of the province? And they will continue to rule, but rule by fear and fear alone.

An item that has appeared in the farm paper, that good old John Deere farm paper, The Furrow, since 1879:

For what avail, the plow or sail
Or land or life if freedom fail.

I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier in his New Year's message attempted to paint a rosy picture of the economy of this province. I would suggest to the Premier that he travel throughout the province and talk to the people and then travel throughout the Province of Alberta and he would notice an entirely different response and attitude.

The people of Alberta do not have the same feelings of fear and frustration that exists in this province. Fear brought about because of the realization their freedoms are being lost to a totalitarian government, dedicated to complete state domination of the lives of everyone.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to support this Bill to bring about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The question being asked by everyone is, why is this being done? Why is it necessary for the people to borrow untold millions of dollars to supposedly own the potash industry? The Premier said that the reasons were that these companies dared to question the action of the Government and took them to court. In other words the Premier has said, as Members of the party have said, we will tell you what is good for you and you do not even have the right to question our wisdom. We are the all powerful, we are the almighty, we are the master planners. Then in addition to that we have heard of the many woolly phrases that the socialists like to mouth and certainly their Premier has mouthed them on every occasion that he has had the opportunity, he has talked about public ownership, talks about the potash industry belonging to the people and obtaining benefits, preserving our environment, benefits in making it possible for Saskatchewan people to have greater control over their own destiny.

How will public ownership of a potash industry bring about these things? Surely to goodness the Government has the power to control the industry and to tax it without the necessity of public ownership. And in any event, do I as a citizen of this province own the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office? Do I as a citizen of this country own Air Canada? Or the Canadian National Railway? Or the Saskatchewan Power Corporation? Or the Post Office? Of course I don't own them, nobody owns them, unless it happens to be the Cabinet Minister and the bureaucracy who control them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again, why is it necessary to involve ourselves in the resource field, particularly in the production of potash?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote a passage from a report given by James E. Neilson, President of Husky Oil Limited, multinational, when referring to a need for additional energy resource development and he said, and I quote:

The unresolved question though seems to me, who should do the exploration and the development of future energy resources, private industry or government? I would remind the readers that historically it has been private industry, not government, that has been a successful discoverer and developer of energy supplies. We believe that the private sector will continue in the future to be more efficient operators than the public sector. Those advocating

government operations and management of energy industries overlook current example, where Government has been less than successful in the management of such things as post office, railroad and a most striking example of all, the management of government itself, the cost of which is an ever increasing percentage of the gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, I should like us all to reflect seriously on those words and draw it to the attention of this Government, that they have been no more successful than any other government in the management of things that have been in the public sector and in particular, as was pointed out by Mr. Neilson, they failed miserably in what would be the most striking example of all, the management of government itself. The bureaucracy of this province has increased substantially and the cost of doing business by this Government is beyond belief. The numbers and numbers of civil servants hired by this Government; the cost of doing business by this Government boggles the mind. The hundreds of people that this Government has hired for the mere purpose of trying to perpetuate their existence shows the very inefficiency of the public sector. With each measure of control, we as individuals, lost some of our freedoms.

In some cases controls are necessary and it is necessary that we individually give up some of these freedoms for the collective good of the whole. However, we must be diligent in preserving individual freedoms and initiatives and that is what is at stake at this time.

The question the people of this province are asking is, who is next? Who can escape the headlong determination on the part of the fanatics to control the economy and the lives of every person in the Province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, do some people believe that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will be concerned solely with the production of potash? I would like to point out this Bill goes considerably further and allows the Potash Corporation to deal in all kinds of fertilizers, artificial chemicals, natural products of all kinds and generally to carry on the business as manufacturers of and retail dealers in all kinds of fertilizers, both natural and artificial chemicals of natural products. Is it the intention, Mr. Speaker, to have the Government go into the fertilizer business on a retail basis? I would ask every dealer in Saskatchewan who sells fertilizer on a retail basis, whether it is Saskatchewan Pool, Federated Co-ops, independent dealers, whether or not they are aware that this Government has the intention of being involved in the retail sales of fertilizers and chemicals, and if the Government says it is not their intention and they have no intention of doing it, then can we believe them? The Premier and the Government who have shown so little respect for previous commitments, would, I am sure be quite prepared again to show that their word meant nothing. And if, Mr. Speaker, they have no intention of carrying on these businesses, then why have they included them in the Act?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the power given to this corporation is very wide. It will enable the corporation to carry out any business not now anticipated and that these powers are put into this Bill for the express purpose of having this corporation again encroach on the business community, again be taking away some of the rights and privileges and individual initiatives that now exist.

We all listened with concern to the remarks of the Prime Minister of Canada that were given in the last couple of weeks. The realization that the socialist Prime Minister intends to bring about a state controlled economy run by bureaucrats with the lives of each and every person being under the same control as that envisaged by the Government of this province.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province when commenting on the remarks by the Prime Minister, indicated that they were the type of remarks that could be expected from a party with the philosophy of the NDP. And while he was in general agreement with the remarks of the Minister he felt that perhaps maybe the Prime Minister had gone even further than he would have dared to have gone.

Mr. Speaker, the Members to our right, I am sure, find themselves in a most difficult position. On one hand being critical of this socialist regime in the province and on the other hand finding themselves supporting a government in Ottawa that is dedicated to the same socialistic philosophies. I wonder if Ross Thatcher would have soft-pedalled Mr. Trudeau the way the Members to my right have done?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is only one party that has a hope of leading the Province of Saskatchewan out of the socialist wilderness, and that, of course, is the Progressive Conservative Party. I know that we would welcome any Members of the Liberal or the NDP into our caucus as we have welcomed thousands of their previous supporters into the Progressive Conservative Party and that these numbers have swollen immensely since the remarks by the Prime Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would again emphasize that this Government does not have a mandate from the people of this province to continue this journey into socialism. Nothing whatsoever was said about the nationalization of the potash industry in the last election. Those areas that were involved in the nationalization of the oil industry rejected wholly and completely the socialization of that industry. I can well envisage what would have happened had the Government had the intestinal fortitude to have campaigned on a socialist program.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province do not wish to continue this journey into socialism. There is no doubt that this journey can only end in a complete subjection of the individual to the state. That is contrary to the way that this province was built. I firmly believe that every person in this province has a right to participate in the future of this province and they have a right to the individual freedom and initiative and they can best participate in the future of this province with a viable economy and a government not dedicated to the subjection of the individual to the state, but to the creation of a climate conducive to allow individuals to obtain their own objectives that will allow each of us to share in not only the wealth but in a feeling of a progressive economy alive with enthusiasm as exists in the province to the west of us, and not stifled by a bureaucratic government and ridden with fears of further government takeover.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the Government was and is morally wrong in the introduction of this

legislation. They are morally wrong in that they have broken their word. They have brought about disrespect for the Province of Saskatchewan and indeed for the whole of Canada. They have brought about a situation where the ethics of the entire province are called in question. They have brought about the feelings of frustration and fear in the hearts and minds of every person in the province, whether he be a farmer, a businessman, laborer, school teacher, or a member of the professions.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I should like to make reference to some of the needless waste in advertising conducted by this Government.

I strongly resent the Government including myself and 60 per cent of the people who voted against this Government in being involved in these advertisement. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they are wrong for two reasons. Firstly, they were not put in by the Province of Saskatchewan, which is dramatically inaccurate in that the province could not insert the advertisement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they should have been put in by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan or the NDP, and not to indicate that they were placed there by everyone in the province. Secondly, I resent the fact that part of my tax dollars and a part of the tax dollars of 60 per cent of the people who oppose socialism has been used to support a philosophy of a political party dictated to by the master planners.

The people in British Columbia turned out a socialist government. I have no doubt that the actions of this Government with reference to potash takeovers had an influence on the voters of British Columbia and directly lost them many of their seats.

MR. BLAKENEY: — How many Tory seats?

MR. LARTER: — We got one. It most definitely would have had a bearing on the recent Saskatchewan election had the NDP been honest with the people. This is just another example of the deceit and dishonesty of this Government. It seems to me that the NDP Government of Saskatchewan had better hurry in hiring from British Columbia as it seems the socialist Liberals of Ottawa will be competing for the services of the socialists out of British Columbia. I assume that the Members to the right will support the hiring of socialists as their federal leader obviously does.

Speaking for a moment, Mr. Speaker, on the ad inserted in the two dailies in Saskatchewan, the Minister of Labour may be interested in the cost and the result of these ads, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan, involuntarily and by our money, I would like to table this ad. These ads cost \$1,100 apiece in the Leader-Post and Saskatoon Star-Phoenix . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I might draw the Member's attention to the fact that he is being right on the borderline with regard to discussing what is before the House. As a matter of fact, I would say that the greater percentage of his time has been dealing with the principle of the acquisition of the potash industry and not the principle of the creation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. A number of the items the Member has mentioned are irrelevant to this Bill that is before us at

this time. I really want to bring the attention of the House to this, at this time, because I anticipate there will be more debate and Members will be having difficulty keeping on the topic which is, the principle of creating a corporation as a method of administering this acquisition which should be discussed on Bill 1. I think Members had ample opportunity to discuss the principle of the acquisition of the industry on Bill 1. They should direct themselves to discussing the positive or negative factors involved with regard to the establishment of a corporation for that purpose in Saskatchewan. I would say that the item the Member has brought up now is not related to the Bill.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, I was just attempting to tie in why we should not be in the Potash Corporation and I was attempting to point out that the results that the people have shown us in tying this in. The response that we received on this ad shows that the people do really resent us in owning a potash corporation. The response we received on that was that this ad was almost paid for, approximately \$1,600 of it, so \$500 investment is not really bad to find out how many of the people of this province — and on top of that we received almost 250 new PC members — this would interest the Members. Because of the results of this ad we are placing a similar ad in the Western Producer this week. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure in moving, seconded by Mr. Berntson (Souris-Cannington):

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

Bill No. 2 be not now read a second time in order that the principles of the Bill can be brought before the public in a provincial general election.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on this Bill. I might say at this time, in case I forgot, that I will be supporting it, but I certainly will be opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I also want to say that as a teacher of history I will now know whom to contact if I want to subject my students to a good dose of 16th Century political, economic and social philosophy. I will certainly feel free to get one of the Members, one of the Tory Members, to speak to my students. The Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) certainly indicated to me that he and his crew are living in the 16th Century when it comes to those things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I want to reply to a few remarks that the Hon. Member for Estevan made. First of all he mentioned something about the banana republics and likened Saskatchewan to a banana republic. I want to tell you that the banana republic, as most people know, is exactly the sort of logical conclusion to the

kind of political philosophy that you fellows are always advocating. It's capitalism run rampant without any restraints. I say that the reason the banana republics are in the plights that they find themselves in, is because there is no socialism there.

The Members opposite, particularly the old Tories, there is no such thing as new Tories, make much of what Tommy Douglas is supposed to have said or not supposed to have said. I think the gentlemen should be aware that Tommy Douglas did correct one of your members who not too long ago said as this Government is doing. Well, I assure you that Tommy Douglas said that he was misrepresented by probably you fellows or maybe the Liberals, too — the same difference. I want to assure you that Tommy Douglas did say that his words were twisted, and that is not what he meant. And were he in our position he would have done exactly the same thing as this Government is doing. If you want to go back into the 1940s, why don't you go back to the 1930s. You know your record isn't that good if you go back to the 1930s. I can recall a school issue in the 1930s where the Tory government of the day went into certain schools in the province and saw all the crosses on the wall, and they said, "Those things have to come down." That is one reason why the Tory Government was defeated in the 1930s.

Mr. Speaker, I am the only fellow in this House who has to take off his glasses to read.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I can't see at a distance and I can't really read with these glasses on, but I tell you the view is very good when I take them off and I look over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a little prepared text. I feel I must rise to speak in favor of this motion because, as far as I am concerned, opposition to this Bill is really an eye opener as to opposite Members' true feelings in regard to all Crown corporations; and that seems to be that they have a burning dislike for them. A burning dislike, Mr. Speaker, because Crown corporations serve Saskatchewan people and not the corporate clichés, foreign or otherwise, that all Opposition Members serve in the name of private enterprise, or as I choose to call it, economic feudalism.

Mr. Speaker, if Members opposite would not dislike the concept of Crown corporations, they would surely want this Bill passed. But no, Mr. Speaker, what they choose to do is to attack this concept, and in doing so they attack the many Crown corporations that we have set up over the years. This they are doing because they know that every word spoken against this Bill chips away at Saskatchewan Power, the Saskatchewan Transportation Company and others that the citizens of this province fought to get and will preserve at the next election via an NDP victory of even greater proportions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, you might be wondering whether or not I have proof that Members opposite wish to knife Crown

corporations in the back. I believe some of their candidates who were not successful certainly tried to do that in the last election.

AN HON. MEMBER — . . . one . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It's not just one, Mr. Hon. Member, it's a long list, and I don't want to waste the time of this House.

MR. LANE: — Oh, it's not a waste.

MR. MOSTOWAY — In this regard I should like to mention the last Liberal junta era when the then government Member for the old constituency of Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) threatened to throw in the towel if the planned sale of SGIO to private interests went through. Now there was a man of integrity when it came to Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker. He knew that should private enterprise gobble up SGIO, rates would have doubled or even tripled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Well, they have in British Columbia.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Oh certainly. They have a Tory Government, or is it Tory, Liberal or hybrid, or whatever it is? I don't know. It's a little bit of everything. It's a Pandora's box. And then I have a quote from the Debates and Proceedings of this House, dated February 16, 1965, where the present leader of the Opposition, official Opposition, stated:

If we have to break Government monopolies or Crown corporation monopolies we will gladly break them.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that the same Member who now directs the thought of most Members opposite? Can Members honestly say that they are not against Crown corporations when their Leader is on record as saying he would gladly break them? Members on this side of the House surely know the answer, and that is why I know Members opposite are now obligated to prevent the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan from becoming another people's success story.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, in true sincerity, who in this House can deny that the fate of the world's natural resources should not be left in the hands of money hungry corporations, as Members opposite would like? Who in here can deny that their record in this field is one that has been distasteful to say the least? Who will deny that the oil companies created an artificial energy crisis a while ago for the sole purpose of enriching their own coffers? Who will deny . . . Oh! There is one who will deny that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Who will deny that many Canadian-based mining corporations have, in the past, taken our resources, scarred the countryside . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Got your hearing aid?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Pardon me.

MR. CAMERON: — We can't hear you — a little louder.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Scarred the country side and in some cases ran operations that caused the premature deaths of many of their employees? It seems to me that that is what Members opposite are really trying to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I know the stakes are high, but the long and the short of it is that corporate interests clash with people interests. And if I were a foreign corporation I, too, would goad my friends opposite into opposing this Bill. I, too, would suggest that they filibuster or sit as petrified objects, and I, too, would use every trick in the book to lure organizations into putting ridiculous advertisements into our newspapers. But if I did that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my conscience would get the best of me, because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my first responsibility is to Saskatchewan, not to Toronto, Chicago or New York, as is plainly evident in the case with Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, Opposition Members have prattled much about the investment involved in people gaining control over the potash industry. They claim it's too high. Well, Mr. Speaker, the price will probably be much lower than the price all Canadians will pay for the forthcoming "Liberalympics" to be held in Montreal. But not a peep from Members opposite on this. And the reason for this is plain. When Liberal governments pour money into questionable ventures, that seems to meet with their silent approval. When an NDP government invests a large sum in a venture to benefit present and future generations, then they howl, scream and filibuster or sit in stony silence. Not too much consistency there, Mr. Speaker, but what can one expect when one is but a pawn in the hands of a small group of financially powerful people who operate out of corporate boardrooms.

MR. LANE: — It's hard to see why Herman got the job!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Oh! I think I'll take these glasses off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It has been, up until now, a good day.

MR. ROMANOW: — He's getting real mean, Paul!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Now I should like to address my remarks to one Hon. Member of the Opposition. I don't believe he is in the House right now. He a while ago seemed to imply that we on this side of the House have a more than ordinary relationship to the sickle. Not the bicycle, but the sickle.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I resent such remarks from the Members opposite who infer that we on this side of the House are not Canadians first and foremost. Now I resent such a remark

because it casts a slur on the many good people of Saskatchewan whose ancestors came from eastern Europe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I resent this because it seems to me that what he was really saying is that these good citizens are somehow not up to par with the other people of the province, and that they must be reminded, but the others don't have to be, not to fall into what I thought he implied was an NDP plot.

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Hon. Member, (and he's not in the House now) he is going to be reminded of that constantly in the next four years. We don't need somebody who knows nothing about history of eastern Europe to be using those scare tactics on these people because he, or anyone else, thinks they are not smart enough to arrive at conclusions themselves, and I say he will pay dearly for the slap in the face he has given these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, if that Hon. Member thinks that these good citizens need to be warned about some imaginary plot any more than the other citizens of this province, he has much to learn and no doubt will, I suggest, in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to spend a few minutes on certain individuals and organizations who are no doubt dedicated to bucking this Government even if it means destroying and tearing down Saskatchewan.

MISS CLIFFORD: — . . . offer that!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Yes, I do, quite a bit.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's why he is so good, Linda!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Is this an offer of assistance, or what?

Well, at any rate, first I wish to refer to remarks made by the outgoing American ambassador to Canada, and it is good that he is outgoing. To his remarks I simply say that it is a well known fact that the American government has always been more concerned with protecting the investments of its corporations outside America than it has been with the negative side effects of these investments in the countries concerned. To an ambassador of a nation that aids and abets the economic feudalism of Central and South America, to the ambassador of a nation that has ordered American subsidiary companies in Canada to ignore the wishes of our Federal Government, I say what can we in Canada expect? And in this regard I commend the Federal Government in decrying American condemnation of Canadians attempting to run their own country.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That Trudeau is a good guy!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — He's a good fellow at times. Now, I didn't say how many times, but he has been, at times, a good fellow.

In regard to recent statements made by the Hon. Otto Lang, I simply say I always thought he was a Saskatchewan man. I always thought he was one who had not knuckled under to the economic power group based in Toronto. I thought he would for sure by now know that what is good for Toronto or Ottawa or Chicago is usually not good for western Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I thought for sure that his collaboration with Central Canada Potash at Colonsay in challenging prorationing would have taught him a lesson. Little did I know that I would be wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon Board of Trade's recently announced public education program on potash is doomed to failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It is doomed to the same fate as its opposition to Medicare, in collaboration with parties opposite. It is doomed to failure because it is a ridiculous venture in trying to destroy the creditability of Saskatchewan in favor of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, when I saw one of its advertisements in this regard, I thought it to be an affront to the intelligence of the people of Saskatoon and area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Well, the advertisement that I saw done up by someone obviously immature and emotionally unstable and politically biased from the word go, did not wash down well with Saskatoon and area people, and so I say to the Saskatoon Board of Trade, "Stop your propaganda program which belittles Saskatchewan." To them I also say, "Stop your efforts in this regard, and if you have money to spare on such nonsense, I believe it would be better spent on improving conditions for your many customers in Saskatoon, many of whom vote NDP, and on whom you certainly lean for support in your various business endeavors."

MR. ROMANOW: — The Board of Trade is to promote the business life of Saskatoon, not the political.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Is that what the Board of Trade is supposed to do, to promote business? I didn't know that.

MR. SPEAKER: — I fervently hope that the Member intends to tie his discussion closely to the principle of the Bill before us, which is the creation of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I am finding it difficult to get the connection now with regard to the Bill that's before us, and the Member will make it difficult for me to call other Members to order when I find them straying from the principle of the Bill.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Certainly, I will try to do that. I'm trying to show that all these ventures in which various organizations are involved produce a climate which is not conducive to the smooth functioning of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — . . . and if you will just bear with me, as I know you have on numerous other occasions in this House, I shall try to show you that I have been right, all along.

I also want to say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, if the Saskatoon Board of Trade does not want the headquarters of the Potash Corporation to be located in Saskatoon, the other Saskatoon NDP MLAs and I certainly do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — We want it located in Saskatoon because it is the only logical site what with the many potash mines in that general area.

Mr. Speaker, from my remarks I know you fully appreciate the fact that I will be supporting this Bill and not opposing it, but opposing the amendment.

But before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a few other things and if you would just bear with me, I want to refer to some statements made by the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) on February 9, 1966, in the Debates and Proceedings. On this paper it has Cy MacDonald, but I would not care to call him by that name here, myself, I'm just quoting:

The modern capitalistic economy does not automatically work at top efficiency.

The Member is not in his seat at this time. He usually is though.

It can only be raised to that level by the intervention and influence of government. Government has not only the ability, but the responsibility to use its powers to increase production, income and jobs.

And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this Bill proposes to do, increase production through expansion, income and jobs for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Does he have a twin brother?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Lord forbid! I don't know, Hon. Member.

I have another article here, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not too sure what paper it is in. It's an ad put in by the National Citizens' Coalition, 74 Victoria Street, Toronto, and I say that kind of an ad is an affront to the dignity of the people of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — . . . and I say that I know that we are on the right track when we can get central Canadian-based organizations

opposing us. That's the acid test. Then we are on the right track . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Then I have another article here and it is from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, a recent issue, "Living Standard Claimed Result of Selling out the Economy." These words were said in Thunder Bay by a contender for the Liberal leadership race in Ontario, Dr. Stewart Smith, who says:

Foreign ownership has reduced incentive and efficiency and as a result Canada is unable to compete for world markets.

Now there is a smart Liberal contender!

I also mention to Members opposite, in another issue of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, November 29th, "New York City Residents face 24 per cent Income Tax Boost." Well, that is a perfect example of a capitalist city. The kind advocated by Members opposite, the kind of city where you wouldn't dare walk unless you had a couple of guns under your belt. You wouldn't be safe.

MR. MALONE: — Is that what the Premier did when he went down there?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — No, when you have an honest face, they don't bother you.

Mr. Speaker, I have another article here, the Globe and Mail, December 20th, 1975. "US Distributor trying Montana for Potash." I want to mention that I have had the misfortune to see an ad on television showing us that some potash companies are testing for potash in Montana, making it look as if since we introduced our Bills in the House, that the companies have somehow gone down to Montana and started drilling. Well, I tell you those are summer scenes. I know Montana is south of Saskatchewan, but I didn't think that far south.

I have another article here from the Leader-Post, December 22, 1975, by Mr. Morris Shumiatcher, one of Canada's top notch criminal lawyers. I want to quote an article here.

I am one among a growing number who believe that we ought to let brewers brew our beer, let the John Mitchell's build our boxes, let the Fred Mendel's pack our meat and let the potash companies who discovered the mineral deposits, continue to mine and market potash. There is an old adage that a cobbler should stick to his last; it is one that applies to governments just as it applies to shoemakers.

I want to tell Mr. Shumiatcher one thing. I believe that lawyers should stick to law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — This expert on everything from how to bring up babies and potash should be sticking to law, if he really believes in

what he says. I am getting a little sick and tired of those articles.

I have another article from the Star-Phoenix, January 2, 1976, page 3, "Ad Campaign Upsets Weekly Publisher." Don Teffler of the Humboldt Journal, etc., etc. You all know what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Well, I don't think I should really tell what he said to the Saskatoon Board of Trade. I don't think it was very complimentary.

Manager Don Teffler of the Humboldt Journal, Secretary-manager of the Saskatchewan Weekly Newspaper Association, said Friday weekly newspapers have received copies of the Board's advertising material with no explanation or instructions for use. When contacted, the Board of Trade said it thought Weeklies might run the advertisement free of charge, Mr. Teffler said. The Board was told advertising in weekly newspapers costs money, just like in the dailies and on television. Some people believe weekly newspapers will use anything,

(I would like to add, even garbage)

that they receive, Mr. Teffler said.

That may have been the case in the past, but with faster type-setting equipment and more material available, it is no longer true.

In his column in the newsletter,

the Saskatchewan publisher also criticized the Board's advertising campaign for taking key shots at political figures.

Now isn't that cheap. The advertisements were also poorly laid out. They should have been because they come from the same place as the Liberal ads in the last election campaign. Those ads caused them to be a failure then; obviously the Board of Trade's campaign is doomed to be a failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I have an article which I received a little while ago. It is in regard to a survey that the Saskatoon Board of Trade took. Figures don't mean anything to me here. I do want to say that I did have one call from a constituent in Saskatoon who was very annoyed that he had received a telephone call asking for her opinions on the potash question. Upon asking the callers whom they represented, she got no answer, no satisfaction. I do not suggest that it is illegal; I suggest that it is improper not to tell the person you are calling whom you are representing.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you the Conservative ad in the paper. (Comic page) Oh, I see; I told you my eyesight was bad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I see the type looks well, I am looking at the picture. I suggest maybe we should nationalize the photographic industry. Apparently in the picture department, they are twenty years behind. There are some statements here. "It is grossly inflationary." Mr. Speaker, I thought about that last night and I said to myself, here is a perfect example. If a farmer is renting land from somebody, and he decides that he wants to buy that land, I suppose Tories opposite would say that that is inflationary. Of course I know the reason for that. They would like to see the owner of the land hold that particular tenant in bondage in perpetuity, obviously.

"It is a bad business deal." I suppose when the price of wheat is rising that it is a bad business deal for farmers to plant more wheat. Is it? It is 16th Century economic philosophy. I don't understand that.

"Takes away Capital that is needed Elsewhere." Well I suggest that all of our programs have always been paid out of current revenue. Saskatchewan has in the past always had balanced budgets, and there is no reason to believe that we won't have them in the future. We certainly don't want to have a deficit like Tory Ontario of \$3 billion, or Liberal Ottawa of \$2 billion. I suggest it is not going to subtract from many of the programs that the people of this province have come to demand from this Government.

"It Converts Thousands of Workers into Civil Servants Without Consultation." Well, I suggest that this isn't a real concern of workers. I have talked to many workers, potash mine workers in Saskatoon and area. That is no hang-up with them. I also notice that Texas Gulf which was bought out by Ottawa didn't make a bit of difference to the employees of that particular company.

"It Breaks our Word," Tommy Douglas has gone on record as saying that Tories are wrong. They said we have broken the word of Tommy Douglas.

"Centralized Power in the Hands of a Few." I agree with the Tories that it does, it centralizes power in the hands of a few corporate giants in Chicago and New York. That is exactly what we are trying to do away with, and get power back to the people of Saskatchewan. I believe that is what they are opposed to.

"It does Not Recognize Other Alternatives." Who knows what they mean there. It could be participation. I suggest as far as Crown corporations are concerned that everybody has a share. The Hon. Member who spoke before me says that no one owns Crown corporations. No one? It doesn't really make sense to me. It is not like other Crown corporations. That's a famous story, they look back on the Crown corporations that have been successful over the years and they say, "But that's different." Hindsight! With the kind of restricted look into the future that you Members have, we would never have anything new. I predict that in 10 or 15 years when some other governments decide to nationalize match boxes or whatever the case is, you will look back and say, "Resources? That's a good deal, but match boxes, that's different."

"The Government Has No Mandate to do this." I suggest that it has. On June 11, the people spoke.

MISS CLIFFORD: — You didn't ask the right questions.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — We didn't ask the right questions? We had them right in our little pamphlets, at least I did in my area, and I said in those pamphlets and in the news media, ads that were paid for by our people, that the resource industry and the potash industry should be given to the people of Saskatchewan and that we weren't going to give back hundreds of millions of dollars like Tories and Liberals were suggesting. I give you my word I said that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It just seems to me that every time a Bill comes up and Members opposite aren't in favor, we should have an election. I suggest that if we follow your suggestion to its logical conclusion, we'd have an election every day for 365 days of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you can determine that I will be opposing this amendment which will deprive the people of Saskatchewan of great benefits. I will be supporting the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult act to follow . . . However at the outset, I wish to say how proud I am personally to rise in this Legislature in support of what I say is landmark legislation.

Since the Hon. Attorney General first unveiled this Bill I have been intrigued, and Yes, I have been disappointed with the stance of Members opposite in relationship to this vitally important resource policy or resource Bill.

So far we have seen the Liberals and the Conservatives involved I would say in the game of "one-upmanship!" It appears to be a contest to see who can talk the loudest and the longest. I would have to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Leader of the Opposition has too much experience in his back pocket to be challenged successfully by the Member for Nipawin.

I have found this debate particularly revealing. This issue has confirmed what we have suspected for a long time, that there is really no difference at all between the two old line parties sitting opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — They both recognize that their survival depends upon unqualified support of their corporate friends. They have both done a reasonably good job in displaying that loyalty. However, let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, in doing so, they have also alienated the vast majority of Saskatchewan people who recognize the importance and the advisability in bringing forth this legislation.

The official Opposition say their party will not allow this legislation to be rammed through the House, and that they will use any tactics possible to delay its passage. Mr. Speaker, this Government is not afraid to debate the issues involved, however, I feel it is very unfortunate that this Legislature must endure the apparent 'never-ending' verbal assault of Members opposite whose motives are strictly political I would have to say and nothing else.

They say our decision to become involved in potash is arbitrary and unprecedented. They say it is unfair and it is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a moment or two commenting more specifically on some of those charges.

First, I wish to raise a few points in relationship to the question of whether or not our decision was arbitrary. For anyone who has not been a student of this issue, and for anyone who is unfamiliar with the history of potash development in Saskatchewan, that charge might sound like a fair one, however, that is most certainly not the case.

Aside from the fact that resources belong to the people, not the corporations, it is abundantly clear that multinational corporations have had their way far too long, and have made it very clear that they are either unwilling or unable to involve themselves in the process necessary to not only expand the industry but to co-operate with government in the sharing of revenues from the development of this non-renewable resource.

With potash now fetching close to \$70 per ton, compared with the \$37 per ton which was obtained in the mid-sixties, the old incentive argument certainly cannot be justified.

So recognizing our right to control our resources, Mr. Speaker, it was this Government, a New Democratic Party Government, which had the foresight and the determination to insure that the owners of this resource, the people of Saskatchewan get a better deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — These multinationals had the opportunity to display their responsibility, but they failed. Firstly they challenged our taxation legislation in the courts and then a few of them even refused to pay their provincial taxes. They were issued the challenge to expand and they refused to do so. The issue therefore, Mr. Speaker, is very clear to me, the potash industry needs orderly expansion and the only way we can assure orderly expansion is to do it ourselves.

The Opposition also calls this legislation unprecedented. Yes, they are probably right on this count, however, it certainly isn't the first time that an NDP Government has shown leadership I can assure you and foresight to do something positive for the people it represents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Unlike old line parties who consistently allow expediency to dictate their actions we, Mr. Speaker, are not afraid to act if that action will result in positive developments for the

province as a whole.

In 1962, Medicare was unprecedented as well, and I predict that in ten years' time, today's decision will reflect as positively on this Government as that struggle did as years passed.

Members opposite have also labelled this legislation as being 'unfair'. I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, unfair for whom? I ask Members opposite if it is fair that for years we have allowed foreign corporations to reap gross profits from the development of a resource which they do not own? Is that fair?

I also ask Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, if it is not fair for the people of Saskatchewan to expect a fair return from the development of these resources, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition if he thinks it is fair that millions and millions of dollars in profits leave this province each year and whether or not it is fair that not one Saskatchewan resident has any investment in this industry? However, when one remembers the Liberal policy respecting forestry development, Mr. Speaker, it isn't too difficult to understand their position respecting potash.

No, Mr. Speaker, the potash industry is not being purged. They have consistently been provided with the opportunity to continue. However, I would have to say they have fallen short.

During this debate, there has been much comment respecting the unpredictability of the potash industry and Members opposite say we should not invest our money in this industry because of its past history. Yet, they do not seem to be able to grasp the significance of why potash has in the past had its ups and its downs.

Mr. Speaker, this unpredictability and uncertainty is the very reason why this Government finds it necessary to involve itself. In order to ensure stability within the industry at all levels, we find ourselves committed to this challenge.

Saskatchewan possesses over 40 per cent of the world reserves of potash and our product is of very high grade. Demand for potash is increasing each year as the world continues to emphasize food production to meet the needs of spiralling populations.

There is no doubt that we need to expand potash production in Saskatchewan. World production is growing at something like 1.3 million tons per year. According to industry spokesmen, world demand will double within the next 14 years. The refusal of the potash companies to proceed with expansion, places Saskatchewan in a poor position in the international market.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to have our market jeopardized while the private companies hold out for even more tax concessions. It takes four to five years to even get a new mine into production. In the interim, if we have effective control of the industry we can expand some mines efficiently. The expansion must proceed without delay. The only way we can be sure of getting expansion in the way Saskatchewan wants it, and needs it, is to do what this Bill will do, to do it ourselves. The citizens of Saskatchewan will do it, working through their own company, Mr. Speaker, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition and the potash corporation say this decision is unnecessary. They would like to think it is unnecessary I am sure, however, we think differently.

In the calendar year 1974, total revenues from potash sales were \$312.6 million. Total Crown revenue was \$34.6 million.

In 1975, it is estimated that sales will be approximately \$400 million and Crown revenues will equal \$100 million. With prices expected to jump from the present \$70 per ton to \$100 per ton, I would say that profits will soar even higher.

The question is, who should benefit from these increased profits? Is it fair that we continue to allow these multinationals to enjoy a financial field day in Saskatchewan at the expense of Saskatchewan people? I say, Mr. Speaker, the answer is obviously, no.

The industry has made it clear they do not wish to co-operate. As I said earlier they fought us in the courts over our royalty legislation and they have steadfastly refused to take the necessary steps to expand and stabilize this important industry.

However, effective control through ownership of our potash industry will do more than keep the profits here in Saskatchewan where they belong. It will make Saskatchewan headquarters of the second largest potash operation in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Once in a while you will see an organization with a head office in Saskatchewan such as Federated Co-operatives, Intercontinental Packers, Co-operative Insurance, IPSCO, and so on. They are here, Mr. Speaker, but I remind you because they are either co-operatively organized by Saskatchewan people to serve themselves, or they are companies established and maintained here because of action or participation by an NDP government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — The history of this province shows that if we want to make something of Saskatchewan, we have to do it ourselves.

In 1975, we have decided to make something out of our potash industry. Effectively we are going to bring all or most of the head offices home, from New York, from Europe and from Chicago, wherever it may be.

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will employ many people. Managers, here to serve. These are not a new level of officials in a bureaucracy that did not exist before. These jobs exist now, Mr. Speaker, but they are not in Saskatchewan. They should be located in Saskatchewan making profits for Saskatchewan people, doing business here in our stores, and adding to our economy instead of siphoning dollars out of Saskatchewan and out of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I say, Mr. Speaker, it will be Saskatchewan citizens making the decisions, doing the job, and reaping the benefits. The hundreds of jobs that will be brought home; top managers; top engineers; and top decision makers. For that reason alone, the investment is worth it.

There is a desperate need for economic leadership in our nation. So far here we have private corporations owned by people in other countries and currently making decisions that we should be making here.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, now is the time to display leadership, to show Canadians it is possible to buy back our economy and our country. In Saskatchewan we are setting an example and we are providing a model of leadership for all Canadians by making this move Mr. Speaker, to attain effective control through ownership of our most vital mineral industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Saskatchewan has led the way before. Now is the time for national leadership in the resource field. Once again Saskatchewan is leading the way. Mr. Speaker, we will never have a better opportunity to do it than right now.

I know that judging from my remarks it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I offer my fullest support for the passing of this legislation and I will vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. E.G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to Bill 2 and the amendment to Bill 2, an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Since the opening of the Legislature on November 12th, we have listened to many well researched and learned debates on the Liberal side of the House on Bill 1, regarding the development of the potash resources in the Province of Saskatchewan and Bill 2, respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

We of the Liberal Party oppose the takeover of the potash industry in this province and we oppose the creation of a new Crown corporation which is called the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We oppose these two pieces of legislation because we believe the course proposed by the Government regarding the development of our potash resources will not result in the best deal for the people of our province.

In speaking about Crown corporations I refute the criticisms of the Members opposite who say that the Liberal Party opposes all Crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I particularly refute the criticisms of the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) who says the Liberals have a burning dislike for Crown corporations. I refute the charges made by one of the Hon. Members of the Government in criticizing me when he said, quoting me, government enterprises usually take

ten times as many people to get one-tenth of the productivity. He accused me of saying that the average civil servant is inefficient and lazy. Such is not the case. I too would commend the good, loyal, hard-working civil servants. There are many who come into that category.

However, let me cite an incident that illustrates an attitude of some workers serving the public in government offices. It's an illustration of how government offices are run and how the people are treated. It gives an illustration of why people feel that they are not getting the best service. About five minutes to five one evening in Saskatoon, and I'll not mention the office, because I think it might be typical of all government offices, I went into a government office to ask for some information and found they didn't have the information and I would have to use a telephone to phone another government office. While I was talking to the girl another girl put her head around the door and said, "It's 5:00 o'clock, lock the door." With that the girl I was talking to, jumped up and ran and locked the door. When she came back, she said, "What did you want?" I said, "I want to use your telephone." She said, "You can't use my telephone." I said, "Why?" She said, "It's 5:00 o'clock and we're all going home." And they did! And they locked the front door and I had to get out the back door. They all left.

Now what business would stay in business very long if they treated their customers like that, or their shareholders? Have you ever been in a retail outlet and been treated like that at 5:00 o'clock, they locked the doors?

It's that kind of treatment of the general public that gives the feeling that civil servants' first concern is not service to the public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I'm just giving an incident. I wanted to remind you that I said there are many civil servants who are giving good, loyal service. It's the system that they are working under.

The fact is, government run enterprises do not have to meet competition and economic pressures as a business in the private sector does. Therefore, they face the danger of growing into unwieldy bureaucracies tied up in government red tape and inefficiency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — A further problem, Crown corporations are so closely related with government, they run the risk of having political decisions forced upon them. Political decisions that may or may not be good business decisions and which may or may not be in the best interests of the corporations or the people the corporation was created to serve. The most recent blatant example of political interference in the policy making decisions of a Crown corporation has been witnessed in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and resulted in the firing and public humiliation of two of the most loyal, trustworthy and efficient civil servants that a Crown corporation could have in its employ.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — Both Mr. Keith and Mr. Reed had given a lifetime of loyal devoted service to the Power Corporation, and then they were rewarded with a callous dismissal by a heartless government.

The Members opposite continually compare the creation of the new Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to existing Crown Corporations such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation or Saskatchewan Telecommunications. I say there is a basic difference. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Telecommunications were created as monopolistic Crown corporations managing utilities whose purpose is to provide a service, and I stress that word service to the people of the province, at as reasonable a cost as possible. Although recent gigantic rate increases prompts one to ask the question have they lost sight of the goal of providing services at a reasonable cost.

The proposed industrial potash corporation is not created to render a service to people but rather for political reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The Potash Corporation is being created to take over and manage an existing industry. The Potash Corporation will not be providing a service but will attempt to mine and sell a product, the product is potash. They will attempt to mine and sell it at competitive prices on a world market. In debates from the Government side and we have heard it again this morning from the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) I have heard it said that the Liberals would knife Crown corporations in the back.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Agreed.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Which reminds me, I think there was a knife on one of the desks over on the Government side the other day. Maybe it is the Government that is going to knife people. Did you put it away? It is the Government side who had the knife ready. The Government Members say that the Liberals oppose all Crown corporations and would set out to dissolve them. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We say there is a place for well-managed efficient Crown corporations, corporations that give good service to the people of this province. I would say that Sask Power and Sask Tel are giving good service. What we do object to in the strongest manner possible is the decision of this Government to take over the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — We object to the creation of a new industrial Crown corporation for the purpose of taking over an industry that is already in existence and producing. An industry which at the present time is bringing in millions of dollars annually in taxation. We object to the powers that Bill 2 gives to the proposed Potash Corporation. Bill 2 in Sections 9, 10 and 11 speaks of powers. I should like to read into the records some of the powers it speaks of.

In addition to any other powers conferred by this Act, the corporation may (Section (a) under powers) acquire, own, lease, open, explore, develop, work, manage, maintain, and improve mines and mining properties, and dig for, process, refine, otherwise treat, conserve, store and transport potash and potash bearing substances whether belonging to the corporation or not, and render merchantable, purchase, sell or otherwise dispose of potash or any interest in potash.

Section (b) under powers. Manufacture, buy, sell and otherwise deal as principals and as agents in and with all kinds of fertilizers, both natural and artificial chemicals and natural products of all kinds and all elements and materials entering into the composition or manufacture of fertilizers, chemicals and natural products thereof, and generally carry on the business of manufacturers of and wholesale and retail dealers in all kinds of fertilizers, both natural and artificial chemicals and natural products.

Section (c). Associate, participate or enter into joint or other ventures of individuals, associations or other bodies or corporations in the exploration for, development, management, utilization, conservation, purchase or sale of potash or for any other purposes of the corporation and take part in the management supervision or control of the joint or other ventures.

Section (d). Regulate by resolution or other means the proceedings at meetings of the corporation and provide generally for the conduct and the management of the affairs of the corporation.

There are a number of powers and I won't go through them all. I think Section (h) is interesting:

Apply for or acquire any secret or other information concerning any invention where the secret or information seems calculated directly or indirectly to benefit the corporation.

Sections 9, 10 and 11 state the powers of what Bill 2 will do.

On January 15th, last year, Mr. D.B. Furlong, a well respected brilliant, former, general manager of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation spoke on the role of the Crown corporations. Regarding the creation of a new industrial Crown corporation he said:

He had pretty definite ideas about the creation of new industrial Crown corporations. He believed creation of new industrial Crown corporations should be approached with extreme caution.

In his opinion there were certain important criteria that should be met before such a step is taken. He listed five points which should be considered. I will list them for you, then I want to deal with them.

1. There should be a real need, for example, in some significant fashion the industry should be shown to

be incapable of or unwilling to do the job properly.

2. There should be solid public support so that there is little risk of reversal in future political changes.

3. The costs and money requirements should be realistically evaluated and provided for.

4. There should be a hard-nosed evaluation of the advantages and not just a woolly, vague feeling that because it is owned by the people it is necessarily better. He hopes everyone realizes that that is a myth.

5. In practically all cases if similar results can be achieved by taxation, regulation and government incentives, the Crown corporation route should be abandoned or deferred.

Let us now examine the five points made by Mr. Furlong and relate them to the present debate on Bill 2, the Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, 1975. The first point, there should be real need. It should be shown that the industry is incapable of or unwilling to do the job properly.

The socialist government opposite would have us and the people of this province believe that the potash companies fall into the category of being incapable of or unwilling to do the job properly. What a disservice this Government is doing to the companies and to our citizens to try and sell such an idea. The potash companies came as experts to this province and I stress at the invitation and with the encouragement of the Saskatchewan government. The fact that the potash companies were multinational corporations didn't seem to bother our former NDP Premier, T.C. Douglas. He knew that without their investment of millions of dollars, billions of dollars and without their expertise to overcome the almost insurmountable mining problems Saskatchewan would never be in a position to market her potash.

Mr. Speaker, the former Premier, T.C. Douglas knew it was necessary to sign agreements before the companies would locate here. And so he did. He gave guarantees of fair taxation, and no danger of expropriation. It is interesting to note now how one NDP government could set aside and rationalize its philosophy and desire for state ownership, in order to get the potash companies to locate here. And now to watch another NDP government do a complete reverse on a former NDP government and set out on a nationalization program. The present socialist government has broken the solemn agreements made by T.C. Douglas, agreements that have been read out in all their detail to this Assembly on several occasions.

It has been brought to our attention this morning by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Centre that Mr. Douglas now says he has been misquoted. Mr. Douglas now says that he blames the companies, he says that they broke their promises. But I would point out that during the past months this Government has ignored and turned their back on former agreements. They have set out on a planned course of relentless and ever increasing taxation, until the potash companies have been strangled and brought to their knees. In such a situation with now the added threat of expropriation, it is not surprising that the potash companies have cancelled all plans for expansion.

Mr. Speaker, this Government after creating the impasse with the potash companies they would now have us believe that the takeover of the industry is a necessity to ensure the future expansion and development of this vital industry. Although the potash has been in the ground for hundreds of years, the Government is trying to convince us that it is necessary to rush these Bills through, in fact, it was their desire to have them put through before Christmas, I would say for one reason. Before the people of the province would have time to realize the serious repercussions of such action. The Government has through its public propaganda campaign used taxpayers' moneys to try and convince the same taxpayers that the potash companies who have developed our potash industry are not now capable of doing a proper job, and that they are not working in the interests of the people of the province. However, I would say that government propaganda will not fool or convince the thinking people in this province that the proposed move by the Government is a good business deal. It is evident to a growing number of people in our province that the real need Mr. Furlong mentioned as a first criterion for setting up a Crown corporation does not exist in Saskatchewan. There is no demonstrated need for the Government to enter directly into the potash industry in Saskatchewan.

The second point made by Mr. Furlong, was that there should be solid public support. I think this is an important point that the Government Members should take note of. If the Government had wanted to assure themselves of strong public support for such a serious and far reaching move as the nationalization of the potash industry, they had every opportunity to do so at the time of the June election, six months ago. The Government at that time had the opportunity to go to the people, go to them honestly and put the question before them. And set out at that time all the political and economic ramifications of such a move on the present and on the future of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the socialist Government was afraid to make the nationalization of the potash industry an election issue. Far better to win the election by promising more and more free programs and then surprise the citizens on the first day of the Eighteenth Session of the Legislature about takeover plans for the potash industry. Plans that no doubt had been in the making for many months.

The people of Saskatchewan should have been given the opportunity to express their opinion about the Government plans and people in Saskatchewan should have been given the opportunity to voice their opinions about the province borrowing billions of dollars at today's interest rates. The people of Saskatchewan should have been given the opportunity to express their opinion about a government that goes back on former agreements.

The Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) has so truly and ably said that Saskatchewan people were brought up to take pride in the fact that in Saskatchewan a man's word is as good as his bond. He said, "Saskatchewan people do not like welchers," and that is a fact. Saskatchewan people do not approve of a government that welches on its word and its agreements.

Had the Saskatchewan people been presented with the facts and the financial implications at the time of the election, people of the province would not have indicated approval of such government action and indeed many of the Members opposite would

not be sitting here as elected Members today. A Liberal government would have restored good commonsense government to this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot claim that they have solid support for the creation of a new Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. The Government must be aware of the strong opposition by a great many people in this province. As I mentioned in earlier debates, I still read in the paper that the Government have a slogan, "Speak up, The Government Wants to Hear You" and yet individuals phone in their objections and have reported that they have not had their calls accepted. Citizens in Saskatoon phoning the government office there have been quizzed unnecessarily regarding their name, their address and occupation. Perhaps they too fear retaliation for a stand that they have taken and for the trouble they have taken to inform the Government of their opinion.

I am sorry the Member for Saskatoon Centre has left his seat, I would like to compliment him. I am told that he is a teacher. Is that correct? I think he missed his calling, he should have been in the theatre. As a matter of fact when I go back to Saskatoon I am going to recommend him to Gateway Players. I would vote for him an Academy Award for the year.

MR. ROLFES: — Plays his role well.

MRS. EDWARDS: — If the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) will refer all my compliments to the Member for Saskatoon Centre about his theatrical abilities, I'll be most grateful. I said he is a great actor. The Member for Saskatoon Centre boasts of his loyalty to Saskatoon and at the same time he threatens retaliation to business groups in Saskatoon who have dared to voice their opinion about government takeover of the potash industry. I was glad to see he had many papers, he reads from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, the Globe and Mail and the Leader-Post. I think his attack on the Board of Trade is unwarranted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The reason the Board of Trade have taken the stand against the takeover of the potash industry is because they are interested in the business and industrial development of that city and this province and they know that it is not a good business deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — If it has become the situation in Saskatchewan that we have a political climate where Saskatchewan citizens and groups fear retaliation when they speak out about government action, we are indeed facing a much greater and frightening situation than just the nationalization of an industry. We are facing the loss of one of our most cherished basic freedoms, the freedom of speech.

I am glad the Member for Saskatoon Centre is back, perhaps

I should repeat what I said, he has missed it. I have been told that your profession is teaching. I suggested to the House that you missed your calling, that you should have been in drama and I am going to recommend you for Gateway Players when I go home. I should like to see you in one of their productions, I am sure you would get the academy award of the year. I might even vote for you, you are a great actor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It must be all the hours of teaching that you have had experience in.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Are you suggesting a command performance?

MRS. EDWARDS: — We had that this morning! We'll get you an award.

Mr. Speaker, this Government certainly does not have the solid support that is so necessary for such a drastic move as the creation of a new Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation.

If I may read to you as a third point, that Mr. Furlong had made, "The costs and money requirements should be realistically evaluated and provided for." I think I should like to remind the House that again the man making these statements was the former general manager of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. He made these statements long before this potash debate ever came on the scene. He is setting out five points that should be settled before any government should create a new Crown corporation. That is point number three.

There have been many estimates made about the costs and financial implications that nationalization of the potash will mean for the Province of Saskatchewan. It has been said that to buy or expropriate all or part of the potash industry will result in one of the largest financial commitments taken on by any provincial government in history. Some estimate the amount required will be at least \$1 billion, others say it will be close to \$2 billion.

Bill No. 2, speaking of finance and advances by the Minister of Finance, Section 14. It states in Section 14:

- (1) The Minister of Finance may out of the consolidated fund advance moneys to the corporation for its purposes in such amounts, at such times and upon such terms as may be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.
- (2) In order to provide the funds required under subsection (1) the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize the Minister of Finance to raise, by way of a loan upon the credit of the Province, any sum or sums of money that may be required and for that purpose to issue bonds, debentures or such other securities of the province as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council considers advisable, and to pay those moneys to the corporation for its use.
- (3) The sum or sums of money mentioned in subsection (2) shall be raised in accordance with The Saskatchewan Loans Act

and may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding thirty years and at such rate of interest as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may determine; and the sum or sums shall be raised upon the credit of the consolidated fund and shall be chargeable to that fund.

It is interesting to read under the part on finance and the power to borrow all the powers that the Act gives to the Government. However, it is also significant to note what it doesn't say. It is significant to note that Bill 2 does not have a clause that sets out the limitation on borrowing. The Premier has thrown out the figures stating the amounts could be anywhere from \$500 million to \$1 billion. This is not definitive enough to be accepted by the Members of our caucus.

It is interesting that other Acts setting up Saskatchewan Crown corporations do set out clearly the limitation on borrowing powers, for instance, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation when first set up, the limitation on borrowing clearly stated \$50 million as the limitation. Saskatchewan Telecommunications, the limitation on borrowing powers stated in the Act respecting Saskatchewan Government Telephones, when the corporation was first set up the limitation was set at \$25 million. There have been subsequent amendments to both those Acts since then. The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, an Act respect the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation sets the borrowing limitation at \$75 million.

Mr. Speaker, in our opinion it is essential that Bill 2 include a clause similar to all these other Crown corporations, setting out the limitation of borrowing for the potash company. How can the Government Members opposite expect us to approve a bill which does not set out clearly what the costs will be? In other words, how can the Government expect Members of the Opposition to approve a bill or as they say, "buy a pig in a poke."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan should be given the true picture of the financial implications, for the province, the true picture of what borrowing millions, perhaps billions of dollars at today's interest rates would mean. The citizens, the taxpayers of this province should know and realize the Provincial Treasury will be giving up millions of dollars each year, funds that were previously received from taxation and royalty revenues, moneys that are badly needed to finance health, housing, education, highways and many other programs. It seems to me that at a time when there is a great need for increased financial help in the province, we are already seeing cutbacks in provincial spending, cutbacks that have already been announced which directly affect many communities in Saskatchewan.

Examples I could cite of how austerity in spending affects communities and when government help is so badly needed. I could relate, in my own constituency, in my own city where the capital budget for school construction has been drastically cut. An example in my own constituency; Evan Hardy Collegiate where the enrolment has been increasing dramatically because of new housing development in that area. There is a desperate need for eight new classrooms. The school was built to house 850 to 900 students and now the enrolment is closer to 1,200. This is an example of how government spending doesn't keep up with different areas. The Government on one hand is encouraging new housing starts and boasting about new housing starts and saying the Federal Government should do more. It is a habit of this

Government, every time there is a problem to say it, the Federal Government should do more. We have new housing starts, there is a lot of development in our area, East College Park.

I should like to bring out another point. The Government has apparently not realized that when you have new housing starts you have to have schools. That's where the children are, so they cut back on capital money for schools. How do they expect children to go to school if there are no classrooms?

School boards and citizens need financial help in order to provide the facilities in the area or they need assistance with transportation costs, if children are forced by lack of classrooms in one area to go to another. So you see when there are housing starts, it follows there have to be services, schools and transportation and the Government should realize that.

If austerity measures because of lack of money coming in from tax revenues are going to be laid down as far down as the constituency level, it is certainly going to affect the health care programs. I see the Minister of Health is here. Last night I was reading an article where he was calling, as many of the Cabinet Ministers do, for more federal aid, for every kind of health program. I say we need the money from the taxation of the potash industry to help with our health care. I think the severe limitation of budgets on acute care hospitals is forcing the rationing of services to our people. The Government on one hand boasts of free hospitalization. That's a good thing, but it is not doing any good for the people that can't get in to take advantage of it.

I should like to remind the Government opposite, that now we see, because health care costs have been rising, we see a trend, I say we are going back full circle to the days when we stressed home care. Before hospitalization people had to stay at home because they couldn't afford hospital care, now we are saying once again, don't get sick and go to the hospital, stay at home, we can't afford to run the hospitals. Perhaps cutting back is the answer. Maybe that's the only thing that can be done. What I am saying is that the money that we could be receiving off the taxation of the potash industry, instead of investing it, could be used to help our acute care hospitals with their budgets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I am like the Member for Saskatoon Centre, I am a little hard of hearing . . .

MR. ROLFES: — We have a hearing aid program!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I have heard about that. I haven't seen the Member for Saskatoon Centre taking advantage of it yet. What did you say?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — For you, Evelyn I leave my glasses on.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Are they rose colored? You see me in a better light that way.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say on this, could I call it 12:30?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I think we had better.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 until 2:30 p.m.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Mr. Speaker, just before the lunch break, I was bringing to the attention of the House some points made by the former general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. D.B. Furlong when he spoke on the role of Crown corporations. He was speaking about some of the points that should be looked into very carefully and settled before any government should consider the creation of a new industrial Crown corporation.

Just so that we may pick up the thread of the debate, I should like to review those five points and pick up where I left off on the financing end of it. His first point was that there should be a real need. In some significant fashion the industry should be shown to be incapable of or unwilling to do the job properly.

2. There should be solid public support so there is little risk of reversal in future political changes.
3. The costs and money requirements should be realistically evaluated and provided for.
4. There should be a hard-nosed evaluation of the advantages and not just woolly vague feeling that because it is owned by the people, it is necessarily better. He said he hoped everyone realized that that was a myth.
5. In practically all cases if similar results can be achieved by taxation, regulation and government incentives, the Crown corporation route should be abandoned or deferred.

Now in speaking about his point that the costs and money requirements should be realistically evaluated and provided for, I was bringing to the attention of the House that at the present time we are in Saskatchewan receiving from taxation, millions of dollars to help with a variety of programs that are badly needed throughout this province. I had mentioned some specific instances in my own constituency and in the city of Saskatoon.

I should like to pick the debate up there and say that health care of our senior citizens is an area that needs a great deal of attention and probably a great deal more in the way of money spent on it. I don't think I need to say again, but I will say that there is a severe shortage of Level IV beds in Saskatoon and I know that at the present time I haven't heard of any government plans to ease the situation. I would say it is of little comfort to the people waiting and waiting for this kind of accommodation to know that the Government is going to put valuable dollars into buying potash. All the acute care hospitals in Saskatoon have long stay patients, using expensive acute care beds. I don't think I need to remind this House that that's not an efficient way to be spending the health dollar. The best way is to have the right patient in the right bed at the right time.

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) says the Government has decided or is planning that foster home care is

going to receive a higher priority than institutional care for our elderly. Well he's suggesting, I should say, I don't want to misquote him, that this may be an alternative and I'd say that's perhaps something that can be done. However . . .

MR. ROLFES: — The Government didn't say that, I said that.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Well, certainly there needs to be some great study done and some answers brought forward for the care of our senior citizens. But, Mr. Speaker, before we move in any direction such as that I would suggest to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) that we try to determine at the present time how many private homes are now providing care to the aged. We've had many chats about this and I put a question forth on November 21st.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. If the Member is allowed to proceed with her discussion this would indicate to me that I would have an opportunity to rebut some of those things in the same debate on the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . inaudible . . .

MR. ROLFES: — I didn't know your name was Mrs. Edwards, but if it is, okay I'll speak to you, but I'd much sooner speak to Mrs. Edwards, the Member for Sutherland.

On the Point of Order if she is allowed to proceed then I should like to have the same opportunity to rebut on the Potash Corporation or establishment of the Potash Corporation as it pertains to nursing homes. I don't know just how it does pertain to that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Up to this point I have been hesitating to interrupt the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland because she is one of the few Members who has been staying fairly close to the topic under discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — However, I would have to agree with the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista that nursing homes hardly fall within the discussion of the principle of the Potash Corporation. If I can steer her back on to the subject, I'm sure she will serve as a model to all Members on that side when they are making their point in the debate.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize if I have strayed from the subject, but I really was trying to make the point that the people who require the care need the dollars that are going to be borrowed and used to buy potash. This is an instance. It's not the nursing home, it's the people who need the care whom I'm talking about and they are the ones who would not vote for the potash.

I think if you would put the question to people, would you rather have a bed and have somebody look after you when you are sick and elderly, or would you rather have the Government put the money into potash, I think the answer would be very clear. That's the point I'm making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — That's not the point. You ask Dave Steuart the last time when he borrowed money for nursing homes and hospitals. Never.

MRS. EDWARDS: — No, I'm not saying that we should borrow money for them. I'm saying that the revenues we are now receiving from the potash which we will not be receiving when we buy it, for maybe 20 years, we'll have to feed it back in. We will be missing that money. In other words, in my opinion and maybe I'm not all that great on economics, but I don't think you can spend your money twice. I've never been able to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — That's pretty basic.

MR. ROMANOW: — We'll get Leonard Larson to reply.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Well, if the Hon. Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) can tell me how to spend my money twice or the Government's money twice, he should be the Minister of Finance and I tell you he'd be a magician. He'd be moving right up to the front bench.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might go on and I will try to keep right to the subject of Crown corporations, but I did want to bring out this point about one very vital area that would need government help. I brought it out recently in a resolution and that has to do with the difficulties municipalities are facing right now with property taxes having to be increased and increased until they are unbearable for property owners. I said in that resolution that there should be new tax sharing agreements between the Provincial Government and municipalities.

I think the days are gone when municipalities have only one way at their disposal, of taxation, in order to provide services for this ever growing and increasing population that they see, and all the demands for increased services that come with it.

Of course, in my own constituency, if you may bear with me on this one point. I do want to make it. I'm sure if the voters of Saskatoon- Sutherland were given the choice of priorities in government spending, about whether they would prefer some money going towards a new bridge or towards a potash mine, I think the vote would be very clear. They would prefer that we use tax revenue and put some money towards a new bridge and new services for that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It would be unfortunate indeed if the Provincial Government could not see its way clear to co- operate and I mean co- operate financial and every other way with the Federal Government and local government, particularly now that the funds for the Yellowhead route have been allocated so that we could be sure of an early start on this very necessary bridge for Saskatoon.

This is no time for the Government to be borrowing money to buy mines when we could be receiving taxation revenues. I am sure that every MLA here could cite similar examples and instances in their own municipalities where provincial financial assistance is badly needed.

I would say that the Government of Saskatchewan should level with the people and tell them, that instead of receiving millions each year, they will be paying out millions in interest payments alone. Paying out badly needed dollars to repay capital and interest money, that will go to the same multinational potash corporations that were kicked out of the province and who, with their expertise and knowledge in the mining of potash and their knowledge of world markets, will be investing their money elsewhere, in competition against us. Competition that will be financed with our own money.

The sums mentioned, millions or billions, are beyond the comprehension of the average person. The Government nonchalantly tosses out the words as though they meant nothing. To bring it down to terms that are easier for the average citizen to understand it would be similar to the Government borrowing \$2,000 to \$3,000 on behalf of every man, woman and child in this province. Likely at an interest rate of ten to eleven per cent. Or to put it another way, approximately \$10,000 on behalf of the average family.

The interest rate alone will cost millions. It is estimated that it will be at least 20 years before any financial benefits will come to the people of this province. The financial implications because of borrowing such fantastic amounts are frightening to even the most experienced and sophisticated businessman or economist.

It was recently reported in the Star- Phoenix that:

There is a very real danger that there may not be the demand for potash in the future, the same as there has been in the past.

The article went on to say that:

Many countries are now realizing their pressing and primary need is a need for more and new energy sources, and they are putting their money in that direction. Therefore potash purchases will not be a first priority on their shopping list and in their budget preparation.

The people of this province are beginning to realize one further financial implication. That is the effect nationalization of an existing industry will have on future business and industrial investment in the province. The good business reputation and good name that has been attained for Saskatchewan and it's been attained by the hard work done in the past

by former governments, Departments of Industry and Commerce and others who have worked hard to promote Saskatchewan. This good reputation will be ruined by this act of nationalization.

Potential business and industrial development will find places other than Saskatchewan to invest their money. Our citizens will be the losers in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up point number three made by Mr. Furlong and that was a point that the cost and money requirements should be realistically evaluated and provided for, I submit that this has not been done by the Government. The Government has not provided the detailed information to this House or the people of the province to justify the creation of a new Crown corporation, the Potash Corporation.

The fourth point I would like to speak on is, I quote:

There should be a hard-nosed evaluation of the advantages and not just a woolly vague feeling that because it is owned by the people it is necessarily better.

Mr. Furlong went on to say:

that such a conclusion is a myth.

And he is quite right.

There has been enough sad experiences in Saskatchewan with government run enterprises to prove to the citizens of this province and to this Government (if they would admit it) that government run enterprises do not have a good track record in this province. They are not successful in the business world in competition with the private sector. Only a few Saskatchewan industrial Crown corporations have created the jobs that were predicted. Only a few have returned any significant financial gain to the provincial treasury. In spite of the fact government sponsored businesses often enjoy the preferred position of benefitting from special consideration, subsidies and tax advantages not afforded to the private sector.

May I remind this House and the citizens of this province about some of the failures when government tried its wings in business. I know the Members opposite do not like to be reminded of these but when you are looking to pass legislation that you are, you should look at the past and see what lessons can be learned. I'm going to list some of these Crown corporations.

The Box Factory Division that was established on November 3, 1945. It was dissolved on October 31, 1957. The Fish Marketing Division, established May 1, 1949, sold on April 30, 1959 and dissolved on April 30, 1959. The Government Trading Division, established November 1, 1948, dissolved March 31, 1959.

MR. BYERS: — What happened to them?

MRS. EDWARDS: — If you don't know, if the Members opposite don't know what's happened to them, I suggest they should find out. That's part of the lesson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — If one of them would like to take part in the debate, I'd be glad to let them, if they want to tell us.

The Clay Products Division established May 15, 1945, sold January 1st, 1966. The Fidelity Company Ltd., established October 2, 1949, sold July 31, 1954. The Tannery Division, established July 5, 1946, dissolved December 31, 1949. World Products Division, established June 5, 1945, dissolved March 31, 1954. Leather Products Division, established June 12, 1945, dissolved December 31, 1949. Saskatchewan Reconstruction Corporation, established May 8, 1945, dissolved December 31, 1951. Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing, established August 17, 1945, dissolved March 31, 1947. The Saskatchewan Fish Board, established July 20, 1945, dissolved October 31, 1949.

The socialist government that set up the Crown corporation such as the box factory, the tannery, the shoe factory and the woollen mill tried to tell the people of Saskatchewan that it would be in their best interests to own such enterprises. They said there would be new jobs and prosperity. To the Government's horror and to the dismay of our citizens such predictions resulted in quite the reverse.

The company I have listed ended in disaster, were sold or dissolved.

In spite of the questions I put to the Government soon after the opening of the Legislature, we have not yet been informed of what return we have received on one of the most recent business ventures taken on by this Government. The investment of millions of dollars for less than 50 per cent of the shares in Intercontinental Packers. This information in my opinion should be readily available. It think it should be before this House before we agree to the Government launching us on one more of their hairy, scarey schemes.

The reluctance to answer my question would lead me to believe that there has really in actual fact been no profit at all but indeed a loss. Indeed recent reports from Intercontinental would lead us to believe that there are less people working at Intercontinental than before.

One of the most recently created Crown corporations, Saskoil should also be closely examined at this time, to determine the effect it has had on the oil industry and the exploration for oil in this province. It is well known and has been well documented by the Hon. Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) that since the passing of Bill 42 the oil industry has been in a slump in this province.

The attitude of the present Government has discouraged oil companies which have the money and the knowhow to do further exploration in this province. All this at a time when as I said before, the number one priority of this Government should be the seeking of new petroleum resources and new energy sources.

In 1974 in Saskatchewan there were 286 drilling starts. Fewer than at any time in the past 22 years. However, in 1975 the picture is more dismal. We have reached an all time low. We have now 212 drilling starts. One only needs to visit

Lloydminster, a border town, a border city to see how government policies effect oil exploration. New wells are continually being developed on the Alberta side while the Saskatchewan side shows little or no increase in the number of wells being drilled or developed.

In spite of the fact that Husky Oil owns property in Lloydminster on the Saskatchewan side, in spite of the fact their huge office complex was built on the Saskatchewan side during the time a Liberal Government was in power in this province and Husky Oil had future plans at that time to locate a refinery on Saskatchewan property, it is interesting to note that just before Christmas their \$75 million refinery was announced and is going to be built, and I'd like to tell this House that it is very sad to see that it's going to be built two miles inside the Alberta border.

This \$75 million refinery will also produce coke to supply the Aluminum Company of Canada and will be the largest coking operation in western Canada. This is a development that could have been and should have been developed in Saskatchewan. It is one more example how the policies of this Government are driving business and investment out of our province.

Another example, I have been told that since the announcement of the takeover of the potash industry, over \$200 million worth of construction that was ready to go and this is construction of a variety of projects in Saskatchewan was cancelled, following the announcement of the takeover of the potash industry.

Mr. Speaker, the socialists of today in Saskatchewan have not learned from the mistakes of the past. I think they must have a book somewhere away back where they read from and it must be called, 'Do It Yourself Kit', because they say anything you can do, we can do better. It would seem that they are not capable of learning from the lessons, even of the present, such as the defeat and rejection of socialism in British Columbia and more recently the defeat of socialism in Australia. Surely the disasters of the past socialist experiments into the business sector and the more recent rejection of socialist policies and programs at the polls, it would seem to me that all these lessons would bring sobering thoughts to the most radical socialists of this province. And particularly to those who insist on pushing this legislation through this House. I like that word 'pushing' — struggling.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . more like struggle.

MRS. EDWARDS: — I am glad that you recognize the struggle, Mr. Attorney General. As a matter of fact this is a speech that I prepared for December 15th and it is now January 15th. It is like the potash, it didn't go mouldy — it is better with age as are most things.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say again that the history of this province does not show any evidence that government run enterprises are better. Instead of bringing the increased revenue and the jobs that were promised, in many instances that I have cited, they have been a dismal failure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to point number five. Mr. Furlong said in point number five, particularly all cases if similar results can be achieved by taxation, regulation and government incentives, the Crown corporation route should be abandoned or deferred.

Mr. Furlong was well qualified to speak on the role of Crown corporations. I suppose that he was a man who would know the Saskatchewan situation regarding Crown corporations better than most having been general manager of Sask Power and a very successful and well qualified general manager he was. I agree with Mr. Furlong's remarks regarding the development of our resources.

It has been demonstrated in this province that good financial results have been achieved through taxation, regulation and government incentives. The original agreements made with the potash industry took into consideration, in the first instance, the heavy financial risk that potash companies had to embark on to locate here and develop mines in the province. Responsible governments in the past know that fair taxation and good government regulations would, in the long run, bring greater benefits to our people than in investing enormous amounts of risk capital to own and operate our own mines.

The present Government has abandoned the policy of fair taxation and they have increased taxes until they have placed such a heavy burden on the industry that the companies claim, and they say that they pay now over 80 per cent of the net revenue in taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the millions of dollars gained annually by taxation should have been enough to satisfy a reasonable government and a reasonable government would not be proposing the creation of a new Crown corporation to take over and manage the potash industry as it exists today.

I have listed five points that should be seriously considered before taking the steps that the Government proposes. The Government cannot argue that there is justified reason to set up a new corporation. And they cannot argue on any one of the five points, the facts that there are no justifiable reasons for the Government to take the proposed drastic actions towards the potash industry have been clearly demonstrated.

Mr. Furlong went on to one other point, and I think we touched on it yesterday, about Crown corporations, and that is "how do you judge their inefficiency or efficiency?" This is a growing concern, I suppose it should be, to all people, certainly to governments.

He said that in business, economics and competition soon weed out inefficient operations. But, as I mentioned earlier in this speech, unfortunately such pressures do not reach Crown corporations and government enterprises and they continue to exist with the help of government grants, subsidies, tax considerations, even if they are inefficient.

Mr. Furlong suggested that there should be regular and drastic review of the contribution of Crown corporations and he said that the review should be divorced from the political scene. Instead, of what he called the useless exercise of Crown Corporation Committees, corporations should report

annually to a management review board, consisting of accountants, business people, professional and academic people, people who would be paid to advise the government or parliament publicly about the relevance of each corporation and the time for review.

Mr. Furlong concluded his speech by saying:

Crown corporations are an established feature of the Canadian provincial scene. Many are useful, many are almost useless. Some machinery or pressure needs to be devised to eliminate the least successful.

And he stressed that the creation of new industrial Crown corporations should be approached with great caution. This is particularly true if the pressure to create a new corporation is mainly political.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the socialist Government opposite would do well to take heed of the wise advice of one so knowledgeable about the role of Crown corporations and their relationship to government.

In spite of the long debates bringing to the attention of the government the dangers and the pitfalls of creating a Crown corporation it would seem that the Government has closed its eyes and ears to all the objections and has stated that they are going ahead. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they have gone ahead to the point where as long ago as mid- December or earlier they were advertising, advertising in the newspaper. Perhaps this was before they decided to hire a consulting firm in eastern Canada to go out hiring and headhunting for them. But I should like to read you an ad that I cut out of the paper because I think it indicates, if this was the first person they were looking for, what they were looking for in Saskatchewan and the kind of person they want in the potash company. I am sorry there are so few Members over there because I thought some of them might even be thinking of applying for this job. This is from December 13th, Saturday, Star- Phoenix. It says here and this ad was put out by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Who put it out?

MRS. EDWARDS: — The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, it says here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, they are not even in existence yet, are they?

MRS. EDWARDS: — But they are advertising, they are going to get people. The ad says:

We need a take charge type . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Henry Baker . . .

MRS. EDWARDS: — Henry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I wonder what a takecharge type would do? It goes on to say: "a takecharge type" . . . and it goes on to what he would

do, this very special person whoever he may be, I will read on and we will see.

. . . is to plan, implement and manage abroad . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — A broad?

MRS. EDWARDS: — Oh no, just a minute, "abroad communications," I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

. . . advertising and public relations programs.

Well, I guess that is the kind of person they need to sell the whole idea. You have to get the public relations person first.

MR. MALONE: — Dunskey, yes he has some experience.

MRS. EDWARDS: — Dunskey, perhaps we will get that information from the other side of the House. Probably they know, but we will speculate. It goes on to say:

. . . you are a professional.

A pro? Surely not. It says:

. . . a professional but mature in your outlook.

An older person, naturally.

. . . but young and progressive your ways.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . the Member for Nipawin.

MRS. EDWARDS: — It can't be the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). That is almost impossible.

. . . mature, but young and progressive.

Now it goes on to the next paragraph:

. . . you may be a seasoned pro.

Now what is that, a seasoned pro? No, just a minute, "you may just be coming into your own, but you have a proven track record." Now this track record but I don't mean the kind of track that you run on, but it says"

. . . in developing good corporate communication strategy.

Remember, this has to be in a variety of situations. I don't know if they can find a person for this job. When we know who that person is, I would like to meet him, her, it.
It says:

. . . you will be able to interpret the policy and direction of our corporation to the public
or to help our marketing VP.

that is that head office bunch, I guess.

January 14, 1976

. . . in planning programs and strategy for national and international markets.

Now, here comes the next one. I don't know how you could ever find a person to answer this ad. Now the next one states:

. . . you will feel equally at home.

Now where would you feel at home?

. . . in the boardrooms of New York.

But not just there, but:

in the townhalls of Saskatchewan.

I haven't heard any suggestions yet from the other side. Have we got any names suggested over there.

The person we hire with a solid background in communications, advertising, public relations will be all of these things and more.

And this is the clincher:

. . . if you think you can fill the bill we would like to hear from you.

Well, I tell you I was just about to try it because after all the talk about this yesterday about this new thrust and the advancement of women to executive positions in the Government service and with all the things that are listed here, well I know one thing is clear — it would have to be a woman, no man could fill all those qualifications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It will be interesting to see who will get the job in any case. I think that it has been since that ad, the Government has decided that they need an outside consulting firm to run their ads. I haven't seen one like that since.

That was put in by Donald R. Ching, Executive Vice- President of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The address goes on to say:

Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, 2161 Scarth Street, Regina.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That is head office.

MRS. EDWARDS: — You know all the threats to the Board of Trade in Saskatoon that they would not get the head office, that is just a bunch of nonsense. How could you take something away from someone when they never had it and no chance of ever getting it?

Mr. Speaker, during this debate on Bills No. 1 and 2, it is a long road that doesn't have a turn and we will remember Mayor Baker.

Well during this debate and many have said it has been a long debate for Bills No. 1 and 2. The Liberals have been accused of unduly delaying the passage of these controversial Bills. We have been accused of filibustering and if you want to call it that, that is fine with me.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in our democratic system of government and I am sure that there isn't a person here who would disagree, there is an important and vital role for the Members of the Opposition. It is the duty and the responsibility of the Opposition to bring well- researched, serious debate to the question before us. These two Bills are the most important, far- reaching pieces of legislation to come before this House in decades. Perhaps the Attorney General would have us say nothing, because we dare to have views opposed to his.

I should like to say here and now that I was elected by the people of Saskatoon- Sutherland to speak on their behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — I should like to assure the Attorney General and all other Members on that side of the House and to my friends to the left, that I intend to speak and keep on speaking in opposition to what I believe in conscience to be wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It is my right and my obligation to speak on behalf of my people and I intend to do that now and always no matter what words the Attorney General or others use to intimidate us on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — An editorial in the Leader- Post on December 16th headline said: "Events Show Importance of Opposition Parties" and I want to quote from that, because the Members here are not keenly aware of what the role of the Opposition is and I think that I should tell them. I am preparing you for 1979 when you sit on this side of the House and then you can play your role. I should like to quote from that article about the role of the Opposition parties:

Current legislation debate in Saskatchewan and comments in the aftermath of the election result in British Columbia provide examples of the necessities of strong and capable opposition parties.

It goes on that article and it says:

If it is accepted that the NDP Government has every intention of acting in a manner consistent with its legislation it must further be accepted that the two opposition parties have every right to demand as much detailed information as possible of government plans.

Now I would like you to get this, and this is said in the Leader-Post:

The old ploy of government, any government, charging the Opposition with obstruction . . .
and we have heard that accusation

. . . does not wash in a manner as important as this one where the effects are bound to be felt for a long time

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — The article goes on and it says:

Premier Blakeney says he suspects most people in the province will support the potash takeover but that will depend on whether or not it proves to be successful. The 'if' suggested by the statement should make all people worry and it should lead to total support for opposition parties on their quest for complete and detailed information of government plans.

Speaking of opposition parties, it brings me to certain Members of the Progressive Conservatives to my left. It is difficult for me to understand the performance of the seven Members. They have been elected for a constituency as every other Member in this House. Surely they were elected to speak on behalf of the people who elected them. And as this is written December 15th and since that time they have decided to take part in this debate, I must compliment them for it. We welcome them into the debate, finally, but I should like to remind them of one thing and a very important thing, they accused us and said we were wrong in delaying the passage of these Bills. I should like to remind them had we not done that, these Bills would have been law by now and their decision to come into the debate would have been too late and they wouldn't have had the opportunity to speak on Bill No. 1 and Bill No. 2.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — So it is only because of us that they have had the opportunity to finally decide to get up and say something.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks on Bill 2, I should like to make the point again that the creation of a Crown corporation to take over and manage an existing industry, the potash industry in this province, is not necessary. It is an economic risk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS: — It will ruin the reputation of our province as a good place to invest and do business in. Furthermore, there is no justification whatsoever for pushing these Bills through at this time and not giving the people of the province an opportunity to voice their opinion. The Government and the Opposition and the people of this province should be given more time to consider the consequences before Saskatchewan is launched on the biggest financial risk a provincial government has ever taken.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the passage of Bill No. 2 but would support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to speak on Bill 2, an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. After listening to the Hon. Member for Saskatoon- Sutherland I believe now that I know what King Solomon meant when he said in Proverbs, "Like a gold ring in a pig's snout is a beautiful woman without good sense."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — I believe this Bill is important because by setting up a potash corporation we will be broadening our industrial base in this province. We will be improving our employment opportunities and will help in the developing of resources of Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people.

We hear all kinds of hogwash from the Opposition and their supporters condemning our Crown corporations and, in fact, their employees in this province. They always go back and talk about a couple of corporations that lost money. They don't mention the Crown corporations that continue to operate and provide a vital and reasonable service to our citizens in this province. And when they do talk about them it is condemnation. I want to point out that the total loss of all corporations in Saskatchewan amounts to a mere \$2 million. During this same period there were many private enterprises that encountered failure and difficulties and went under but they don't mention those.

Since 1944 we have 18 Crown corporations in this province which have paid in excess of \$700 million in salaries. They have returned \$350 million in profits to the Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — In 1975 alone, Saskatchewan Minerals net income totalled an excess of \$2 million. Sask Tel in excess of \$17 million. Sask Power, another one, in excess of \$11 million. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that our record of Crown corporations is much better than the Opposition tend to admit. Saskatchewan Government over the years has borrowed approximately \$900 million to expand the Crown corporations and this did not cost the citizens of this province one cent more. We heard and we still hear the same arguments and scare tactics that were used in medicare and the Land Bank and we are hearing it in this debate. The same old ads by the same people. If the Land Bank was so bad, why are some of the States in the USA implementing the Land Bank Program. The fact remains that when Opposition goes on a united opposing front, we know that it is a good program, that it is good for the people and that the people will benefit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — The Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Conservatives and their colleagues speak with one voice on the issue of potash. They both speak with the voice of those large potash companies which are sending us their messages of concern

about potash from their head offices in places like New York, Denver and Toronto. Everywhere it seems but Saskatchewan. The message that comes from all of these places is that the people of Saskatchewan are being exposed to an unnecessary risk by going into the potash business for ourselves by establishing a Crown corporation which will serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Now I will put aside for a moment the idea that somehow it is wrong or of no benefit for us to be owning a controlling interest in the industry, in fact, in our industry. They would like us to forget about all the huge profits over perhaps hundreds of years that will be leaving our province and even our country because the potash companies and their opposition spokesmen don't think we should own some of the industry ourselves. We will put aside those profits because the Opposition doesn't want to admit that they exist and the companies don't want to talk about them. They won't tell the people of Saskatchewan about them and I can't say I blame them because if people knew what the multinational parent companies are really taking out of this province in profits and by other means I am sure they would see the matter in a different light.

What the Opposition parties are saying is that they have no faith in the people of Saskatchewan. In fact they have no faith in the people of Canada. What else can they mean when they say that investment in our own potash resource is a bad investment? It is a negative, destructive and defeatist argument. It can only have one result to aid and comfort the multinationals and to spread and encourage the feeling in Saskatchewan that we are not as good as the other people.

I reject those views, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan reject those views. We can do it ourselves. It is plain by the multinational spokesmen that investing in our potash resource is a terrible risk. The Americans didn't think it was a terrible risk and neither did the South Africans or the British, or the Germans, or the French. And although they have cried poor, they don't seem anxious to unload this terrible risk now that they've got the chance. On the contrary, the multinationals seem anxious, at least some of them, to resist us by every possible means when we offer to relieve them of this terrible risk.

It's the greatest risk the people of this province have ever been exposed to, according to the Opposition. But even their friends in the multinationals don't seem to agree with them on that one. What our opponents are asking us to believe is that Canada is not a good investment. We are asked to believe that Canada is not a good investment. If our huge and valuable potash resources are not a good investment, then what is a good investment?

Investment in Saskatchewan according to the Opposition parties is too risky. When will the Opposition parties say something good about their own province and about the people who live here? When are the Opposition parties going to stop badmouthing our people and doing their best to encourage investors to stay away from Saskatchewan? I want to make it very clear to the people of this province that their Government believes the move to acquire a controlling interest in our potash industry is the best long term investment this province may ever make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

We think Saskatchewan people should be given the opportunity to exercise their rights of ownership by having a say in the expansion of the potash industry through a potash corporation. By having a say in the production, by having a say in the returns that should come to the people through taxes. The multinationals think Saskatchewan is a good investment. The Government of Saskatchewan thinks that Saskatchewan is a good investment.

If the Opposition parties don't think it is a good idea to buy back control of an important part of Saskatchewan's future, then I challenge them to say so. Let them say that we shouldn't own or own province. Let them admit that they want our potash resources to be controlled effectively by someone else outside this province and mostly outside this country. This Government has decided in favor of Saskatchewan. We think the people of Saskatchewan have the right to run their own affairs without any outside interference. The Saskatchewan people are going to have some say in the future of their potash industry. I have seen nothing in the behavior or the statements of the potash multinationals, or their spokesmen in the Legislature or on television, to indicate that the potash companies believe they should obey all our laws, give us the information we need, pay their taxes like every other citizen in this province, or expand their output unless the Government of this province and the people of this province do what someone in Denver or Pittsburgh or Toronto thinks we should do.

I want to ask you, who is running this province? There can only be one answer. The Government of Saskatchewan who were elected by the people of this province in a democratic way. Not a group of multinationals.

We have just come through the expense of an election, the people have spoken and they don't want another election for another three and one-half or four years. This Government believes in this province and this country. We think Saskatchewan is a good investment. We think the people of Saskatchewan can run our potash industry. We have the skills and the technology to make the most of this resource right here in Saskatchewan and that is what we must do. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion and not the amendment.

MR. L.M. LARSON (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in rising to participate in this debate. I listened very attentively to what has been going on. I see the Bill before us and an amendment to the motion, an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, will probably to some extent limit the remarks. You have allowed a lot of latitude and if I stray I beg you to bring me back to order and I shall do my best.

Now I want to address myself for a few minutes to the amendment that came this morning, but before I do so, I want to say that I was rather amazed at the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). After having gone through a real going over for reading our speeches I saw him stand and not even raise his eyes off the lectern, so I don't know whether this is an indication whether all of us ought to be reading written speeches or making our own. I personally don't need a written speech, I can use one if I have to, but I don't need one. And I want to make that very and abundantly clear.

Now I am not sure that he was afraid, or ashamed probably is

a better interpretation of what he was saying, or if he was afraid that he was going to make some bad remarks. I want to say to my Conservative friends, that in coming out the way you have in total support of a free enterprise system and a free market system, you have completely cast your lot with the Liberal Party. You have done so very unknowingly of the circumstances you are dragging yourselves into. You have a record in this province of not having formed a government since I was probably this high, which is quite a long, long time ago. There are seven of you sitting as Members for no other reason that the intolerable and totally destructive actions of the former Liberal Government, both in government and as an opposition. Totally irresponsible, totally irrelevant and totally outdated. By casting your lot with this archaic group of people you have doomed yourself to a continuous failure. Let me tell the Leader of the Conservative Party that by eulogizing your free enterprise and your free market philosophy and not telling the people of Saskatchewan what you are going to do when you hope to form the government you are discrediting yourselves and becoming as irresponsible and as irrelevant as the Liberal Party is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — You can't continue, Mr. Speaker, to promote and to profit by a philosophy without the consequences. You live in a province just in case you don't happen to know it, where we have the best social legislation on the North American continent. This legislation has not come about by accident. To a large extent it is because of previous legislation similar to an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Acts that have taken into account the needs, the hopes, the aspirations of the people of the province. These have been paid for and they have been paid for in full in spite of some of the utterings from the Liberals opposite. They are going to have to be continued to be paid for in full, they will not be paid for in generalities, they will not be paid for in any of the utopian free market or free enterprise structures that you are talking about. If you want to continue medicare, hospitalization, dental care program, hearing aid, we have all these in Saskatchewan. Family Income Plan, Farmstart, Land Bank, housing grants, senior citizens grants, I could go on and name them until you would be tired of listening to me. You are going to have to show the people of Saskatchewan where you intend to get the money from. There is no such thing as magic just because you happen to be the Leader of the Conservative Party in acquiring the very necessary and essential funds to pay for these programs. It is as simple as telling people what you are going to cut out by way of programs, deprive them of or whether you are going to tax them directly to pay for these programs. It won't be done by going on television and saying we believe generally that free market system and free enterprise will do it. This is the general sobering aspect and fact that you must face. And if we were to take you up on your amendment, and call an election, you would have to go before the people of Saskatchewan and you would have to tell them where you are going to increase taxes; you would have to tell them what programs you are going to cut; you would have to tell them where you are going to get the money to replace the income that comes from the natural resources that rightfully belong to the Province of Saskatchewan.

And in case you don't happen to know what these incomes are I invite you to in Crown Corporations Committee to ask questions,

find out the facts; don't you go on television and in the Press and all over the place talking about what a wonderful utopian society free enterprise would give us. Make no mistake that the people of Saskatchewan, and the farmers particularly, Mr. Speaker, are very pragmatic people. They know and know very well the penalties of free enterprise. They know the ultimate end of free enterprise. This is why they have done what they have been doing.

If we were to take you seriously in your stupid amendment with regard to an election, we have just come through one. If you really want to be portrayed to the people of Saskatchewan in this stupid fashion, we probably ought to take you up on it. But I know what would happen. The Liberal Party would be totally obliterated, the Conservatives would go back to where they were in the last 25 or 30 years, without a leader, without any one in the House and without even a voice. So I say, if you are going to make these kinds of statements, not only in this House, but to the people of Saskatchewan that you face up to the responsibilities and the consequences of what you are saying. Because let no one kid you, that you are going to be allowed to hide these things under the rug when the time comes that you have to account for your actions here and your statements as well.

MR. MOSTOWAY: —They'll just get a bigger rug, that is all.

MR. LARSON: — I am afraid that Saskatchewan doesn't make a rug big enough to hide this kind of nonsense.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, rather attentively to the Member for Saskatoon- Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards). I want to say that I appreciate very much the efforts that she put forward. I am not the kind of person who likes to discredit anyone. I am not the kind of person particularly that wants to discredit a lady. But she made some statements that must in my opinion be challenged. She made some statements that I could not possibly ignore. I will forgive her if she doesn't really know what she was talking about. I will give her an opportunity later on to correct some of the false impressions that she left. She said something about putting money into potash instead of putting it into hospitals, roads, nursing homes and the like. Of course, she ought to know that these kinds of projects are not constructed by borrowed money. These projects are not constructed in the same fashion as you set up a corporation, a Crown corporation that will last longer than my lifetime, longer than the lifetime of anyone in here, unless we very unfortunately happen to elect a Conservative or a Liberal government. So you can't really seriously try to convince this House that you didn't know better. Certainly we can't accept that. This is a false premise. Most Members on that side of the House know this and to parrot it is simply irresponsible and utterly ridiculous. Certainly you must know the difference in financing a Crown corporation and a road, or a hospital, or a nursing home or any of the social programs. This is false and phony and you all know it.

She made some disparaging remarks with regard to Crown corporations. My friend from Redberry has done a very good job in talking about the benefits of some of these corporations. She also tried to tie it to the debate on this Bill 2 with regard to setting up a potash corporation in Saskatchewan. It reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of some of the statements that have been made in this Legislature when similar Crown corporations

January 14, 1976

bills, motions have been debated. I seem to recall rather vividly when the Saskatchewan Power Corporation building here in Regina was being built. I went to the library and I dug up some of the comments that emanated from the Liberal benches during that time.

Mr. Coderre, the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg on October 17, 1961 said this:

I am rather disturbed from the continuous borrowings of the Power Corporation from their shyster friends. It is somewhat contrary to the Regina Manifesto. This Government has borrowed so much money, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt if the next generation or the next or the next will ever be free from the so-called perpetual interest charges. It has been mentioned before in this House time and time again of the overwhelming debt of interest that we have to pay. These accumulated drawings, the interest on all of these is greater than the total expenditure of the previous administration for any particular year. However, let's see what the costs really are.

Then he goes on to outline some of the costs.

Another gem, October 17, 1961. This was with medicare and again a move that the Liberal Party didn't dare to destroy. They did everything conceivable except destroy it. The Hon. Dave Boldt Member for Rosthern said this:

Today this House is assembled here to discuss medical health, socialization of the doctors. It won't be long before they will be socializing the druggist. You can rest assured that this Government has in mind that at some future date all farmers and everyone else will be socialized. We will not be the only ones that will be left in the open.

Very interesting. You have a fellow by the name of Allan Guy, formerly from Athabasca. Again on October 23, 1961:

The medical care program will prove so costly that the province will be in no position to consider improving any other fields of health, health care, including dental, optometry, drug, mental or other services with the result that these services will be behind and will fail and fail forever.

Very interesting. Almost similar to the utterings that we are hearing today.

We have another one from Ian McDougall, the Member for Souris-Estevan:

While the Premier is leaving Saskatchewan and while I want personally to wish him well, the only thing that we have in common is a Scottish background, but Heaven forbid that Canada ever turn to this type of politics. I can visualize Mr. Douglas being Premier of Canada and having a summit conference with Peking, Moscow and inviting Castro to take over Prince Edward Island and putting a Dew Line from Russian into the North, giving Vancouver Island to Peking and then putting up a wall between here and the United States saying, now you capitalists, you keep out of Saskatchewan and Canada.

Very similar, I could go on to quote . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who said that?

MR. LARSON: — Ian McDougall.

MR. FARIS: — No wonder Bob Larter took his place.

MR. LARSON: — Yes, no wonder Bob Larter took his place. Then we have a gentleman by the name of Snedker, the Hon. Member for Saltcoats. Talking about medicare:

The whole scheme leads to destruction of self-government in this province including destruction of the Swift Current Health Region.

And so it goes on. I could quote for a long time. I don't think anyone really would be too interested.

The brand new Liberal Party is still flying under the old flag of red herrings, scare tactics and archaic, totally outdated not in step with anything that is going on.

I want to quote from another famous Liberal who is eulogized by Members opposite. I don't know what plans that have for him, but I have my own suspicions. I am talking now, of course, of our good friend from Saskatoon-Humboldt, our good friend Otto Lang. Good old Otto. "Potash Takeover Disastrous - Lang". Fergus, Ontario of all places. He doesn't want to come to Saskatchewan to talk about it. He doesn't want to join the debate that other Members are talking about. He is afraid to come to Saskatchewan. But in Fergus, Ontario he says:

Federal Transport Minister, Otto Lang said Wednesday, the decision by the Saskatchewan NDP Government to nationalize the potash industry is disastrous. Mr. Lang said in his speech to Wellington-Gray Dufferin-Waterloo Liberal Association, that Saskatchewan needs investment and population growth and that the decision will be disastrous and discourage investors.

So we have Otto getting into the act. Then we have another, very interesting comment from the president of the Canadian Fertilizer Institute speaking in Ottawa, branding the proposed Saskatchewan Government takeover of the province's potash industry as an intolerable intrusion into private enterprise. I am sure that the Members to your left of the Conservative Party endorse this and are probably saying under their breath, Hear, hear! And hooray, hooray! R.W. Neil said the announcement of the proposed takeover last week by Premier Allan Blakeney guaranteed to scare off investors and goes on and on.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, we are going through precisely the same exercise, precisely the same motions, precisely the same kind of tactics that have been practiced by the Liberals, by the Opposition since 1944. These tactics have grown on them, they can't purge themselves of them. They aren't in a position to really come up with anything new and, of course, the whole philosophy is that they will remain in oblivion for a long, long time to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — I want to say to the new Members that if you have any hope of ever updating, updating — and I don't say bringing up to date — but I simply say update just a little bit of the Liberal Party, you had better start doing it now. Rather than use the Legislature as a campaign ground for the leadership, start updating yourself. Start making yourself presentable. Make a little bit of sense. Don't be bogged down in 1944 or later tactics and philosophy.

I want to say a few things more about what you did in this archaic fashion when you were the government. When the people of Saskatchewan made that one fatal error since 1944 of electing you as government, you emasculated as I said, medicare by deterrent fees, utilization fees. You were just sitting quietly hoping and praying that you would have the opportunity to finally finish it off. To make yourselves seem presentable, you said well we are going to have a vote on a drug program. You didn't say what the vote was going to be about, or didn't say how it was going to be conducted or what would be at stake, but we will have a vote, we are going to be very democratic. This has gone on from time to time. You gave away the timber resources. Instead of bringing in a bill similar, very similar to an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, just to show you that I intend to stay on the subject, you gave away the timber resources of the North. You paid good Saskatchewan taxpayer's money, you didn't even borrow it, you paid it out of taxpayers' money to entice these people to come in, tax concessions that were paid for by the taxpayers of the province. So you got them in and you gave them special concessions, special royalty rates, special tax concessions. And you said, but, we are creating jobs. You sold Northern Airways for a song, sold it for a song. Now we could very well have made use of Northern Airways with the development of the North. With bills like an Act respecting the Potash Corporation, Mr. Speaker, we could very well have used a similar act dealing with transportation in the North in the new DNS. But you sold it. You sold it for a pittance, you gave it away.

You said, you know all costs are going up. We have to impose some new taxes. Rather than bringing in a bill that would assure the people of the province that we would get something from our resources to offset these taxes. You brought in a special tax on 'grub', tax the hungry, hotdogs, my goodness. Everything except turkey saddles. Increase one after the other, saying we can't go with a bill like 02, we have got to tax. This is the only way that we can assure the people of a free enterprise system, Mr. Speaker. Freedom of choice, the free market. So we have to tax you. We reserve the right to have the freedom to tax you to death. Grudgingly, very grudgingly you gave welfare. And I could quote some of the very choice phrases that were made about the bums and the drunks that were clamoring for welfare. Some very choice phrases with regard to the native people. A phrase stating, you can't do nothing for them, they multiply like rabbits. These were the kind of solutions that were offered by the Liberal Party when in government instead of trying to do as we are doing, bringing in an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have to caution the Member for Pelly that

grasping an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in his right hand while speaking doesn't necessarily constitute sticking to the principle of the Bill. I wonder if the Member could either relate to the principle of the Bill or desist.

MR. LARSON: — Thank you, very kindly, Mr. Speaker, I realize that I was probably pulling a fast one on you in reporting the Bill at various times so I take under advisement your very timely and very correct words.

MR. ROMANOW: — It was all true what he said anyway.

MR. LARSON: — That's right, it was all very true.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to say in connection with the purposes of this Bill. I have outlined some of the social programs that Saskatchewan enjoys and takes for granted. I challenge Members opposite to come out and say precisely what they intend to do with regard to revenues that are generated from the use of our natural resources. I think that we now stand, Mr. Speaker, at the crossroads, socially we have gone a very, very long way. We now need to assure Saskatchewan and the Government of the day, whatever stripe they happen to be of an economic base that can support these programs without direct taxation. And I submit to you that an Act such as respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has a very vital role to play in this whole picture. Without assurance that we can have for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan the rightful heritage, the income from their resources, we are not going to be able to guarantee or even pretend that we can support these social programs.

I want to say that at a time in history when every nation on the face of the earth is becoming increasingly conscious, increasingly aware, increasingly cognizant of the fact that resources are depletable, they are a once-in-a-lifetime deal, once they are gone and you can't replace them, that government's role and government intervention in these resources is becoming ever and ever more important and necessary.

We don't as citizens of this century, have the right, Mr. Speaker, to not protect the heritage of future generations. This cannot, this will not, this has not been done under the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system exploits and ravages and rapes for today's benefits. It pays no attention, it pays no concern to future generations or tomorrow. Historians will record that this is the case. Historians will record that in the name of profit and in the name of perpetuating a system that is doomed to failure, a system that is archaic insofar as the last half of this century and the beginning of the new century is concerned, is totally destroyed.

I want to quote from the Leader-Post an article dealing with nationalization of oil industry and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

On New Year's Day, Venezuela took over full control of its vast oil industry in the largest single takeover of American property by a foreign government in history. In December, Kuwait took over . . .

and it goes on in this fashion outlining the number of oil

developments that have been taken over and nationalized. Then it concludes:

The nationalization landmarks of '75 would not have been acceptable in any previous time. Traditionally nationalization was a threatening act. It meant a radical purging afforded devils and much rhetoric and often little thought for the future. Today nationalization generally means long businesslike negotiations terminating on agreements sealed with handshakes and a smile. Granted, the smile may be a little forced on the part of the companies' representatives who in a very short span of time have gone from the master to the servant mode, but it is still there because there is still a considerable role for the company to play. But the fact remains, it is becoming acceptable that governments must play an ever increasing role in the control, use, development, dispersion and earnings of the depleting resources of our globe.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 2, an Act respecting the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan does precisely that.

To clutter up a meaningful Act as this by dragging in, as my Conservative friends have done, the red herring of an election is the height of irresponsibility. I will not be supporting the amendment, but will be supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few words about Bill 2, the Act that deals with the financing aspects of the Potash Corporation, an Act that allows the Government to dispense and to acquire funds by Order in Council without taking recourse to the Legislative Assembly, I should like to say the precedents set in this Bill were against the very history of all Legislative Assemblies, in fact, it would destroy the very foundations upon which Legislatures are founded. Every Legislature throughout history has gained their powers to govern and hold those powers only when these powers include the disbursement of public moneys. In asking us to pass this Bill without an upper limit, without information as to where the money is coming from and at what cost, where it is going to be spent and what it is going to be spent for, goes against, as I say, the very fundamentals of parliamentary function. Its very reason is to collect and disburse money for State purposes.

One can go back as far as the Roman Senate and find that when the powers of directing and spending of taxes of their far-flung empire was taken up by the Caesars, Rome collapsed. When the Senate could not assure that public funds through their debates and deliberations were to be spent for the most good of the most people, the empire started to collapse. This is what you are asking us to do right now.

The momentary whims and pleasures of the Caesars in power at the time would deplete the public treasury leaving not enough money for the upkeep of their roads, postal or other necessary services. This loss of control by the Senate of the public purse was one of the greater reasons for the decline of the Roman Empire.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government in asking us to pass this

Bill 2 without giving maximum figures as to the amount to be allocated to this Crown corporation, without tabling feasibility studies, they are asking us — we the elected representatives of the people of this province — to accept a course of action that has proven disaster for other democratic systems.

Mr. Speaker, the very founding of our parliamentary systems, the very reason for their existence was in the controlling of the spending of the public purse. The Feudal System in England and France had its strength in itself in the power of the Lords of the Council, not the King in having the power to levy taxes and to decide on the disbursement of these taxes.

To emphasize the importance of the Legislature to control the spending of tax dollars I should like to quote you some words about the origins of our parliamentary system. This goes back, as I say, to the very beginnings when the Feudal System was in effect and they found at that time that kings needed money to pay for the government machinery or to carry on war with other kings. My source is Palmer - History of the Modern World and I quote, page 30:

Taxation as known in the Roman Empire was quite unknown in the Germanic and Feudal tradition. In the Feudal scheme each person was responsible only for the customary fee which arose on stated occasions. The king, like other lords, was supposed to live on his own income — on the revenue of manors that he owned himself and the proceeds of estates temporarily under his wardship or occasional fees paid to him by his vassals. No king, even for the best of reasons, could simply decree a new tax and collect it. At the same time as the use of money became more common the kings had to assure themselves of a money income.

In England in the 12th Century the customary obligation of the vassal to render military service to the king was converted into a money payment called 'scutage' or shield money. As the towns grew up with a new kind of wealth and a new source of income they agreed to make certain payments in return for the royal charters.

This as I say when asking us to not know where the money goes, we are going against the very beginnings of why we started a parliamentary system. Continuing to quote:

The royal demands for money, the royal claims to exercise jurisdiction were regarded as innovations. They were constantly growing and were sometimes a source of abuse. They met with frequent resistance in all countries. A famous case historically (though somewhat commonplace in its own day) was that of the Magna Carta in England in 1215, when the English lords and high churchmen joined by representatives of the city of London required King John to confirm and guarantee their historic liberties.

The liberties they talked of at that time were their tax liberties. Again:

The king as has been said, like any lord was supposed to act in council or 'court' with his vassals. The Royal Council became the egg out of which departments of government were hatched — such as the Royal Judiciary, Exchequer,

and military command. From it was also hatched the institution of parliaments. The king had always, in a rough sort of way held great parleys or 'talks', (the medieval Latin parliamentum means simply 'a talking') with their chief retainers.

In the 12th and 13th Centuries the growth of towns added a new element to European life. To the lords and bishops was now added a burgher class which if of far inferior dignity, was too stubborn, free-spirited and well furnished with money to be overlooked. When representatives of the towns began to be normally summoned to the king's great 'talks' along with lords, clergy, parliaments may be said to have come into being.

Parliaments in this sense sprouted all over Europe in the 13th Century. Nothing shows better the similarity of institutions in Latin Christendom or the inadequacy of tracing the history of any one country by itself. The new assemblies were called 'cortes' in Spain, 'diets' in Germany and 'estates general' in France and 'parliaments' in the British Isles. Usually they are referred to genetically as estates, the word parliament being reserved for Britain, but in origin they were all essentially the same.

As I say the parliaments were called for one reason only. Not to allow the people who are paying the taxes to determine the amount of tax and how collected and how it was disbursed. It says further, page 32:

And finally as a reason for the strength of the parliament in England the elected Members of the House of Commons very early obtained the power to commit their constituents. If they voted a tax, those who elected them had to pay it. The king, in order to get matters decided, insisted that votes be binding. Constituents were not allowed to repudiate the vote of their deputy nor to punish or harass him when he came home, as often happened in other countries. Parliament thus exercised power as well as rights.

As I say this, what you are asking us to pass is taking away the power of our legislative system.

Mr. Speaker, these words show that the parliamentary system was not put into motion as a result of people wishing to voice political or philosophical differences, but rather the parliamentary system was designed to fulfil the necessary chore of voting taxes. Then after acquiring taxes to use them under the direction of the members of the Legislative Assembly to the good of the people.

How then, Mr. Speaker, can we as the official Opposition not oppose a bill that asks us to abdicate the very responsibility that is the reason for our legislative process as created?

Mr. Speaker, many times we have asked this Government to state the maximum amounts that would be spent for the purchase of mines and to put it in the Act. These requests have either been ignored or answered in a facetious manner. I am sure that you would agree that any answer that covers a range of \$500 million to a billion dollars is a very facetious answer.

Mr. Speaker, when we as representatives of the citizens of the province ask that this Government table feasibility studies that have been made, these requests are ignored. Are we to believe that no studies have been made or else are we to believe that this Government has become so arrogant as to believe that they need no longer be responsible to the citizens of this province for their actions?

Mr. Speaker, the NDP feel that they can borrow tax money for the purchase of the potash companies and that this disregard for parliamentary procedure will go unchallenged. They feel that they can set up Crown corporations that will not be taxed and that the Federal Parliament will allow them to escape their share of federal taxation.

The NDP would do well to study the results of such action in the annals of history. Like actions on the part of the colonial government of the American colonies resulted in immediate reaction by the British Parliament and led to the American Revolution. (Page 324).

I should like to quote you the result of such actions.

The colonials in practice paid only such taxes as were approved by his own local legislature for local purposes. The Americans in effect enjoyed a degree of tax exemption within the empire and it was against this form of provincial privilege, Parliament began to move.

We can rest assured that the Federal Government will protect their taxation privileges vigorously.

Mr. Speaker, without limits being put to the amounts to be borrowed under this Bill, no citizen of this province could accept its passage. It gives this Government a blank cheque signed by every citizen. I would challenge the Members opposite by asking them to hand a blank cheque signed to myself or anyone to purchase something for them. I doubt that you would agree that it is good business. Without feasibility studies, and unless each transaction, each purchase is studied and approved by the people of this province. By putting this information before this Legislature, the people of this province are being asked to sign this blank cheque.

Under this legislation the people are not given an opportunity to study and approve each financial transaction and when the people have no chance to approve such transactions we leave the opportunity open for the misuse of public funds. We lay the opportunity open for overpayment of mines accompanied by a kickback to the purchase. We leave all such transactions open to the opportunity of embezzlement of public funds. Surely the Members opposite have more respect for the hard earned money of our citizens than to ask them to pass a bill that has no restraints. A bill that leaves opportunity open for such things to occur.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — In allowing taxes to be raised without parliamentary consent or to be disbursed without approval of the Legislature, we are giving up without a whimper what men before us have fought and died for.

To illustrate how even at the birth of our parliamentary system, the legislature so regarded the right of an elected parliament to approve the raising and spending of taxes I should like to quote you the following, page 146:

In 1629 the king and Parliament came to a deadlock. Charles I attempted to rule without Parliament, which could legally meet only at the royal summons. He intended (much as the NDP) to give a good and efficient government. Had he succeeded the course of English constitutional development would have paralleled that of France. But by certain reforms in Ireland he antagonized the English landlords who had interests in that country. By supporting the high Anglicans he made enemies of the Puritans. By attempting to modernize the navy with funds raised without parliamentary consent, (called ship money) he alarmed the property owners.

I am afraid with Bill 2 we are alarming the people of this province. Continuing to quote:

Whose opposition was typified in the famous lawsuit of the country gentleman, John Hampden in 1637.

The ship money case illustrates the best arguments of both sides. It was the old custom in England for coastal towns to pay a tax called ship money for the arming of ships in time of war. Charles I wished to maintain a navy in time of peace and to have ship money paid by the country as a whole including the inland counties. In the old or medieval view it was the functions of the towns which were directly affected to maintain a fleet. In the new view sponsored by the king, the whole nation was a unit on which the navy should be based. The country gentleman whom Parliament mainly represented and most of whom lived in inland counties neither wished to pay new taxes or depart from old customs which worked in their favor, nor even to maintain a navy in which they saw little advantage to themselves. It was the king, who, in the ship money case, represented the more modern ideas of government and the needs of state. The parliamentary class represented the idea derived from the Middle Ages, that new taxes must be authorized by Parliament. John Hampden lost his case in court but he won the sympathy of the politically significant classes of the country. Until the king could govern with the confidence of Parliament, or until Parliament itself was willing, not merely to keep down taxes but to assume the responsibilities of government under modern conditions neither a navy nor an effectual government could be maintained.

I'm afraid my friends we are falling into the same trap here where we feel that the Government can ask us to pass a bill that takes away the power from us the Legislature and us the people to determine how taxes are to be raised and taxes are to be spent. The action of the king in subverting the rights of Parliament finally led to the civil war and his beheading. Which I'm afraid we're not quite that wound up this day and age.

After a 40 year trial period people demanded the restoration of the parliamentary procedure. It is interesting to note that the first legislation was concerned with, not as one might

believe, the thought that parliament should be used for furthering political ideas, on the contrary their first act was to define the power of legislature to raise and disburse the tax money for the citizens of their country. I should like to quote their action because I think it's a good thing to remember in view of the Bill we have before us that asks us to not do this.

Finance was always a weak spot in the French monarchy. The methods of collecting tax were costly and inefficient. Direct taxes passed through the hands of many intermediate officials and direct taxes were collected by private concessionaires called tax farmers, who made a substantial profit. The state always received far less than what the taxpayers actually paid. But the main weakness rose in the old bargain between the Crown and nobility. The king might raise taxes without consent if he only refrained from taxing the nobles. This is what they changed by their action in their bill. They decreed that the National Assembly would only have the power to tax.

After we find that the same action was a cause in the French Revolution where the king before that time had taken away the power from the nobles and took care of taxing. One of the funny principles after the Revolution in France was that after one of their first acts of parliament at that time or their National Assembly was that taxes might be raised only by common consent. All public servants were accountable for their conduct in office and the powers of government should be separate and different branches. But their first law was a tax raised only by the parliament's consent, from there on in the king would not raise any more taxes. This was before the king was deposed and executed in 1793.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — The . . . should . . . that.

MR. ANDERSON: — This was before Paul, this is after the Revolution that I'm talking about. Now they are taxed.

In the further principles of the French Declaration of Independence was the other principle of taxation laws. I quote:

Another deep demand of the French people, deeper than the demand for the vote was for more reason, order and economy in public finance and taxation. The Consulate gave these also. Taxes were henceforth collected not by local persons who allocated quotas upon individual taxpayers at their own discretion but by professional collectors who were employed by the central government and dealt directly with the individual taxpayer.

Order was also introduced into expenditure and accounting methods were improved. There was no longer a haphazard assortment of different funds in which various officials drew independently, confidently as they needed money, but a concentration of financial management in the treasury and even in the kind of budget.

In fact they did away with what you're asking us to pass and that's Order in Council where you can draw money out without immediate parliamentary authority.

I believe the history of democratic governments has proven that legislative bodies must control the raising and spending of tax moneys. Therefore to control, we must know the upper limits or the final limits of what can be borrowed. We also must know what you are paying for and for what mines you are paying. This is even as important after the Bill does pass because a great problem in the modern nations that have gone into nationalization such as England is accountability in Crown corporations. I should like to refer to a recent study of this problem that they have found in England with their many Crown corporations. In this study they ask, what does it mean to be accountable?

It is not accountability merely to submit a certified financial account each year. To be accountable means to give reasons for and explanations of actions taken. But an account rarely provides explanation and it never gives reasons. It does not as a rule even contain such information about what has been done. It is not a sufficient record of policy and transaction.

I'd like to point out that this is speaking of the Crown corporations of England, of their coal, their steel, Crown corporations that have been nationalized and the problems they have found in keeping accounts. Therefore, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to pass this Bill with Order in Council as authority to disburse funds as needed, we are falling into a very deep trap that has plagued England. My source is *The Dilemma of Accountability in Modern Government* edited by L.R. Smith & D.C. Chaque published in 1971.

It says further and I'm using extracts from pages 314 to 324:

Any major financial account hides far more than it reveals. It is a protection against fraud and the law provides that it may not conceal criminal sins but other kinds of sins may be lost without trace within it. Financial accounts must therefore be accompanied by explanations, but a report by the responsible official does not by itself constitute accountability, even though that report may be the subject of discussion and questions by a parliamentary committee. This is because a report being the work of the persons concerned to justify themselves cannot be impartial. Anyone who has ever observed the drafting of such a document knows that a principal concern is to present matters in the best light and there is no breach of trust implied by so doing. It is, moreover, impossible for even the heads (of these Crown corporations) to know absolutely everything about what goes on within large organizations; they may have doubts and suspicions about for example, over- staffing or the misuse of investment funds, but it would call for costly research and perhaps cause internal tensions to uncover, to present the full stories.

Therefore, in asking us to pass Bill 2 without upper limits, without studies being presented, without knowing where the money is coming from, what it's going for, not only now in the purchase but after in the operation, we are leaving ourselves open to the very problems that the British parliament has found with their Crown corporations.

It says further:

There would seem to be very little incentive for them to make any public disclosure. The authors of annual reports may thus choose their subjects and avoid questions which have caused them difficulties and embarrassments.

I'm quite sure you'll all agree that this happens quite often. A report says what it wants to say, or what the authors do, not the complete facts.

Although it is often precisely these issues, the ones that they are not choosing to put forward which should be the concern of public accountability.

Thus the cause and agenda of debate on an annual report may be set by its writers. It is the very essence of accountability however, that this initiative must be held by the questioners. They therefore need an independent source of information to ensure that no vital problem remains unmentioned or uninvestigated. Only when all the facts are made accessible can we hope to reach a balance of public accountability.

I feel that in Bill 2 we have started out completely away from the concept of accountability. In fact, in its first drawing up we are subverting that because an Order in Council and not the Legislature sets the amounts. I feel that if we are to be asked to pass this Bill, that we must pass it with consent of the Legislature, not Order in Council. I feel that we must have the facts and the figures put before this Legislature now, because we are likely to be buying, and later on, every expenditure, should be studied and these studies tabled so that we can make our decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — Further in the study we've run, I should like to mention more of the problem on needs of nationalized industries, as it comes to the problem of making them accountable. The problem of accountability and this is for the English nationalized industries which certainly have had a long time to try to iron these problems out and yet they have not, because this very study was made in 1969 after 30 or 40 years operation of these Crown corporations. The study was made on a study of nationalized industries, particularly in England but in other countries, to try to solve this very problem, that we are building into this Bill. I think it would be well if the Members opposite would bother procuring this book and trying to work into their nationalized potash industry the cures for the problems they have found in other industries, rather than when writing Bill 2, putting the very basic weakness into the bill. That you have no accountability, not even to the Legislature, but only to the Cabinet and Council. As I just read previously, there is no way that the Cabinet or Council, unless you have an independent committee study and come in and get accountability out of a nationalized industry. They have proven this fact in England and it's a problem that they are trying to correct. I quote:

The problem of accountability for the nationalized industries is a study of conflicting motives. The basic question still remains unresolved.

This is what the English have found after 30 some years.

Namely whether nationalized enterprises should be genuinely accountable to the public and its representatives at all. Unresolved at least in Britain and comparable countries elsewhere the decision has long been in favor of accountability.

In England they haven't made that step and I suppose possibly this is the reason that their coal industry and their steel industry is in such sad disrepair financially because they have not made the step. They feel that public accountability is a step they can't quite make because it's too politically dangerous. But other countries in the world that have nationalized industries are all in favor of public accountability.

The select committee appears to share the doubts in full. The truth is perhaps that no British government has insisted upon full public accountability because of justifiable apprehensions that published information about the corporations would be exploited to provide political arguments for and against their very existence.

I'm afraid that we are falling into the same trap that England did here in Saskatchewan. We feel, the Government in power feels and does not insist on full public accountability for those very reasons, because they feel they might be exploited to provide political arguments against these corporations' very existence.

Therefore, I could in no clear conscience vote for a bill that's very phony, has no accountability in it, when we know that the accountability will get less and less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: —

Secrecy thus becomes an element of political tactics. In paradox this was especially so for the parties which have always favored nationalization, as a means of securing public accountability for powerful management.

It's very odd that they found this in England, that has suffered long from a socialist government, that secrecy becomes an element of their political tactics of any socialist government that believes in nationalization.

That nationalized boards themselves were no doubt conscious of the same political hazards. There is also a strong tradition of secrecy in private business; in the words of two students of management, 'Privacy is certainly the key note of British business character; any invasion of it is intensely resented and instantly attacked as injurious to the national interest.'

So that at any time in the past history of England when the opposition party has asked for public accountability has asked that the nationalized industries' books be opened to full account and to see if they are efficient, to see if they are operating for the best in the public good. The very nature of their being that any of the civil servants so employed would not dare to give out information that would be detrimental to the government in power, keep this fact concealed and it said that it's been one of the political packages of the socialist

governments in England, to favor this no accountability. Sounds very much like it is here and as I say this is why I could not support a bill that has no accountability built in its very structure. And it hasn't. If you study this Bill it's a wide open field for the Cabinet to use Order in Council to authorize what money is needed, where, when and how. If we have no accountability when the Bill is presented creating this corporation we have no accountability over the industry because they found it's not possible. I think it would be a dereliction in my duty as a representative of the people of this province to vote for a bill that had this built into it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I quote further:

Against this background of somewhat ambivalent views of the Select Committee on Nationalized Industries on the subject of public accountability may more easily be comprehended. The Committee said a good deal about this in a recent report on ministerial control.

And this is in England.

On the one hand the Committee stressed the great size of interests involved. The assets of the industries (that are nationalized in England) are valued at 10,500 million pounds and in 1966-67 their fixed investment was at a rate of some 1,500 million pounds a year, over half of which was financed from the general tax fund, the Exchequer. The interest of the taxpayer was also emphasized. That a decline of only one per cent in the earning power of these industries as a whole would mean an increase of 90 million pounds provided by the general tax fund, approximately equal to sixpence on the standard rate of income tax.

Which shows a one per cent variation in that industry and I feel when we deal in a province with this population and the size of the debt we've seen thrown at us from \$500 million to \$1 billion. Some sources who have started the potash industry say that if the business was bought now, all the nine mines, that the replacement value, plus depreciation we could get a figure closer to \$4 or \$5 billion. When we see that we have no accountability, we can't prove that they are running at full efficiency because it's not built in. We could take a drop or an increase in taxes to the people of this province. I cannot see and I cannot understand the Government writing a bill up with no accountability built into it. It seems very stupid to start out that you have no accountability on the money to be spent or where it's going to be borrowed and you know that when this is set up. We're not going to be able to have an accountability over the nationalized industries because they have found that it has not been possible so far in all the years of management to get public accountability that was meaningful. Passing this Bill without the studies being made, without the amounts named, is going against good government and good business practice for the people of this province.

So these facts alone would seem to provide a case for public accountability and the Committee expressed itself in agreement. It appreciated the importance of public accounting for the desired efficiency, especially when large sums of public money are involved.

And certainly we are faced with large sums of public money involved here.

They believe 'that as well as a system of economic obligations and financial objectives, some system of external efficiency studies may also be needed, otherwise public accountability cannot be secured.'

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to close in saying that I cannot support Bill 2 for the reason it does not provide accountability, it goes against the very grain of parliamentary procedure. I will not support the Bill, but I can support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. N. VICKAR (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise this afternoon and take part in this debate, after listening to the proceedings in the House in the last month and a half. I have come to the conclusion that one should enter the debate and enter it with words of knowledge and wisdom.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to deliver them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I enter the debate in support of the Motion at hand and I hope to give you some valid reasons for my convictions. One in particular because I am a businessman and because after studying the pros and cons of the purchase of the potash mines, I am convinced that it is a good business deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, let me give you some facts as to why I am of that opinion. Several of the potash companies took it upon themselves to refuse to pay their taxes. They refused to do what every citizen, and what every resident taxpayer of this province has to do, and that is to obey the law and pay taxes. They then attempted to have the courts rule that their taxes would be refunded if the lawsuit succeeded. In short, with the industry booming, the last few years we have seen one attempt after another by the potash companies to avoid paying taxes, to keep the rising profits for themselves and to contribute the lowest minimum possible to the benefit of the people of this province.

This is an intolerable situation. Here we have the citizens of Saskatchewan, owners of the potash, being told by a handful of corporations that we have no claim to the benefits from our own resources. Not only do these corporations withhold their taxes, they challenge the very rights of the province to pass a law to collect them. Saskatchewan cannot afford stagnation in potash. New markets are opening in the hungry nations of the world, markets in which Saskatchewan potash can be sold. We must keep pace with the need for our product or other producers

will capture the markets and our great potential will remain just that.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Saskatchewan shows clearly that if we want to make something of this province we have to do it ourselves. In 1975 we had decided to make something out of our potash industry. Effectively we are going to bring all or most of the head offices home to Saskatchewan. From now on when you deal in potash, you come to Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I say potash belongs to the people of Saskatchewan and the people who manage the industry should work for the people of Saskatchewan. I say they should be located in Saskatchewan, making profits for Saskatchewan people, doing business in our stores and adding to our economy, instead of siphoning off the dollars to the East and out of Canada, it would be Saskatchewan people making the decisions, doing the job and getting the benefits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, although Canada is going through a period of inflation and high unemployment, Saskatchewan is enjoying record prosperity and virtually full employment. Our taxes are relatively low, our provincial budget is balanced and our credit rating is triple "A". If ever we were able to afford an investment like this, now is the time. The potash industry has been a 'boom and bust' industry and at present it is emerging from a period of low prices to an over-supply. In 1969 a ton of potash brought \$20 on the market and today it brings \$70 or more. All forecasts indicate a strong continuing demand in firm prices. Getting into the potash business at this moment could be the best investment this province has ever made. While no one could be confident that we won't have another bust period. I think that everyone agrees that the long term future for the potash industry is very sound.

Mr. Speaker, potash is bound to be a very important mineral in our world of population explosion and food crises. It is the basic ingredient in fertilizers, used in regions of Asia, Africa, China, India and Japan. In the long run our potash will be in demand. Acquiring potash mines is a timely move for Saskatchewan for several other reasons.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan the 925,000 people who live here own the potash and they should be in charge. Saskatchewan is setting an example in providing a model for leadership for all Canadians by making this move to obtain effective control through ownership of our most vital industry. Saskatchewan has led the way before with Medicare, with auto insurance and now is the time for national leadership in the resource industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Once again, Saskatchewan is leading the way, and, as I said before, we shall never have a better opportunity to do it, than to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, acquiring a controlling interest in the potash industry in the province is purely a simple and a good investment. I want to emphasize that point. Apart from the important reasons for buying into the industry, such as acquiring effective control through ownership of one of our major resources and making sure that it is developed in a sensible way, our purchase of the industry makes good business sense. It is a first rate investment. We will be buying into an industry which produces a basic product which will be in demand for as long as there are hungry people in the world. The need for potash — the market is growing every year. Growing on the average of something like five or six per cent every year. The industry has had its ups and downs, but the long term trend is up. At present, each year the world markets expand an average of one and one-quarter million tons of potash more than the year before. That is the production capacity of a large mine, like the mine at Rocanville for an example. We have the western world's best and most acceptable potash. We are buying into an industry that makes a very handsome yearly profit. Enough we feel, to present no threat of a drain on the taxpayers' pockets.

Mr. Speaker, we will use the profits from the money we borrowed to buy the industry. We will not be using taxpayers' money, but we will be building up the taxpayers' assets in business terms, the debt we incur to purchase the potash mines will be a self-liquidating debt. It is paid off by the profits generated by the mines and that is pretty good business and common sense. It is good business practice and is going on every day across Canada.

Most of our farmers and our small businessmen can understand the principles because they follow this pattern themselves. A farmer decides that he needs another quarter section of land, to make his operation more efficient, so he borrows the money to buy the new land. The land itself is the collateral for the loan. The additional production is increased efficiency, to provide the increased profit the farmer uses to pay off the loan for the land. The farmer does not have to lower his standard of living to pay off the loan. He does not jeopardize his financial position, in fact he is increasing his assets and improving his financial position. Businessmen follow exactly the same pattern.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing. We are going to increase the assets of the people of Saskatchewan. We are going to improve our financial position. We are going to ensure that our future is secure. We are going to do all this by investing in Saskatchewan, by acquiring a controlling interest in our potash industry . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — . . . by exercising our right to expand and develop this vital resource. We have a solid asset which we are developing for the benefit of the people of this province and by making some prudent investment decisions. Our potash has been developed by outside companies for the benefit of the loan shareholders. That seems to have been acceptable to many businessmen in Saskatchewan and others over the years. Now we are going to get into the business ourselves on behalf of the original shareholders, the people of Saskatchewan, and that is good business, and that is a good investment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, it is a good deal and it makes good sense. I have said and continue to say that obtaining all or part of the potash mines is a good deal, both from the investment and from the returns. It has been said that Saskatchewan people will suffer through the loss of services because of the lack of finances that will be diverted to the potash purchases. Mr. Speaker, again, as I may say, as many of my colleagues have already said, we will not be using the taxpayers' money. Money will be borrowed to purchase and to expand these mines and will be repaid out of the profits created from the industry. This is the same as any good business deal is made. One must be an optimist, whether in private or public deals, and general revenue in the province will not be affected by the purchase. Therefore, the level of service that our Saskatchewan people are used to will continue to be as high and they will not decline.

Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of Saskatchewan young people are starting to make their homes here in Saskatchewan rather than seek their fortunes elsewhere. They know that Saskatchewan is a good place. We feel it is our duty as a Government to do all we can to make it possible for our young people to make the decision to stay in Saskatchewan. The spirit of adventure and challenge still lives in most of us. There is still room for pioneers. We still have people with imagination, initiative, drive and guts, and these are the people who will grasp this opportunity to assert our independence as a province. They will make our potash industry work and they will not be stopped by people who would sap our independence and our initiative and turn us into welfare dependents of outside companies.

Mr. Speaker, we can do it and we will do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — The question asked on many occasions whether the Americans will buy our potash. Mr. Speaker, it is very unlikely that they would refuse our products because the only significant supply is the Soviet Union and they do not presently have the technology to meet the upsurge in demand and there are no indications that they are in the position to meet these future demands. Mr. Speaker, the American farmers need our potash and I do not think it makes any difference to them whether it comes from Crown corporations or private corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the mines are operated by miners and they will still be there under the Potash Corporation. What will happen, however, is that the headquarters will be brought to Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, headquarters and management will create new jobs. These new jobs that are now located in New York, in Houston, in Chicago and in Toronto and in Europe, the payroll created from these new jobs will have a large impact in our community.

While I am on this subject of headquarters I would like to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker. The headquarters positioning in the province seems to be a problem in this House. We have the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon jockeying for position to obtain the head office to their area. We also have many

other cities in the province that have already entered the game. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Melfort, situated in the centre of the province, with good highways leading to and from, both with CP and CN rail connections, good bus service and hopefully by 1977, a modern blacktop runway, which will accommodate all the planes which will be used in conjunction with the potash headquarters, Melfort being the gateway to the North, the North with all its resources such as gold, iron, copper, uranium, fish, yes and even fishing. Mr. Speaker, Melfort . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — What about golfing?

MR. VICKAR: — Yes, grass greens . . . Melfort is far enough away from any existing potash mine and yet not too far for communications to and from the operation. Melfort, the most progressive town and hopefully soon to be the youngest city in the province, the most peaceful place to locate headquarters for a bustling and hustling industry such as the potash corporation. Melfort is a place where controversy never exists, Mr. Speaker, and I have the assurance of the Chamber of Commerce that whatever type of accommodation the potash industry needs they and the town of Melfort would certainly be glad to oblige. Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that what better contribution can we have in the town of Melfort from the Saskatchewan province, as a gift to our town, when we become the youngest city in Saskatchewan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, moving the potash headquarters to Melfort would quiet completely the controversy that exists between the various centres in the province. We, in Melfort would welcome these headquarters just as we have welcomed many other offices and people to our area.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on Bills 1 and 2 have been continuing now for quite some time, and what have we accomplished? I am sure that everyone in this House, either on the Government side or on the Opposition side, have had his or her say, either pro or con on either of the Bills. How much more can one add to what has already been said, and how many times does everyone have to repeat themselves in order to make an impression to the listening public?

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that when the public heard one speech they heard them all. No one becomes more impressed by continuous repetition of the same remarks. And I am sure that nobody needs any special assistance to make them understand the situation with repeated debate.

On December 28, the CTV television in an interview you probably noticed the Prime Minister of Canada, as I did, and listened to what he said. And although I do not agree with many of his arguments, I do agree, however, Mr. Speaker, that there needs to be some revision in parliamentary performance and I am sure that a good number of you who listened to him that night have to agree, that, what has been done in the last 35 days in this House is just what he is trying to avoid and I have to agree with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — We are repeating a debate on the same subject day after day and we are not moving forward. I suggest that a time

limit would have to be placed on any debate. Naturally before a Bill is brought into the House so that when the time limit is over, the debate is over. I do not think that it will be taking away any democracy from anybody.

Mr. Speaker, when the time comes to make reforms in the House, I hope that this suggestion will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious from my remarks that I will be supporting the Bill and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in this House and speak on this Bill. I just am happy to add a little more of the common sense and responsibility that this side of the House has shown to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — . . . rather than the idiotic stupid statements made sometimes by the Opposition.

I am sure again, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to listen to reading of history books and old newspapers and that is about the length of their speeches.

Mr. Speaker, about all that I have got from the Opposition so far, is their attitudes towards the people of Saskatchewan, to the working people, senior citizens and so on. I have heard them condemn and call all business people of the North, shady characters and scoundrels and that they should be investigated because one or two of approximately 365 outfitters happen to be bad actors. I have heard them condemn both the North and the civil servants from the North, the civil servants in general, Mr. Speaker, and also the residents in the North.

Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of the Liberal Party in this province. If they can browbeat the ordinary people of the province then their corporate friends will look after them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I think this shows how two-faced the Liberals really are. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) when he spoke in this House had the nerve to even mention the Athabasca Pulp Mill. Mr. Speaker, I believe they lost the 1971 election on this issue and then again in 1975, their candidate in the Meadow Lake constituency lost it by supporting that very same thing.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition forgets the very stupid and foolish things they did in the past. One of the blunders was the Athabasca Pulp Mill. I should like, at this time, to point out the deal that they had lined up for their corporate friends, not for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan and certainly not for the benefit of the people of northern Saskatchewan. I think that this was proven by the amount of the Members elected in the 1975 election in northern Saskatchewan and in the whole northern part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals may call the northern people stupid, crooks, browbeat the civil servants and want to investigate the small people, Liberals may feel this way, but we in the North let the Liberals know how we felt in the last election by returning a solid block of NDP Members. Yes, people are glad and they will be happy for years to come that they have NDP Members in the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, the great deal for the people, the Member for Prince Albert- Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) mentions, how they tried to beat the people of Saskatchewan out of their forests in the North. The provincial cash outlay and risk came to a net of \$129,600,000 or 73 per cent of the cost and for this, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan was going to get 30 per cent of this great venture and development. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal corporate friends with an equity of \$16,800,000 would receive 70 per cent of the ownership. This is the kind of a deal that the Liberals would make with their potash friends if they had the opportunity. They would like to spend the money of Saskatchewan people, our taxpayers' money, and give it to their corporate friends and take our natural resources away from us that belong to us.

Also, on top of this, Mr. Speaker, other subsidies; a mill site at the taxpayers' cost of \$30,000; road grants of \$3 million and a guaranteed line of credit of \$13 million for further road and rail lines; and a 1.7 million cubic foot capacity natural gas line to the site — all at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan, with no returns; stumpage you people don't know anything about that because you don't know anything about the North — but the stumpage at half price. One fellow told me they don't pay stumpage in the willow bush in the North, tell your Hon. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Anderson). And a construction contract to build this mill at the cost equivalent to what it cost to built the Prince Albert mill which would give them more than the equity they had in it. More than the equity than they had in it! And also, Mr. Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) they gave them cutting rights on an area as large as the province of New Brunswick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — They would rather sell out to their multi-million dollar corporate friends.

MR. LANE: — Why don't you talk about the Delta System . . .

MR. McNEILL: — I will. I am not ashamed of our record in the North, but I am ashamed of yours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — I have heard the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle, his mouth is going miles before his brain gets in action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, we heard the Liberals condemn the small business man, the working people, the civil servants, but never have they said one word about their corporate friends not paying their taxes or anything. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a bigger hypocrite in this country and certainly not in the House than our Opposition across there. They say on one hand they're concerned for the people of Saskatchewan and yet in this House they will fight tooth and nail for their corporate friends and disregard the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, I have heard on the other side of the House how terrible the NDP Government are using their fine citizens in this province, the potash owners. I don't know of any citizens in Saskatchewan who sit in a board room in the southern part of the States and in other places in the world. They sit all over. They may be citizens, Mr. Speaker, but not of Saskatchewan. Even Mr. Carpenter doesn't have guts enough to have his office in Saskatchewan. I think their attitude shows all their interest in this province is the money, not the people of Saskatchewan or their natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately five to six hundred top level jobs to be had here in the potash industry and I don't know one held by a Saskatchewan citizen. But, Mr. Speaker, when these mines come under the control of the Saskatchewan people, all will eventually be held by the citizens of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Opposition suggest that to solve this situation they would drop the tax structure and implement a fair one. A fair one, Mr. Speaker, for whom? For the potash people or the people of Saskatchewan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House say it will be fair for the people in Saskatchewan and we will see that it will be fair for the people of Saskatchewan.

The tale of the Liberals in the House and Conservatives in the hallways would like us to give these taxes back and not charge any more, all at the expense of the Saskatchewan people. All at the expense of the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, this is again one of the many ways the Liberals would like to sell out Saskatchewan and support their multi-corporate friends. Mr. Speaker, by the miserly attitude of the potash people, by refusing to expand, has cost thousands of jobs and therefore this is another way the friends of the Liberals have created at the expense of the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland suggested the millions of tax dollars from potash could be used for social programs. Yet another bridge in Saskatoon, they've got thousands of them, they want another one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what taxes is the Member speaking of? If the Liberal Opposition had their way, all the taxes would be given back to the potash people. And there would be none charged any more in the future. I say that the natural resources belong to the people of Saskatchewan, and this includes the potash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — And that the revenue from this should go back to the people of Saskatchewan. And when this happens we will have money to spend on social and other programs for the bettering of the people of Saskatchewan. Maybe then, Hon. Member for Saskatoon- Sutherland, we could get our bridge across the median that we have needed for years. And that the Federal Liberal Government has absolutely refused to have anything to do with paying for it, and they have got a moral obligation to pay over half of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, the scare tactics and such have been bad or worse than when they fought medicare and Government insurance and any other program that was good for the people of Saskatchewan . . . That's right, they speak with two tongues. I have lots of Indian friends in the North and they have accused the white man of that for years but now they are starting to accuse the Liberals of it.

Mr. Speaker, all forecasts indicate the continued strong demand and a firm price. Getting into the potash business at this moment could be the best investment this province has ever made. I think everyone agrees that the long term future of the potash industry is pretty sound. Potash is bound to be a very important mineral in our world population explosion and food crisis. Now it is used for fertilizer. I know the Liberals don't need fertilizer.

It is a basic ingredient of fertilizer used in regions of Asia, Africa, China, India, Japan and in the long run our potash will always be in demand. Acquiring the potash mines is a timely move, Mr. Speaker, for Saskatchewan for several reasons.

Ownership and control of most of renewable and nonrenewable resources will be returned to the people of Saskatchewan. Existing programs and services can be maintained and upgraded. Exciting new social and economic and cultural programs in the Saskatchewan tradition can be developed in the future. Thousands of secured and highly skilled jobs in Saskatchewan will become available in the future. Head offices and top management jobs will be here, instead of in Houston and other places. Salaries and wages will be spent in Saskatchewan to the benefit of our Treasury and the general economy. Saskatchewan people, not the foreign multinational corporations will not make vital decisions, such as expansion of potash production, development of new markets and the protection of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, there is a desperate need for economic leadership in our nation. Private corporations owned by people in distant cities and other lands and managed by corporate bureaucrats are making decisions that should be our making. Now is the time for leadership. To show Canadians it is possible to buy back our economy and run our own country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, I think the most disgusting thing I heard is when Ambassador Porter started mixing in provincial politics. At least the Prime Minister of the province had nerve enough to say he was wrong, but not the Leader of the Opposition, he jumped up and patted him on the back and said it was a fine thing.

Saskatchewan is setting an example, providing a model leadership for all Canadians by taking this move to attain some effective control through ownership of most of our vital minerals. But this is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has led the way before, with medicare, with auto insurance and now is the time for national leadership in the resource industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — And once again, Saskatchewan is leading the way. As I said before there will never be a better opportunity than to do it now. There can be no doubt that we need to expand potash production in Saskatchewan. World potash production is growing at five and six per cent a year. That represents an increase of something like 1.5 million tons a year. And that is what a good size potash mine produces. So the world needs about one new mine a year. In Saskatchewan if the industry had the will to do it, we would increase production quickly, substantially and at a reasonable cost by expanding some of the existing mines. That can only go on for so long, but it would postpone the need to undertake major expensive new mines immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I think from my remarks you would gather that I support the motion and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know and I am not really sure if there is anything the Member for Meadow Lake said that was worth responding to, but I will tell you one thing that there is some hope for the NDP yet, if you people ever get a licence to run a freak show, you will make a million dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — It is interesting the amount of time that we have spent in this House and we have pointed out to Members opposite, in fact to every one here, that we intended to stay here for a very long time to debate the potash legislation. They may be assured that we will be considerably longer.

What we have attempted to do on this side of the House is point out to the best of our abilities some very serious concerns

we have about the potash legislation particularly Bills 1 and 2. We pointed out to the best of our information the reasons why we think the Government shouldn't go into this business and we have pointed those reasons out strenuously. One of the things we have been waiting for on this side of the House for the past 35 sitting days is for one Member from the Government's side to stand up and give us one credible reason why the Government should be going into the potash business. Now the Member for Melfort has stood up and in his dissertation on the potash business he only at one point alluded to one reason why the Government should go into the potash business and that was because the potash companies weren't playing ball with Saskatchewan. And that has yet to be proven to us. He intimates that because the potash companies would challenge the Provincial Government's taxing legislation in the courts that they should be nationalized. We have said time and time again that the day the citizens of this province, whether they be corporate or individuals, lose that right of recourse to the courts then we don't live in a democracy any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I was surprised as well that the Member for Melfort when discussing this legislation, I was surprised to say the least that he would stand up and support this as a good business deal and I can only come to one conclusion and that is that he certainly never wrote his own speech before he gave it in this House and he never read it before he gave it. Because I understand that he was a successful businessman in the Melfort area in the car sales business and I assure you if he was successful in that business through the years when there were good car sales and bad car sales, he knows something about business and obviously never read his speech before he gave it.

Members opposite have yet to stand up and give us one example of how this is going to be a good business deal. You have continually ignored advice from professionals saying that the money that you will lose in revenues for the first ten or 12 or 15 years when you invest in the potash business could be better spent elsewhere. In fact, your net return and our net return to the people in this province could be higher if you stayed out of the potash industry. We have pointed that out many times. And no Member here yet has got up and disputed that fact, so I would suggest it isn't a good business deal. Time after time after time we hear nameless and faceless Members from that side get up and espouse some rich speech about how we are thrashing the Crown corporations in this province and they keep using as examples how successful Sask Power is, and how successful Sask Tel is and how successful SGIO is, and because of that, how successful Saskatchewan Potash is going to be. Well, I'll tell you something, you may be right. If you give yourselves the monopoly on potash sales in the international market and if you set the prices yourselves, like you do with Sask Power and Sask Tel, you will be successful provided there is a demand for potash, as there is for telephone service and power. I say those arguments don't hold water.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I have heard people on that side of the House suggest that there is no question the finances involved in this deal will

be sound. We have continually asked for you to give examples of why. We said tell us where you are going to get the money so we can make that judgment. Where are we going to get the money and what is it going to cost? All we hear is the Premier saying it is going to be a self- liquidating debt. Don't worry, it won't cost a cent. He also says or intimates we'll probably use the money from the Energy Fund to help finance the potash deal, but don't worry, we will just be borrowing it. I find that reasoning fairly suspect as well. The Premier informed this province some time ago that the money that would be put in the Energy Fund would be used to develop new energy reserves in Saskatchewan. I suggest he in effect gave his word to the people of Saskatchewan and certainly to the Federal Government that that was what would be done with that money. I would suggest that if the Premier has decided to change his mind despite the fact that he had given his word to the people of Saskatchewan, he must have had very considerable encouragement to do so. And I can only think of one thing that would encourage the Premier to change his mind on that Energy Fund money and that is that he can get that money at considerable less cost than he can get money on the New York market and the international market. And if he gets that money from the Province of Saskatchewan at considerably less cost, which could be eight or eight and a half per cent, then he is in effect costing the people of this province money because that money from that Energy Fund could be invested for ten or ten and a half per cent. In fact, then, I would question the seriousness of this statement that this will be a self- liquidating debt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I am going to be interested to hear the Premier explain that, when he gets up to address us in this debate, if he ever does. We want to know where the money is coming from. We have asked Members opposite on numerous occasions to provide us with that information, basic information. I would assume that you have some idea outside of the Energy Fund where you are going to get your money and what rates you are going to have to pay to get it. Basic information we have asked for and it has been refused and all we get for answers when we keep asking these things is people like the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McNeill) standing up and giving us a history lesson on something that happened in 1971. I'll tell you something, Member for Meadow Lake, you were born four years too late. Believe me, you should have been in the middle of that Athabasca Pulp debate. I'll be interested to hear your remarks on this potash debate four years down the road because it will take you that long to figure them out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — And as a last result, as was pointed out, Members opposite like to talk about medicare. Well, I pointed out in this House before as have other Members, we don't intend to legislate through history. We will learn our lessons from history but we are more interested in the present and the future than we are in medicare or the shoe factory, in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . learn history, too.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, you might take a good example from Saskatchewan then, Mr. Attorney General. The cost of this deal alone may be staggering, in interest payments alone the cost of this deal may be staggering. We are talking about possibly sending \$100 million or \$120 million a year to the American capitalists in the States, in interest. I wonder how you sleep on that at night, you great protectors for the small individuals in Saskatchewan and death to American capitalists. You rest easily, instead of counting sheep when you try to get some sleep, I want you to count every dollar in interest that you are sending across the border, if your legislation ever gets that far.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — You intimate that the people of Saskatchewan won't have to forego any services in order to fund the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. You have suggested that it isn't going to cost anything. Where are you going to get the money to replace the \$130 million a year that we get in revenue from the companies now while you are paying for those companies? What programs are going to suffer?

I'll tell you something. I wouldn't buy them in the first place. You have suggested that the reason you had to get into the potash business was because they weren't good corporate citizens. You have said the main reason we have to go after the potash companies is because they won't play ball with Saskatchewan and I said before and I am going to say it again now, if you people had any capability as administrators in looking after the public interest you could make those potash companies do what you wanted. I suggest they haven't done anything wrong. They have taken your bad legislation to court and I suggest that if that is wrong then it is wrong for any individual in Saskatchewan, and that would include the Member for Melfort to take any bad provincial legislation to court, the only bad thing about it obviously is losing. You have the opportunity as legislators in this province, through regulation and through taxation to control those companies. You have that power, you have that power through regulation and taxation. You have the power to tell them whether they can operate in this province in the first place. You have the power to decide how many mines operate in this province. You have the power, in effect, to tell them how much potash they can produce. You have the power over their environmental policies to see that the environment of Saskatchewan is protected on behalf of the people of this province. You have strict labor codes in Saskatchewan to see that these companies treat the workers of this province properly. What more do you need? Because you passed a piece of bad legislation and got yourselves in hot water with the companies you have to go through a tantrum and socialize them at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

I would hope in the next ten days or the next few weeks, or the next few months, however long it takes to get the kind of answers we feel the people of this province deserve, I hope you start coming up with some credible reasons for getting involved in the potash legislation. And I would be interested in hearing the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) getting up and saying what he has got to gain as the Labour Minister by taking over the potash industry. I would be interested in hearing the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) getting up and explaining to the

people of Saskatchewan how they are going to be better off in the environment field as a result of the potash takeover. I would be doubly interested to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) get up and tell the people of this province how they are going to be better off. Give us at least one good reason, let's have a little flicker of light at the end of a long dark tunnel. We haven't had it so far. I suspect if there is any hope yet it is to come from that Minister who is responsible for the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. Perhaps the Premier, I would certainly hope the Premier. We haven't really had anything from the Attorney General, his left hand man. All we have got is the legal description of the Bill. I hope you provide us with some answers.

MR. ROMANOW: — You weren't listening in second reading.

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, I listened attentively, I assure you as I do to everything you say, Mr. Attorney General. Unfortunately I never heard any credible reasons for taking over the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — We have even gone beyond the point of speaking on the principle of the thing. We feel we have convinced you that there is no reason to take it over in principle. Now all we are asking you is to give us one reason why it is a good deal and you have been unable to provide us with that yet. Facts, one of the Members said, yes, we have been asking for facts for 35 days. We have been refused them on every occasion. We have asked this Government the questions of basic information, as I pointed out, and they have refused to give it to us in this House. We have gone to the extent of calling for the Crown corporations to sit so that we might get those questions through there and it was, of course, flatly denied. We felt that these matters and this information was of urgent public importance and I suggest it is. We are embarking on what even the Members opposite consider the biggest thing in Saskatchewan's history and yet in the middle of that you refused to provide us with that information. What have you got to hide? We offered to debate you in the media centres of this province, in debate which surely experienced Government Cabinet Ministers could have handled themselves. We were refused that opportunity. A neutral forum we asked for to provide the people of this province with some insight into both sides of the story and what happened, it was refused. We asked for an independent committee, a legislative intersessional committee to look into this to try and find one credible reason why the Government has to go into the potash industry and that was also refused. It is no wonder some of the Members on this side of the House sound impatient when they stand up and address themselves to the Cabinet Ministers opposite. And I'll tell you something, it is no wonder that the vast majority of the people of this province are getting impatient with the Government for not providing information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I have considerably more to say about

January 14, 1976

Bill 2 and its effects and the implications of it and its effects on the people of Saskatchewan and for that reason I should like to beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.