

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature.
31st Day

Tuesday, March 31, 1970

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

Welcome to Students

The Speaker: — I wish to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries; 25 students from the Hugh Cairns school from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South represented by Dr. Forsyth, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Mills; 34 students from the Greystone school from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University, represented by their Member, Mr. Charlebois, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Bill Marler; 62 students from Holy Rosary school in the constituency of Regina South West, represented by Mr. McPherson, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Fortin and Mr. Frei; 54 students from Walker school in the constituency of Regina North West, represented by their Member Mr. Whelan, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Hordman and Mr. Hunter; 66 students from the Lorne Hazelton school in the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South, represented by Dr. Forsyth. They are under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Webb and Mrs. Clarke. I am sure that all Members of the Legislative Assembly wish to extend to these students in the galleries, the warmest of all possible welcome and express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable, educational and wish each and every one of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Announcement

Contracts Re Employment of Indian and Metis

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce a new Government policy in connection with the employment of Indians and Metis in Saskatchewan. The Government continues to believe that one of the major social priorities in our province must be to find employment opportunities for our approximately 70,000 native people. A huge percentage of this racial group continue to live on social aid. While progress has been made these past few years, there is still a dismaying apathy and disinterest among our white population toward the seriousness of the problem.

One of the difficulties in locating employment opportunities is the fact that many of our native people lack adequate educational qualifications. However we feel that this stumbling block must be overcome. The Government has tried to set an example, and may I say that we now have about 700 native people hired by Government Departments, Agencies, and Crown corporations. Yet, we feel that additional action is urgently and desperately required.

I, therefore, wish to announce that commencing April 1st a clause will be written into all Highway contracts and all

Government building contracts making it mandatory that a percentage of Indians and Metis be hired. The target will be five per cent of the total work force though the Minister may be in his discretion decrease or increase the percentage of the work force required to be persons of Indian ancestry.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we may want a higher percentage in areas north of Prince Albert; a lower percentage perhaps down in Shaunavon in the southern area where there are not so many natives. Contractors will be subject to penalties, and I may say that they will be severe penalties, for non-compliance.

Every effort will be made to work with any unions involved. At the same time the Government will seek and expect cooperation from union membership, in the vital task involved.

While there may be some difficulties and problems with the new regulations, I invite the patience and understanding of our people generally.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.R. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the native people of this province will welcome that statement made by the Premier this afternoon. I, for one, certainly welcome the announcement of such a statement. I know that it is difficult to have the kind of employment that the Premier speaks about unless some provisions are not made as he suggests this afternoon will be made in the future.

I would like to examine the statement which the Premier has made in more detail and at which time I would like to add additional comments.

Change of Date for Enforcement of the Education and Health Tax Act

Hon. D.G. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to inform the House that I will ask the Legislature to change the coming into force section of The Education and Health Tax Act from April 1st to May 1st.

This change will be of particular interest to food vendors who anticipate collection of tax on food if the sale is above 14 cents, commencing April 1st. The reason for the change is that the Legislature has not as yet approved the amendments to The Education and Health Tax Act and is not likely to do so within the next few days. In fairness to the many, many businesses and individuals affected by the tax change, some advance notices of procedures to be followed and definitions to be used, should be provided.

I would point out that it would not be proper to do this as long as the proposed Education and Health Tax Act amendments are being scrutinized by the Legislature. So there will be no change in the E & H tax until at least May 1st.

Mr. W.G. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on the announcement of

The Provincial Treasurer, I think that we on this side of the House will be prepared to postpone the amendments indefinitely.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Resolutions

Resolution No. 18 — Consideration of a Standing Committee on Provincial Relations

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):

That the Legislature recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a standing committee of the Legislature on Federal-Provincial relations, whose jurisdiction would be the entire matter of Federal-Provincial relations, including finance and constitution, with powers to meet inter-sessionally, receive briefs, summon witnesses and documents, with power to add from time to time representatives from such organizations as the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce this Resolution respecting Federal-Provincial relations and Saskatchewan's role with respect to them. I know that, at a time of critical economic crisis for the people of Saskatchewan, many of our people are probably temporarily laying aside considerations of Federal-Provincial relations in the sense of constitutions and the like and are rightfully more concerning themselves about the bread and butter issues, to coin a phrase that has been stated many times in the Province of Saskatchewan as it relate to this area. However, O do introduce this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I think we are legislators of Saskatchewan must be ever mindful of this very delicate relationship that is called Canada.

Some Canadians predict that the great Canadian debate, so-called, has been entered into and is being centred around Federal-Provincial relations. With that comment, I should like to briefly discuss the problem in general terms before introducing the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are in a crisis in Canada. Before examining relations between French-speaking and English-speaking people, I think a first consideration must be an examination of the structure on which this nation rests. We have a nation that has adopted a form of government that under the best of circumstances is a very difficult form of government to function smoothly. Federalism is a complex concept for politicians and our citizens to grasp. I think the average Canadian is confused, as it the average politician and perhaps some governments. Unlike citizens in other countries, Canadians must modify the word nation, always, with the words federalism. As has been stated once by Lord Acton, "A great democracy must either sacrifice self-government to unity or preserve it by federalism."

And later, the noted political scientist, Harold Laski, pinpointed the difficulties of federalism by saying, "Federalism may be described as apoplexy at the centre and anemia at

the extremities.” Thus, we have in Canada 10 provinces which have been given certain powers by the Constitution but must repeatedly, because of the increased activity, go to central government for aid in carrying out their program. If you add on top of that, Mr. Speaker, 58 per cent English-speaking and 28 per cent French-speaking and 14 per cent so-called other speaking peoples of this country, it is no wonder that we have a problem with respect to Canada’s Constitution and Confederation.

Therefore, what we as legislators in the Province of Saskatchewan, in fact all Canadians have, is the awesome task of making a political system of sensitivity and delicate balance of federalism blend with the varied and often conflicting sentiments of nationalism, regionalism, religion, language, culture, and I suppose regretfully, petty politics.

Mr. Speaker, I think that misconceptions in respect to Canada are very deep indeed. It must have been frightening for members of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission of two years ago to have head the views of Canadian citizens of differing backgrounds, in different regions of our country, trying to describe the characteristics of their fellow Canadians in other regions. As I have said, there must have been deep misconception. Most of us on the Prairies feel an unnaturalness in the presence of a culture and language that is so different from the mainstream of North American activities. To most of us Quebec, I think, is thought of as an island in the middle of a huge English-speaking sea. After all we use English daily. We read books in English; attend cultural events where the language is English; we see television; listen to the radio; movies. For good or bad, our culture in Saskatchewan, and in Western Canada particularly, reflects the North American way of life which in terms of language is an English way of life.

As I have said, moves and material that we receive from the United States and other places add to this feeling of unnaturalness to the existence of Quebec. In fact, I think that most people would argue that the existence of the French nation, so-called in Quebec, is a product solely and exclusively of Section 133 of the BNA, a purely legalistic approach and not one consistent with the facts of Canada. The B & B Commission reported that one questioner in Victoria asked the chairman of the Royal Commission if it was really true that French Canadians are forced to learn French by the Liberal party. One of my friends told me that when he was at a convention recently in Quebec, in Montreal in fact, the delegates there were asked by a Quebecker and they asked a Quebecker, “Your children may learn French in a classroom but tell us what language do they really speak when they are playing outside.”

These comments, Mr. Speaker, show what I mean by this unnaturalness of Quebec’s presence and how most of us in Canada feel. In other words, these questions are an example of the type of feeling that I am sure more outside Quebec harbor. The feeling is that all Canadians speak English or at least if they don’t, they should speak English for that is the language of Canada. On the other hand, the misconceptions of Quebec are just as strong. French Canadians, when they talk of those of Quebec, usually grandly describe all Canadian people — and this is particularly applicable in the Western parts of Canada — as our friends the English, ignoring the large ethnic population of Western Canada.

What if a Quebecker studies history and discovers that his tongue was the language of the day back in 1604 and ever since that time? He must surely view the rest of Canada as a composition of recent arrivals. There even appear to be, Mr. Speaker, two interpretations to the historical events that have shaped Canada. I suppose from the native population's view, the English and the French have the same title to Canada for the same reason, conquest. But the French have made the same title to Quebec for the same reason. Quebec says that to the French-speaking Canadians, I suppose very broadly speaking, Lord Durham was the great assimilator. To the English-speaking, he was a great decolonizer. Riel was a murderer who was finally brought to justice. To the French Canadians he was the defender of minority rights, judicially murdered.

May I digress very briefly in this regard. I want to emphasize that the remarks I am making about the Constitution and about the problems of Canada, as I see them, relate directly to a large extent to the language and the ethnic problems that have arisen in this conception within the two groups.

Let me give you another example. These conflicts have not been resolved and they have never been forgotten. They have in fact been distorted and I suppose my getting up today and saying these few words in the Legislature have added further to the distortion. It has been distorted by all people in Canada. The words of Durham, written in 1838 in his report, I think, are equally applicable today if we look at Canada really, when he wrote, "Thus, they live in a world of misconceptions with each party set against the other, not only in diversity of feelings and opinions but by an actual belief in an utterly different state of facts than really exist."

And the B & B Commission ruefully concluded in one of its reports that in Canada there is no dialogue at times. There only appears to be two soliloquies. Well, Mr. Speaker, when minority rights are talked of by French Canadians, Canadians of other nationalities and ethnic groups plead for recognition of their linguistic and cultural rights. Perhaps they are really fighting for preservation for their own mother tongues or whatever reasons. Here in Saskatchewan and on the Prairies this is probably more evident than anywhere else in Canada. The influence of French-speaking Canadians in Saskatchewan and Western Canada is minimal. For example, in Saskatchewan, nearly 54 per cent of our population are from Ukrainian, German, Dutch, Polish, or other ancestry. Forty per cent are English and just over six percent are French. And similar figures paint the same story in the Province of Manitoba and in the Province of Alberta.

What I am going to say is going to apply to the mood of Western Canada, I hope. People on the Prairies view with alarm and concern, the development with respect to the Constitution, not in recent months but in recent years in the history of Canada. There are three factors for this concern. I know the Hon. Premier tries to pinpoint the areas of concern in terms of economic reasons and I will come to that in a minute. But broadly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I say that long after the economic reasons for alienation have gone, there are essentially three factors for this concern in Western Canada.

Firstly, all Westerners have a pride and a feeling of belonging to one nation called Canada. This sense of belonging to and of founding one nation is as strong as any of the older

Societies elsewhere in Canada. People in the West are deeply conscious of having themselves cleared and opened many of the great stretches of territories west of the Great Lakes. And in a different but very real way they have contributed to the founding of a very important part of this great country. Accordingly, it is difficult for Ukrainians or any people from ethnic background to accept arguments that other nationalities or cultures have some vested or special interest in the formation of this country. Wrongly or rightly, people in Saskatchewan reject that concept and think in terms of one nation.

Secondly, whether young or old, all people in the Prairies are the victims of the Great Depression and I think, Mr. Speaker, that this had a strong effect on unifying Canada as far as our position is concerned to the rest of the country, more than anything else. Factors of climate, economics and politics from 1930 to the present have combined to rid Saskatchewan of any narrow provincial attitudes that have forced it to seek national remedies for her ills. I may just stop here. I still think that that it is the feeling of Saskatchewan. I think the feeling of the people of Saskatchewan is to rid itself of any provincial or narrow or inward-looking approach as far as Canadianism is concerned. I don't think that recent talk of Western alienation, the recent talk of Western separatism by the Hon. Premier or this Government, by respected members of various bodies in the Province of Saskatchewan, is in the mainstream of thinking of the people of Saskatchewan. The Great Depression, I think, has taught us and has rejected that narrow and provincial attitude once and for all. With this Depression in the 1930s, came unbelievable hardship. And if the repercussions on the Dominion were widespread, the conditions in Saskatchewan I am told, and by reading reports and accounts of history, were nothing short of disastrous. As a result, we on the Prairies and in Saskatchewan had to look to Ottawa for our salvation. That was the trend that was started and still exists. Slowly and reluctantly, the Federal Government in that time of crisis did not move to the aid of the Prairie Provinces. It is correct to say that today, at times, we get the feeling that the Federal Government does not know of the problems of Western Canada and is not moving to alleviate those problems. That is correct to say. But it is correct also that this can be directly attributed not to the concept of federalism but to the men who are in power in Ottawa and in Regina, the men of a political party that does not accept the position that the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan should work in a positive force to solve the ills and the economic crisis that we face in Western Saskatchewan at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The 1930 experience, Mr. Speaker, dramatically demonstrated for all of us here on the Prairies, in Saskatchewan particularly, demonstrated our independence with the rest of Canada. It highlighted how small a place we were in this world, how susceptible we were to the varying changes of world conditions and climates. And that time has come again. That point in history has repeated itself again on the people in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province will not look to Western alienation or Western separatism but will, like in 1930, go back to Ottawa

and a strong central government within federalism and Confederation for the cure to our ills.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Accordingly, the West has concluded that economic ills can only be treated on a national level. As a result of the 1930s, there was, I think, a new attachment to the concept of a centralized, federal form of government at Ottawa. Demands of articulate and learned people in the French Canadian nation, in Quebec, are looked upon here in Saskatchewan as running opposite to the best economic, political and social thinking in the best interests of us, the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Thirdly, I suspect that Poles, Germans, people of all ethnic groups of the two major groups are worried that the recent events at Ottawa with the Federal-Provincial Conferences, are worried that somehow in the Federal-Provincial Conferences we are going to be squeezed out of our rightful role shaping the future policies of Canada federally, nationally, and internationally. Somehow I think people on all sides of the House and in all parts of the Province of Saskatchewan don't understand Federal-Provincial Conferences. They somehow suspect a huge power play whereby their rights to language and culture and economic and social benefits will be overlooked and deprived. When a person talks about equal partnership or talks of deux nations, or two nations of special status, somehow we on the Prairies tend to feel that there is going to be the establishment of a new economic and social aristocracy or a distinction with respect to Canadians here in Western Canada.

This is a very real feeling in the Province of Saskatchewan. There will be those with a special claim to Canada. That is the fear that I am told many times. Frankly, to the average person who is a recent arrival to Canada and our country is one who has freed itself, they view, from any particular bonds to any country, Britain or France, they are forced to learn English when they come to the Prairies. To many, the thought that French Canadians will not have to do similarly, that they will not have to compromise, that Eastern Canada and Ontario will somehow not have to compromise with us in a similar way, smacks of unacceptable discrimination.

When our 14 per cent so-called other-speaking people came to Canada they were not told, Mr. Speaker, that they were coming to a bilingual and bicultural country. Thus, they fear, and I say that it is a correct fear, about much of the recent Federal-Provincial Conferences and much of the talk we hear coming from the Province of Quebec.

So for these three reasons, Mr. Speaker, people on the Prairie Provinces look to, and always will look to, a strong central government with respect to Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, one can see the many stresses and strains pulling at Confederation, as I said, regionalism, federalism, economic strain here on the Prairies, the situation of the farmers, compounded with the emotionalism of language and culture. And that is why I have delved into that part of this problem because I think that is really integral to the issue that we are talking about. It is little wonder that Canada is like one long ship, sometimes looking to many of us, leaking in many places but sinking so gradually that nobody wants to admit it.

March 31, 1970

Mr. Speaker, what then are the solutions and where do we go from here? I want to say categorically that I condemn any attitude or any public posture taken by politicians or otherwise, that relies on a form of cheap and petty politics, that plays on divisions of this country in order to further the interests of Western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Nothing ever will be gained in my view by the Hon. Premier or by the leader of any party in the Province of Saskatchewan or Western Canada, going about enunciating at length the reason for separation from Canada and not the reasons for looking to a strong central government. If the Premier and his Government have decided that as a course of political tactic, as I am afraid they have decided, that is the way out of its present economic mess, then I say the Premier and the Liberal Government opposite are in for a rude awakening when the people of the Province of Saskatchewan are told the story of this.

It is, as I have described it in another debate, and there is no other way to describe it, cheap politics. It is sandbox separatism of the most unrealistic and unworthy kind.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — A couple of days ago, I was particularly concerned to notice that at the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Convention here in Regina one Mr. Edward Murphy, the president of the Association, had indicated that a strong resolution with respect to Western alienation had to be passed and communicated to Eastern Canada because of the present economic problems. According to the newspaper reports that I saw and the television report, Mr. Murphy's reasoning behind that resolution was because he has noticed that in the past year, the Province of Quebec was able to achieve much of the solutions to the problems and much of the demands that it wanted by being obstinate, when it comes to the conference table at Federal-Provincial Conferences. That was the reason that was advanced by Mr. Murphy, the president of this Association at this conference. If I have misinterpreted his position, I stand to be corrected and I apologize now. But that was what was communicated to me.

I can say to any organization that, as much as Quebec has gained by coming to the Conference table with a gun pointed at the rest of the nine provinces, it has lost and Canada has lost by promoting division.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — If there is any lesson to be gained by the SARM or SUMA or by any other responsible organization, Wheat Pool or economic and social ills that plague us now, it is the lesson of not to follow the confrontation politics of the Province of Quebec.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Much of the division, much of the problem, many of the concerns of the people of Western Canada that I have enunciated can be directly attributable and laid at the feet of the attitude taken by the politicians of the Province of Quebec when they come to Federal-Provincial Conferences.

I say the position taken by Mr. Murphy, if that's the one as I have enunciated, and by other organizations, is regrettable and may be a disservice to the Province of Saskatchewan, because, Mr. Speaker, now in this time of economic and social crisis, we as Western Canadians cannot look inwardly. We have no solutions by separating and forming these provinces as an independent state. It is an economic fallacy. It will be a social injustice. It will be a legalistic monstrosity to try to think in terms of an independent state of free provinces. The inevitable result will be to be sucked in by the United States. That may be good and may be bad. It will also mean the acquisition of all the problems of that great neighbor of ours to the south. As far as I am concerned the people of the provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta can say, I am quite confident, "We cannot look to that inward approach." Now is the time for the SARM to adopt a statesmen-like position. Now is the time for the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan not to be enumerating the reasons for Western alienation. Now is the time for this Liberal Government to be going out actively, confidently, with vigor to the Federal-Provincial Conferences and fighting hard for Saskatchewan's plight, but not by confrontation politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, now is the time for a commitment to Canada. Now is the time for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to get that commitment. This is what I hope by this Resolution I can get Members on both sides of the House to accept.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls for a Standing Intersessional Committee of the Legislature to deal with Federal-Provincial relations. I went about the task of trying to prepare a few remarks about this very difficult problem. I notice one of the books in my bookshelf is one that I read at University. It is called "France Against Herself." I am sure many members have read it. I concluded that perhaps no better title could be given to this particular address, although I refuse to accept it, "Canada Against Herself." I don't suppose to be presumptuous to any Member in this House and the people of Saskatchewan to suggest that I have any solution to this problem. But like all Canadians, I do have my own views and I am going to take this opportunity to briefly put them on the table and before this House. It appears to me that there are five alternatives to the problem of relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians and the problem of economic and social development and growth in Western Canada. With one of these, the hopes and aspirations of the vast ethnic peoples of Saskatchewan must be accommodated. I think there alternatives are as follows: 1. Complete assimilation. 2. Total bilingualism. 3. General maintenance of the status quo; the way things are now with a few minor changes. 4. Co-existence of two unilingualisms. 5. Widespread changes in the legal status of Quebec and a reshaping of the decision-makings

at Federal-Provincial Conferences.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the first possibility, complete assimilation. The melting-pot theory has been favored by many. We look to the United States. It has the advantage of simplicity. But the solution here does not seem to be practical. If French-speaking Canadians ever become convinced that this is the policy of the majority of Western Canada or the majority of Canada, then Confederation, I think, would quickly vanish. With all due respect, this view has been by-passed by the events of time in Quebec and Canada.

The second possibility, that of total bilingualism, I think it Utopian. This does not seem to be the demand of French Canada either. The majority of French-speaking Quebecers do not speak English. The idea that most English-speaking Canadians would want to or could ever become fluent in French, as desirable as that would be, does not appear to be practical.

The third possibility, namely to try to continue as we now are in Confederation, with Quebec being the sole bilingual province has the advantage that no constitutional changes would ever be needed. I presume the government would try to counteract nationalism by a gradual policy of extending French Canadian influence, as it is trying to do in the Civil Services, Crown corporations, general economy and bilingual districts. This approach I think will be rejected. *Le Devoir*, a newspaper in Montreal writes, I quote:

It would be a great mistake to think that a simple extension of bilingualism and a few particular privileges for Quebec will be sufficient to relaunch Canadian federalism. It will not be satisfied with a slightly renovated status quo.

The fourth alternative of two unilingualisms, I suppose is simplistic in its logic, in that Quebec would be in the same constitutional position as the rest of the nine other provinces put together. With all respect to Rene Levesque and others who are knowledgeable in this area, I think this is his position, simplified. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be an admission of the failure of this great country of Canada to adopt that position. It would mean that we could no longer synthesize our two great basic cultures and the situation would still be as Lord Durham wrote back in 1838 and as I alluded to in my beginning remarks, "Two nations in the bosom of a single state." Such a step would legalize the concept of dual nationality that I think is no longer acceptable.

The fifth alternative is widespread changes in the legal status of the French language and the French-speaking nation. Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies that in my view that holds out the best prospect for survival. I feel it appeals to the most articulate and learned Canadians. To that end, I feel such commissions as Bilingualism and Biculturalism, as much as they have been attacked by politicians and elsewhere, have tackled the problem realistically and with the correct attitude. Eventually, this alternative may mean the spread of bilingualism to courts, perhaps even to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. I also see this as being a foundation for working out a system where linguistic, cultural, and economic rights of other ethnic groups that populate the Prairies are accommodated. I see this as the best hope to develop a multi-cultural policy

as far as Western Canada is concerned. I see this as the best chance for us as legislators to set up a machinery whereby French-speaking, Ukrainian-speaking, German-speaking, Polish-speaking people can communicate with us the Government, the representatives of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I see this alternative as being the best avenue whereby the groups could assimilate within the two great nations. I deplore the fact that it seems to me the Government opposite has done nothing to set up a special branch or bureau whereby constituents can communicate in a particular language, can communicate their problems and receive attention in that line. There is no harm. There would be very little expense involved in having that type of a situation set up. But this Government has either been unaware or unconcerned about the problems. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I get many letters from constituents and from other people in the Province of Saskatchewan who can only write in one language and that language is not the English language. We should be looking now to devising ways and means in this House to work within this fifth large alternative that I talked about to develop a multi-cultural state, also implementing widespread changes in the legal status of the French-speaking people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there will be no ready solutions. I want to conclude my remarks now by just briefly pin-pointing the highlights of my Resolution. There are, Mr. Speaker, four major reasons for this Resolution. 1. The development of Federal-Provincial Conferences has caused anxiety and concern everywhere in Canada about what is going on in respect to their own cultural, linguistic, rights and economic rights. I have already made that point. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the growth of these Conferences has meant the growth of a new body of governmental and policy decision-making that we as legislators in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada have been excluded from. When the Premier and Members of this Cabinet go to these C Conferences in council with other provinces and come to certain decisions about the Constitution, about Bill of Rights Entrenchment, about an amending formula, about tax-sharing formulas for the monies of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, they come back to answer to no one. It is like a brand new level of government-making decision-making. It is a new parliament if you will, dealing with Federal-Provincial relations. If we hold dear this concept of a government reporting to this House, because we represent the people of Province of Saskatchewan, then we had better devise ways and means to have that report put on the table before this House and made a subject of debate on a regular basis. The development of these types of conferences means a development of this new body of decision-making and I say this is a first reason of paramount importance to having this special standing committee set up.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution and Federal-Provincial relations must be dealt with in a non-partisan, impartial way. The Constitution of Canada, the economic welfare of our province, the social plight of our poor is not the sole domain and concern of the Liberal party of the Province of Saskatchewan. How we are going to communicate within our courts, how we are

going to deal with our legislators, how we are going to deal with the institutions of government are of concern to every political party and every person in the Province of Saskatchewan and indeed the Dominion of Canada. I say that the present formula lends itself open to the chance of a political party using the Federal-Provincial Conference for political gain and advantage. When you have presentations made by the one group, the one political party, then I think past history has shown regretfully and regrettably that Canadians are very often sacrificed at the tables of Federal-Provincial Conferences and relations. All parties must be brought in to the consultative process.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, this proposed committee I see would be the basis of receiving opinions from all the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. If the Hon. Attorney General likes, a form of extra-parliamentary activity, I think, would be generated with people coming to this committee and presenting their views, criticizing the government, giving their suggestions, with us listening to the people for a change, and going to the Federal-Provincial Conferences knowing what they want when it comes to our interests, economic, social, political and legalistic. I hope this committee would tour the Province of Saskatchewan on a regular basis. I hope that it would accept these views. I trust that it would even explain to the people of Saskatchewan what is going on at these Federal-Provincial Conferences so that they may be informed and more aware because a concerned and aware public only means that we the people can benefit.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, and finally, this committee will be consistent with the recent approach adopted by the Federal Parliament in setting up an Inter-Provincial Committee there. Members of the Legislature will know that just a few months ago, a few weeks ago in fact, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau set up a special committee such as I am proposing. This committee will do the things that I have talked about if the concept of the Prime Minister is carried out. That is a good thing. We must be consistent in that approach. Our Saskatchewan committee could work with a Federal Committee. Our committee could report to the Legislature. It could be a direct link all the way through from the Federal Government to the provinces, to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. So I say let us be consistent and uniform in our approaches in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the Legislative Assembly see fit to adopt this Resolution that I have put forward. As I said at the beginning, I have tried not to deal with too many of the break and butter issues, because, I think, this is the great Canadian debate and that sooner or later we are all going to have to be standing up on and saying something about it. I call on all Members to be statesmen, to show vision in this area, to be committed to a positive, forward-looking government that will go to these Conference tables in the best spirit of cooperation and harmony, in the interest of Canada and all Canadians. This is a chance for the Government and for the Members to show their concern.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion, I know it is very difficult to follow a Member like the Member for

Riversdale, but I am going to put it the way that I see it. I have always been a Member that favored legislative committees. I know on Highway Safety the Legislative Committee did a wonderful job, we did not waste our time, the fruits are there to prove it. On several other committees that I have served I know we saved a lot of time and it is an effective vehicle of the House to use. I am certainly in favor of taking this problem out of the realm of politics and discussing it at a much higher level. I think it is a very important question and I think we could use this committee as a vehicle to better understand it. I know we will be stronger and better for it. It would be a better example for the rest of Canada and also a better example for the rest of the world. Every time we have a problem that presents itself between East and West we hear the cry of separatism. When we hear this type of cry it sets our country back further and it tends to divide us. I want to say again that a committee of this kind would tend to bring better understanding in this House and in the country as well. In this province where we have a great many different places, in some areas you hear, j'ai beaucoup de français dans mon comté, in another area you would hear, ja magou bohato ykayintsiw y moyee hromadie, so you can see how mixed up things can get in just one little province. Now I know that in a country of mixed races like we have, we could be the greatest ambassadors throughout the world with our example. I am not going to make a very long speech. I would say that working together for the common good has always been a good idea. In closing, I would say, instead of trying to change people, let us try to understand them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — This committee is a challenge, I ask the House to support it unanimously.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, this is a very complex constitutional topic and will require further comments from this side of the House. I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Second Readings

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) moved second reading of Bill No. 03: An Act to incorporate The Saskatoon Foundation.

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor for me to be associated with this Bill which seeks to incorporate the Saskatoon Foundation. The organization which is proposed will fill the role of a trustee for the citizens of Saskatoon. It will receive funds in the form of direct gifts and bequests and will administer these in accordance with the wishes of the donors as the purposes are set forth in the Act. The proposed foundation is patterned on similar organizations such as this in Winnipeg, Calgary, and Vancouver. The advisory board which is proposed in this Bill will of course serve without remuneration, but since I have the honor to be named as one of those who are expected to form the

March 31, 1970

first board, I feel that I should declare my interest in this Bill and refrain from participating in the vote.

Mr. Speaker: — I am sure all Members will take note of what the Hon. Member has said in connection with his personal interest in this matter.

Mr. Charlebois: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 03 an Act to Incorporate the Saskatoon Foundation be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Adjourned Debates

Motions for Returns

Return No. 6.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) for Return No. 6 showing:

With respect to the per-ton fees paid by the International Minerals Corporation to the Government on potash hauled over Highways No. 9, No. 22, and No. 80:

- (a) the total amount of such fees paid in 1968;
- (b) the total amount of such fees paid in 1969;
- (c) the dates on which the per-ton fee has been revised;
- (d) the amount of the per-ton fee following each such revision.

And the proposed amendment by Hon. Mr. MacDonald:

That the following words “With respect to the per-ton fee paid by International Minerals Corporation to the Government on potash hauled over Highways No. 9, No. 22 and No. 80” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

With respect to the per-ton fees and special contributions paid by International Minerals Corporation and permits and licences, Education and Health Taxes, and fuel petroleum taxes paid by its trucking contractor, Kleysen’s Cartage Company Limited, in connection with potash hauled over Highways No. 9, No. 22 and No. 80.

That subsection (a) and (b) be amended by adding after the word “fees” in each case the following:

“and special contributions, permits, licences and Education and Health and fuel petroleum taxes.”

Hon. D.G. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, since this motion stands adjourned in my name I can’t amend it, but I am going to prepare an amendment, it is important that we give the House more information in regard to this motion than it asked for in its present form. It only asks for the amount of per-ton that was paid by the International Mineral and Chemical in the agreement we made with them for hauling potash south to the border from the mine in

Esterhazy. I think it is interesting to note that from the 25 cents a tone we have collected \$125,000. We also made an agreement with the Cartage Company that they would buy all their spare parts in Saskatchewan and would pay tax on all the trucks they use, they would by all their fuel and spar parts in the Province of Saskatchewan. The taxes collected so far from them in connection with this haul has been \$60,000 for E & H tax, fuel tax — gas tax \$302,000 and for permit fees \$124,000 for the trucks, making a total of \$661,000 that we have collected just in taxes, fees, and the 25 cents a ton so far. We have made a new agreement to carry on from here under which we will receive 25 cents a ton — this Agreement will be tabled — until a year next July. Through that and the fuel tax they have paid and the tax on spare parts, we calculate that by the end of the Agreement we will collect another \$700,000. In total we will have collected from this Agreement over \$1 million, from this haul. I would point out to the Hon. Members that of this \$1.3 million, almost half a million dollars was the 25 cents a ton which they paid to allow us to maintain and, wherever necessary, to rebuild the roads. So I thought Members would be interest in the total amount of money that accrued to the Government because of this Agreement.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse what the Provincial Treasurer has indicated in relation to the Government revenues produced from this Agreement. I would like to add that this is not only important as far as Government revenues are concerned, but there are other factors in this Agreement which certainly have a positive bearing on the Province of Saskatchewan.

First it makes a very vital contribution to one of our major industries which is having financial trouble. Of course everyone is aware of the potash difficulties that are going on in the province at the present time. One of the major problems that they face is freight rates. This industry is making a very major contribution to the Saskatchewan economy. I would like to give you just a little indication of what this contribution to the Saskatchewan economy has been by the Cartage Company that has of course taken oven this potash haul. I have a statement of operating and capital expenditures for the period from November, 1968 to December 31, 1969 on the Esterhazy potash operation.

First of all the operating expenditures, salaries and wages \$935,000, fuel \$553,000, permits and licences \$133,000, administration \$105,000, repairs and maintenance \$708,000, for a total of \$2,434,000. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the capital expenditures for buildings in Esterhazy \$150,000, in Carlyle \$10,000, in North Dakota \$5,000, equipment in Esterhazy \$30,000, in Northgate \$90,000. In addition, Mr. Speaker, of course they purchased a trucking fleet which cost \$1,350,000 which was not purchased in the Province of Saskatchewan. However, they did contribute taxes in the province on this fleet. For example even in the contribution in the purchase of fuel alone was \$553,000. The number of gallons purchased was 1,574,300 gallons, so I think that this potash operation has made not only to the Government revenues of the Province of Saskatchewan but to the overall Saskatchewan economy. Therefore, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough) to the motion of Mr. Meakes:

March 31, 1970

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 6 to be amended as follows:

That the following words "With respect to the per-ton fees paid by International Minerals Corporation to the Government on potash hauled over Highways No. 9, No. 22 and No. 80" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

With respect to the per-ton fees and special contributions paid by International Minerals Corporation and permits and licences, Education and Health Taxes, and fuel petroleum taxes paid by its trucking contractor, Kleysen's Cartage Company Limited, in connection with potash hauled over Highways No. 9, No. 22 and No. 80. That subsections (a) and (b) be amended by adding after the word "fees" in each case the following:

and special contributions, permits, licences, Education and Health and fuel petroleum taxes.

Mr. J.E Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, will the Member permit a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes.

Mr. Brockelbank: — You were referring to certain figures there and these were over and above the figures that the Provincial Treasurer mentioned. Is this correct?

Mr. MacDonald: — These were different figures.

Mr. Brockelbank: — You mentioned a set of figures, permits and licences \$133,000. Well, the Provincial Treasurer used that figure so you are using the same figures that he is using and adding them on top of...

Mr. MacDonald: — What I gave is an operating statement of Kleysen's Cartage Company Limited which included permits and licences, salaries, wages, their complete operating statement. Some of the figures, for example, on fuel tax were mentioned by the Provincial Treasurer, also permits and licences, however, not salaries, not fuel, administration, repairs, maintenance, capital expenditures.

Mr. Brockelbank: — If you get somebody else to get up and speak he can use them all again.

Mr. MacDonald: — Correct.

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — We might do that!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank the Provincial Treasurer for the added information. It was really...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Just wait

Until I get the amendment before the House and before I put the amendment before the House, I want to make sure it is in order.

The debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — I only rise, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) whether he is prepared to table the statement from which he read a moment or two ago. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, he said this was a statement of Kleysen's.

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, I will table it.

Mr. Meakes: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how much I appreciate the information that the Government has given me. You know if I had thought for a moment that they would give me this information I would have asked for it, but for so many times we have been refused similar information that I thought I had better keep the question simple. I want to say how much I appreciate it. Thank you.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 44

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife) for Return No. 44 showing:

With respect to students who applied for loans under the terms of the Canada Student Loan Plan in fiscal year 1969-1970 to January 31, 1970: (a) the total number of loans granted; (b) the average amount applied for; (c) the average amount granted; (d) the number of applications in which the amount granted was less than the amount applied for; (e) the number of applications rejected altogether; (f) the number of applicants qualifying for independent status under regulations; (g) the number not qualifying for independent status under the regulations; (h) the average amount of parental contribution where the applicant was classed as independent; (i) the number of applications where the amount that could be granted was greater than the amount requested.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. McIsaac:

That all the words after "1970" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(a) total amount authorized in student loans; (b) total number of students assisted; (c) average loan authorized; and (d) number of applications not approved.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion amended was the original motion submitted for the first time last year. You can see this on page 109 of the Journals, 1969. And the reason this motion was submitted was that we want to investigate the problems of students getting enough in their loans to be able to attend university. The conditions last year were bad and conditions this year are absolutely disastrous and we want to know what the Government is doing to help the situation.

When the motion was made last year the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) amended it. He made two changes, one rephrasing and the other an addition. And in the motion made this year we incorporated his own second amendment last year. Last year the Return was ordered on March 11th and tabled on March 21st. The original question asks for nine items. The Government amendment proposed by the Minister of Education gives us three of these items and we don't feel that this is good enough. And particularly since last year the Department has added staff of all kinds and we think that we should be able to get this information without too much trouble.

It appears that the amendment refuses to give us information and is in fact a straight refusal of information and I don't think that this is fair government practice. I ask Members to defeat the amendment and to support the original motion which asks for the identical information given to Members in this House last year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Adjourned Debates

Resolutions

Resolution No. 1 — Prairie Farm Machinery Prices

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin):

That the Legislature of Saskatchewan urge the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to analyze and assess the alleged exploitation of prairie farmers in the cost of farm machinery as reported in the Barber Report, and if found correct, to take immediate action to restore prairie farm machinery prices to a fair and realistic level.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Meakes:

That all the words after the word "that" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore: This Assembly commend the Barber Commission for its forthright exposure of exorbitant prices charged farmers by the large farm machinery corporations, and urge the Federal and Provincial Governments to take immediate steps to:

- (a) Roll back farm machinery prices to reasonable levels and require farm machinery companies thereafter to justify publicly any proposed increases before an appropriate prices review agency;
- (b) Require those farm machinery companies guilty of charging excessive prices to pay rebates to farmers who have purchased their machines within the past two years;
- (c) Within Saskatchewan, appoint a committee of farmers and dealers to advise the Provincial Government on

prices, and to investigate allegations of excessive farm implement prices charged in the Province; and

- (d) Consider the extension of financial and management aid to encourage the establishment and growth of Prairie-based farm machine companies, in particular farmer-owned companies such as Canadian Co-operation Implements Ltd.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join in this debate. I believe it will be and I very well think it should be one of the more pertinent issues that will come before us during this Session of the Legislature. I am grateful to my colleague for moving the amendment which does, in my opinion, incorporate the kind of action which farmers of Saskatchewan want and are in fact, I believe, entitled to.

Contrary to the Resolution moved by the Government Members it does provide some concrete proposals for getting action on the Barber Commission Report. I was somewhat amused, Mr. Speaker, the second opening day of this Session, as many of us will remember, as it was indeed a day of great performance in this Legislature. You will recall when the Government Members began to respond on the Government side of the House like very well-trained seals. Each of the four Members who had been detailed by their coach to get in a “friend of the farmer” act almost fumbled the ball when all of them tried to be the first with their farm resolutions and we are debating one of those farm resolutions.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — I think you’re waking up over there.

Mr. Bowerman: — That’s right. This sudden inspiration of haste and great day of resolution by the Liberal party was, of course, most notable, not for what it was to accomplish by way of a resolution but rather what it was designed to prevent by way of emergency debate on the crisis that does exist in Saskatchewan agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I suggest, Sir, that this position becomes more obvious when we now begin to look seriously at the lack of effective remedial action as proposed in this original Resolution. There is evidence of the usual Liberal stage play on words. It is a typical performance of political manoeuvre to say something and to do nothing or to simply say as little as possible and accomplish less.

Mr. Speaker, consider the fact that there was sufficient evidence back in 1939 to arouse the weary Liberal Government of that day to set up a special committee of this Legislature to deal with farm machinery costs and with the costs of farm distribution. It is not difficult, Sir, to find a constant reoccurring reference by farmers and by farm organizations and by governments to the relatively excessive spread between machinery manufacturing and farmers’ costs. Consider the fact, I suggest as well, that we now have the results of the Barber Royal Commission study, a study on farm machinery and marketing

that is international in its terms of reference, a commission study that took nearly four years to make its preliminary report on the results of its findings in farm machinery costs, a study that has produced irrefutable documented evidence of the excessively high costs charged against Canadian farmers by the large international machinery corporations. There is evidence, Mr. Speaker, in the face of the Commission's inquiries that these same international machinery corporations continue to increase the farmers' costs of machinery only to enlarge their own net profit positions annually. And in the face of these facts we now have a Government Resolution calling for an analysis and for an assessment of what they term is an alleged exploitation of Prairie farmers. I suggest that seal No. 1 really didn't seem to perform too well on this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — I am sure that the Saskatchewan farmers as well as all Members on this side of the House are wondering who the Government has in mind to appoint from among its back benchers that will do this thorough, detailed analysis of correcting Dr. Clarence Barber's work on the Commission. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that it won't be the same two hard-working Member that were so eagerly involved in their important work of selling grain to Romania a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, the original Resolution goes on to say, "if" and it begins with that well-meaning word, I presume, "If we find the Barber Commission Report correct, then we will restore fair and realistic prices." What a shroud of scepticism about so important a document. The Government Resolution is an apology to the machinery corporations. It is an apology that the Barber Commission...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — ... ha caught the machinery corporations in the act of lining their pockets from the Canadian farmers. I suggest that it is a Resolution that advocates a stalling for time, a talk about but do-nothing Resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to second the alternative Resolution on behalf of the farmers of this nation, a Resolution which commends the Barber Commission for its forthright exposure of the exorbitant prices that are being charged farmers by the large national and international machinery corporations. I am proud to associate myself and my colleagues in full support of the Barber Commission recommendations and commend them for their courage and fortitude in digging so deeply into the sacred chambers of the monopolistic giants of this industry.

Mr. Speaker, it rests at the fingertip-control of Liberal Governments in Saskatchewan and in Canada the absolute responsibility and possibility of providing dividend payments to Prairie farmers at an estimated \$15 million to \$20 million annually. That dividend will in fact be a refund of the excessive charges upon farmers' machinery costs that is now claimed by the industrial hoards of Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is for this very reason that the original Resolution was couched in such mealy-mouthed rhetoric so as to be totally ineffective to do the job that

unavoidably must be done. Perhaps we should review some of the interesting history and statistics leading up to the activity and report of the Barber Commission.

My hon. colleague, the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) mentioned some of these but I will go on to mention them again and perhaps some others. I refer again to 1939 when a Select Special Committee of this Legislature was established to inquire into the costs, the sale and distribution of farm implements and parts. In 1952 another special committee of this Legislature was established to review farm machinery prices and profits. It held various meetings — 19 or 20 in all — it so indicated. In 1952 the United Nations also reported that on the basis of retail sales prices, machinery prices in the United Kingdom appeared to much lower than in the United States and in Canada. In 1955 the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life recommended reform within the farm equipment and distributing system industries. In 1960 the House of Commons had a special committee investigating farm machinery prices. Again in 1963, Mr. Speaker, a special committee of the House of Commons was set up to make an intensive study into manufacturing and distribution costs and other factors relative to the farm machinery industry. This committee brought in 30 or more acceptable recommendations. When we add these all together, Mr. Speaker, that is six legislative committees with two governments involved in a little more than 20 years and really no results.

In 1966 the Barber Royal Commission was established and today we have an almost incomprehensible result of that in-doeth study in farm machinery prices. These recommendations, Mr. Speaker, should be the action of Canadian governments for the '70s to relieve the oppressions of Canadian farmers in matters of purchasing the tools of their trade. If this Liberal Government defeats the present alternative motion, moved by my colleague from Touchwood, and adopts the main motion which they have set forth, this Liberal Government is simply saying to Saskatchewan farmers we are not satisfied with the Barber Report and to camouflage their determination to do nothing, it may call for another Select Standing Committee of this Legislature in 1970 or some other investigating device.

Mr. Speaker, our governments must begin now to roll back farm machinery prices which will potentially reduce farm tractor prices by 30 to 45 per cent from current Canadian Prairie prices. This could reduce some tractor prices as much as \$2,5000 from current dollar values. It is totally conceivable to suggest that this reduction in farm machinery costs can put more net return in Prairie farmers' pockets than the whole exercise of acreage payments that is now being proposed by the Federal Government.

It must also be recognized that when the governments have successfully obtained competitive machinery prices for Prairie farmers that we in Saskatchewan much continue to urge upon those governments the importance of requiring farm machinery companies to thereafter justify publicly and before an appropriate prices review agency any proposed price increases.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence establishing the fact that farm machinery manufacturers under international combines arrangements have been gouging Canadian farmers at least since 1952.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 31, 1970

Mr. Bowerman: — This evidence has now been established beyond reasonable doubt by the Barber Royal Commission and also by the experience of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture early in 1968. In addition to these evidences the corporations continue to increase their machinery prices in face of the Commission's investigation. As well, they have used their strangle-hold influence on the machinery industry to prevent farmers from purchasing machinery in markets abroad. And I understand that machinery prices this year again will increase substantially.

This alternative Resolution acknowledges this outright defiance of economic justice in the market-place and calls upon the Saskatchewan and Canadian Governments to require those farm machinery companies that are guilty of charging excessive prices to pay rebates to farmers who have purchased farm tractors in the past two year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — To a province that spends nearly \$1-3/4 million annually for farm machinery, a rebate of 30 to 40 per cent of the tractor sales alone would indeed lift a great deal of the cost burden from the Saskatchewan farmers today.

In support of the position that farmers' organizations and governments can have effect on machinery prices this is evidenced by the news report in The Leader Post January 11, 1968. The headline on that occasion was, "Tractor prices kept down with control in Britain." The Premier and the Government Members across the way will of course say that this is the old Socialist Britain. Socialism is alright, they say, except that it doesn't work. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is the Socialist programs that kept farm machinery prices down in Britain, then what farmers need in Saskatchewan is some Socialistic programs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bowerman: — That quotation from the Socialist program reads as follows. And I quote from The Leader Post again of that date:

Two years of wage and price controls in Britain have kept tractor prices down for British farmers while prices have continually gone up in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — Wages are down there too!

Mr. Bowerman: — In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the (d) portion of the motion which reads:

Consider the extension of financial and management aid to encourage the establishment and growth of Prairie-based farm machine companies, in particular farmer-owned companies such as Canadian Co-operative Implements Ltd.

I do firmly believe that commensurate with the Government's responsibility to roll back machinery prices in Canada, its other greatest single responsibility in this respect is to establish a bold and responsible program to offer financial and management aid to Prairie-based machinery companies.

The mover of the amendment has pointed out the benefits that have accrued directly to Prairie farmers from the farmer-owned machine company, Canadian Cooperative Implements Limited. When the full story is written, Mr. Speaker, farmer of Canada will recognize that the same machinery power structure of international giants has constantly attacked the cooperative machine companies' source of machinery suppliers and I list them:

Cockshutt was bought out by White Motor Company and the sales of machinery to Canadian Cooperative Implements was suspended. Clacey Combines of Germany sold out to the New Holland Company and combine contracts to Canadian Co-op Implements were as a result suspended. Claas Combines of Germany negotiated exclusively to the Ford Motor Company. Combine contracts to Canadian Co-op Implements were as a result suspended.

Mr. Speaker, this machine cooperative company has constantly been a thorn in the flesh of corporate giants. It deserves the support of the Saskatchewan farmers. I am happy to report, as an active and participating member of Canadian Co-op Implements Limited, that at this year's annual meeting of delegates they incorporated additional flexibility into their sales operation which will save farmers a maximum of 43 per cent off the list price of combines and tractors. This, Mr. Speaker, will in fact reduce a \$10,000 machine to \$5,800 cash deal. This company will, in addition, provide a service to farmers for disposition of their used machinery and offer other valuable sales and serving options of great benefit to the Prairie farmers. I submit the final paragraph of this Resolution urges the Governments of Canada to recognize those kinds of Prairie-based farm machine companies, particularly those of a cooperative nature.

We on this side of the House urge the Saskatchewan Government to be determined to strengthen the position of these companies to the extent that corporations will be required to meet reduced farm machinery prices that are possible through such services. We don't need any further analysis and assessment of the facts. Those facts are well known and I think well established by the Barber Commission Report. What we want is action and by seconding this motion I call upon the Government to get in the game and get off the fence.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment but not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to take part in the debate but I want to set a few facts straight here this afternoon. After listening to the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) I realize that he is more confused than ever before and especially when he is supporting an amendment that was presented to the House by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), because after all the Member for Touchwood was a member of a government during the time they set up a committee to inquire into the prices of machinery in this province. To my knowledge and to the knowledge of the farmers in the province as a result of the committee of that day, the price of machinery didn't go down at all during the length of time they were in office. In fact it went up every year since and so to come into the House and move an amendment such as he has here this afternoon just

represents another bunch of Socialist gobbledygook. Now the Member for Shellbrook says that tractor prices in Great Britain have been kept down by virtue of controls imposed on the industry by a Socialist Government. So what! Maybe they have kept them down for the British farmer but what the people of Canada and the people of Saskatchewan are complaining about is they impose no controls on the exports of the tractors made in that country by the Big Four subsequently exported to Canada. When you ask the Socialist Government in Great Britain why don't they do something about this — they are supposed to be the Mother Country of the Commonwealth — why aren't they trying to protect some of the members of the Commonwealth by keeping the price of tractors down to Canada for instance, they say, "Oh no, we need more foreign currency." So the price of the same tractor to a Saskatchewan farmer is maybe \$1,750 to \$2,000 higher than it is to the British farmer. The Socialist Government is quite willing and quite prepared to accept that rake-off. So if the Socialist Government is going to have any control certainly it should act in the interest of the countries that have to import these tractors.

Now then, he says the Provincial Government hasn't done anything since the Barber Commission Report came out. I want to indicate to the new Member that he probably wasn't even in this House when this Government presented the brief to the Barber Commission here in the city of Regina. And incidentally when that brief was presented at that time it was regarded as one of the best briefs presented in Western Canada and I am certain that a great many of the recommendations in the Barber Commission Report were taken from that brief. Then subsequent to that when the Barber Commission Report was announced, we got in touch, in fact myself, as Minister of Agriculture, got in contact with the Federal Minister and indicated to him that many of these things were beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government because these were controlled by international corporations and international companies. However, I am only going to indicate at this time that we did ask the Federal Minister, the Hon. Mr. Olson, to do all he could in his power to see that some of these things could be corrected. I think the best answer to what the Federal Minister has already done comes in the way of criticism in a publication called, "Agri Week" in the March 30th issue. I am going to read you one paragraph of this issue this month. The heading says, "Down with price — Olson."

Having apparently adopted as gospel the Barber Report on tractor prices, Federal Agriculture Minister Olson is in the midst of a determined campaign to force tractor prices down. In recent weeks he has been meeting with Massey-Ferguson, Ford, International Harvester and John Deere officials, calling them to account for the Barber charges. But the best way to bring tractor prices down is to increase competition in the field so he has been talking to officials of the Winnipeg Versatile Manufacturing Ltd., about the company's plan to produce tractor models smaller than its present four-wheel drive for 135 horse-power tractor. There are behind the scenes negotiations with the Departments of Regional Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce, centring on federal assistance to Versatile for construction of a new plant to make these smaller models. He has been talking to representatives from Romania, from Russian, from Japan, Czechoslovakia and as they say in other obscure places,

letting them know that their tractors are welcome here in Canada. The Minister has been discussing the subject with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture under whose auspices six Romanian-made tractors are coming to Canada next month and will be tested here. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture is still at this as well. An official of the organization was recently in (of all places it says here) Finland, looking over some Belmet tractors. Japanese trade officials apparently told the Federal Minister that their tractor makers have nothing to offer in sizes suitable to Canadian needs and they are not interested in developing units for so small a market. And so the industry's Big Four are preparing counter studies to show just how the Barber Commission is wrong.

So when the Member gets up and tries to infer in this House and tries to leave the impression with the people of Saskatchewan that nothing has been done by the Provincial Government, no requests have been made to the Federal Government, no requests have been made to the Federal Government and in fact that the Federal Government has done nothing, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the best defence of the Minister of Agriculture comes through a publication representing those institutions that are taking violent opposition to what he has done up to date.

Mr. Speaker, our own Provincial Government through SEDCO has offered loans to the provincial concerns who are building machinery in this province, and I know that our own Provincial Government has been doing everything in its power to bring some of these new industries into Saskatchewan to make implements suitable for Saskatchewan farmers under Saskatchewan conditions and apparently getting results. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the amendments that have been submitted by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) are just so much window-dressing. Let's get back to the practical aspects of the Resolution and vote against the amendment and support the Resolution.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I too had not intended to participate in this debate. I thought that this Government and the mover would have realized ... I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am surprised to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) getting up in his place and attempting to ridicule the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) and what he has said and what others have said, and attempting to uphold that weak, namby-pamby Resolution of the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), that nothing Resolution. If anybody accepts that, it is an admission that we are defeated before we start.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Why, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most ridiculous performances I have ever seen the Minister of Agriculture put on and he is a master of them.

Prince inquiry, he said, and he talks about the former government conducting a price inquiry and he is right. We conducted that inquiry within the borders of Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, and when we had gone as far as we could and needed permission to carry on and do what the Barber Commission has now done, some many years later, we were told, Oh, no. The Federal Liberal Government at that time refused to move on it. It refused and you are the people that were supporting it and are

still supporting it now. Twenty years late with this Barber Commission Report. You Liberals could have done something, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, if you had had the intestinal fortitude to have done something at that time and you could have prevented many of these things happening if you hadn't sat there and done nothing.

Now, let's take a look. What did you people do since you took office? One of the first acts by the former Minister of Agriculture, your seatmate, now the Senator, went on a little trip and was entertained by the machine companies. He came back with glowing reports of how wonderful everything was down in the heart of Chicago or wherever he went; saying what wonderful things these machine companies were doing for farmers. Why, they were testing everything, and that little namby-pamby AMA couldn't do anything in Saskatchewan that wasn't already done adequately by the companies. And when you did away with AMA and the testing of machinery, you proved that once again you were the friends of the machine companies south of the line. You proved that, and let no one on either side of this House forget it. You did away with it, and the machine companies said, "Oh, now our friends are over there in Saskatchewan and we can really get out and exploit these farmers." And they did. And they have been exploiting them more and more every year since. Now the Minister says Mr. Olson is going to ask for some more voluntary restraint, Mr. Speaker, more voluntary restraint! Well, we know what happened to Mr. Trudeau's voluntary restraint when the steel companies deliberately put on a five per cent increase while he was talking to them, and other things that have happened since Mr. Trudeau was talking to them

An Hon. Member: — They are making a study.

Mr. Kramer: — They are doing just exactly what Liberals have always done — talk and talk and talk and no action. That is exactly what the Minister of Agriculture is guilty of, covering up, saying, well, someday maybe, something will happen. Mr. Speaker, the only action that can be taken is the action that is proposed by this amendment and I am heartily in support of it. I am not going to support a motion such as moved, and I think possibly with good intentions by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this, it does nothing to really do the job that is necessary to protect the farmer. It does nothing for a roll back of prices. Restore he says. Restore what? What do you intend to restore? The prices we've had before, that have already been proven to be too high, that have been proven by the Barber Commission to be exploiting the farmer? This is what he is saying, he wants more of the same. And how can we, how can any Member in this House support that kind of a Resolution?

I support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two with respect to the amendment and the Resolution. I was prompted to enter the debate as the result of the words of the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) indicated to the Members of the House that Liberal Members in Ottawa and Liberal Members in Regina were doing all that they could do. Why, he said, you know the Liberal Minister in Ottawa,

Mr. Olson, he is doing all that he can. The Minister of Agriculture said, why, you know, Mr. Olson is going ahead and he is talking to all of the machinery companies and he is going to talk them into it. Mr. Olson is taking real strong action, according to the Minister of Agriculture. That's what he said. Then he picked up the journal, and then said, "Now I've got the proof in this farm journal that the Minister is getting some positive results. He's doing something for the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan." What the Minister of Agriculture failed to do though was to read the local newspapers here in Saskatchewan, one of which is The Regina Leader Post. The headline says respecting those very talks that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) referred to — "Machine firms reaction discouraging." And I am just going to read the first two paragraphs, Mr. Minister, with respect to that publication that you told Members the about:

Agriculture Minister H. A. Olson said Tuesday he has challenged the four big machinery manufacturers in Canada to do something about their high Canadian prices but reaction has not been encouraging.

Mr. Olson in a speech to a joint convention of the Farmers Union of Alberta and the Alberta Federation of Agriculture indicated that he has been unable to get satisfactory explanations from the companies on why their Canadian prices are higher than in other market areas.

Unsatisfactory explanation, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. And here we have the Provincial Minister of Agriculture telling us, telling the farmers of Saskatchewan that all is in hand. The Minister of Agriculture, federally, is going around and he is talking to the boys. You're not even up to date with what the Federal Minister of Agriculture has said. He has said that he can't get any results from this group. Then he says, well, you know, we are doing lots of things provincially. Why, he says, the Hon. Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) didn't know that we presented a brief. He says you know for the farmers of Saskatchewan we really spoke, the Minister of Agriculture tried to tell the Member from Shellbrook. He said we presented the brief and he said do you know what, he told the Members of the House, the recommendations for the brief have been accepted by the Barber Commission. If that's the case, if this brief was presented, if the recommendations were accepted, then why has your Government introduced such a namby-pamby Resolution. If the Barber Commission has come about and accepted the very things you have proposed, then why do you want your Members here to analyze and assess the alleged exploitation? Alleged exploitation. That's the type of action the Minister of Agriculture is giving to the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan. He asked what we've done. Well I can tell him what he has done. The Barber Commission on Agriculture said one of the things the farmers wanted, and what the Barber Commission has recommended, was a form of government testing of agricultural machinery. The Minister of Agriculture didn't know that.

A thorough study was conducted by a University of Manitoba professor, and I just wanted to quote some facts and figures to the Minister of Agriculture. Eighty farmers were examined and interviewed in Alberta and Saskatchewan. And here is what the survey shows: 73 per cent displayed a negative attitude to current testing by farm machinery; 73 per cent said that the

March 31, 1970

current testing by machinery was not good; 46 per cent had a negative attitude with respect to improvements in new machinery; 63 per cent — no research on design and durability; 90 per cent that more standardization of repair parts was needed; 66 per cent were sceptical of company warranties; 86 per cent were sceptical of advertising by companies — and I doubt that very much — and the result was the recommendation by the Barber Commission that there be some form of independent testing of agricultural machinery by the Government.

You know the type of action this Government has taken. It abolished AMA when it took steps. The Barber Commission says you have got to have it, but not the Minister of Agriculture or the Liberal Government opposite. They abolish it. That's the type of concern we get from the Liberal Government. Well, I am not surprised, Mr. Treasurer, that you have lost touch with the farming people. I am not surprised when I see headlines like this, "Machine firms reaction discouraging." You know, they have every right to say, No, to the Barber Commission because all they have to do is look at this Resolution and they can say that the Government of the foremost province that uses machinery in Canada is taking a wishy-washy stand on agriculture. We don't have to worry.

What this Resolution has done is to indicate to the people of Canada and Saskatchewan that the farm machine companies are thumbing their noses at the farmers and they are thumbing them because you, you the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), everyone on the Treasury Benches, every last one of them doesn't have the guts to put the blame where the blame lies on the farm machinery companies. Well, the Minister of Agriculture says, well you know, some things are Provincial and some things are Federal. After all this is a constitutional thing. Now you see it, now you don't see it — you know. Sometimes it's a Provincial matter, sometimes it's a Federal matter. The Minister of Agriculture is always hiding behind the Federal-Provincial Conferences, other than making separatist statements from time to time when it's appropriate. Then they run to their friend the separatist from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane). He keeps on advocating that when it is convenient for him. The Minister of Agriculture and this Government are totally at fault at the type of gouging that's been going on. You don't have to hide behind the Constitution. The amendment tells you what you can do. You can urge, for one thing, that the Federal Government press for a roll back on prices. They have taken millions of dollars according to the Barber Report, trillions of dollars from the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan, and they deserve something back now. They also simply want another consideration. They say that you should set up a committee to investigate, to go ahead and check into this via consumer protection. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is so proud about consumer protection, why isn't he introducing some consumer protection legislation?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Oh yes, the Attorney General has got lots of consumer protection in all of the areas that essentially are of some assistance. But when it comes to farmers in time of crisis, he's got nothing but a smile for the farmers of

Saskatchewan. A contemptuous smile is what the Government opposite has got for the farmers of Saskatchewan. There is nothing — and you can check with your Attorney General about this. There is nothing unconstitutional about the recommendation in the amendment put forward by my colleague from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). Nothing, absolutely, and if you took the time to read the amendment and understand it with your Government, you would support it. Because you don't, you are the friends of the big business farm companies. You are going to support them. They are hiding behind your protection and your inadequacies. The farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan are being gouged. You, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, the Treasurer, the Premier and the Attorney General, all Liberals opposite stand condemned and are to be blamed for this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 23

Lloyd	Meakes	Pepper
Bowerman	Berezowsky	Matsalla
Kramer	Smishek	Wooff
Messer	Thibault	Willis
Wood	Whelan	Kwasnica
Blakeney	Michayluk	Kowalchuk
Romanow	Brockelbank	Byers
Dewhurst	Baker	

Nays — 31

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Larochelle	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Gardner
Cameron	Estey	Coupland
Steuart	Hooker	McPherson
Heald	Gallagher	Charlebois
McIsaac	MacLennan	Forsyth
Guy	Heggie	McIvor
Loken	Leith	Schmeiser
MacDougall		

The debate continued on the motion.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I am like quite a few other people here this afternoon who had really no intention of entering this debate, but I would like to say a very few words on it. It seems to me that the farming population of Western Canada has been very concerned about what was disclosed by the Barber Commission Report, the way in which they have been led down the garden path concerning the prices of machinery which they had paid compared to what has been paid elsewhere, and what has been paid in this country under certain circumstances of importing machinery. I think that the Barber Commission is certainly greatly to be commended upon what they have done here in bringing in the recommendations which they did. I think that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government can be well advised to take whatever action that is possible under their jurisdiction to try to see that some actual redress for the farming population is brought about because of

March 31, 1970

action taken as a result of this Report. In that respect I think that we feel that this is a natural outcome of what would be the fine work that is done by the Barber Commission.

Now in the motion which you have before us I notice that the mover of the motion is saying that he is asking that immediate steps be taken to analyze and assess the alleged exploitation of Prairie farmers in the cost of farm machinery as reported in the Barber Commission, and if found correct, to take immediate action to restore Prairie farm machinery prices to fair and realistic levels. Mr. Speaker, I take great exception to that word “restore”. You know I have been around these Prairies some little time. Of course, I suppose, if you look at the price of binders back in 1929 it might look pretty reasonable to day but at that time — I don’t think there was ever a time in the history of Western Canada that I can recall that Prairie farmers felt that farm machinery was very reasonable in price. And taken in comparison with the prices of commodities and in regard to the farm labor, other labor, and so, I think that even back in those days we felt that the price of machinery was pretty high. I believe it was. And one thing I noticed during the Depression, everything else went down — the price of labor was nothing. The Government paid you to take a hired man and everything went right to the ground, sales of machinery dropped off. There was absolutely no sale of new machinery but the price stayed the same right straight through the Depression years. I don’t think that there ever has been a time that I can recall when the price of machinery was really what it should be in line with other things. I think that there are some things about this motion, but I feel that personally I just cannot accept it with that word “restore” in there and I would like to move, seconded by my seatmate Mr. Messer (Kelsey):

That the word “restore” in the second last line be deleted and the word “reduce” be substituted therefor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 24

Lloyd	Meakes	Baker
Bowerman	Berezowsky	Pepper
Kramer	Smishek	Matsalla
Messer	Thibault	Wooff
Wood	Whelan	Willis
Blakeney	Snyder	Kwasnica
Romanow	Michayluk	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Brockelbank	Byers

Nays - 31

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Larochelle	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Gardner
Cameron	Estey	Coupland
Steuart	Hooker	McPherson
Heald	Gallagher	Charlebois
McIsaac	MacLennan	Forsyth

Guy
Loken
MacDougall

Heggie
Leith

McIvor
Schmeiser

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of interest was created throughout Canada and especially in the Prairies by the Barber Commission and the Barber Commission Report. A lot of time was spent in preparing and drawing up that report. I believe that the problems of the farm machinery prices were well analyzed at that time and of necessity the Barber Commission found, after they had all the information, that farm machinery prices were excessive. This motion here would lead one to believe that farm machinery prices had been a fair price all along and they are just asking them to restore it to a fair price for farm machinery. Well, the farmers of the Prairie regions know that farm machinery prices have not been at a fair realistic price; they know that throughout the history of the West farmers have always had to pay more for the farm machinery than was the proper value, if the goods were sold to the consumers here in the West at a fair, decent price. Already in the East we see that in Ontario, where the machine factories are, that hundreds and hundreds of workers are laid off now because there is no sale of farm machinery. Some of the big departmental stores have closed because those workers don't have the payrolls coming from the machine companies in order to continue to be purchasers in those cities. On the other end of the cycle we see the farmers here not able to sell their grain; they haven't got the money to pay these high prices so consequently they are not buying the machinery. I feel that the Barber Commission should be commended for the work they have done, and I'm a little perturbed at the tone of this Resolution. I think that the mover could have had a better drawn-up motion, one that each and every one of us could have supported. I do not agree with this Resolution in a number of aspects but in order to try to make it a little more acceptable, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move, seconded by Mr. Thibault:

That the word "restore" in the second last line be deleted and the word "establish" substituted therefore; and the word "to" in the last line be deleted and the word "at" substituted therefore.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I would draw your attention to the motion that has just been moved in amendment to Resolution No. 1. This amendment seeks to strike out the word "restore" where it appears in the fourth line. The previous amendment also sought to strike out the word "restore" where it appeared in the fourth line. Now the House voted down, they voted against the previous amendment. They therefore voted that the word "restore" should remain where it was. The House, having once expressed its opinion on a matter, cannot change it in a further amendment. This amendment is out of order.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, the first one was to strike out the word "restore" and substitute the word "reduce". The Legislature did not see their way clear to strike out the word "restore" and substitute the word "reduce". I am asking that the word "restore" be substituted for the word "establish." I realize the portion of the rule books you are reading from, Mr. Speaker, but I do suggest to you that we are suggesting a different word here. We are not trying to move the word "restore" and again

March 31, 1970

substitute the word “reduce”. I feel that it is a different principle involved, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I reply I quote Citation 194 of Beauchesne’s Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

A motion or an amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again and stands in the judgment of the House.

Now I will find it for you in May’s where it is expressed a little more clearly, if you will wait until I find it and that might take some time.

Order, order! Speakers take less time to figure these things out in London because they have notice of amendments before they are accepted — 48 hours’ notice being required.

I draw you attention to page 418 of May’s Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

Several amendments may be moved to the same question but subject to the following restrictions: No amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, if a question has been proposed from the chair upon such amendment...

How it follows in principle that, the House having once expressed its opinion on a certain part of a motion, opinion stands as the judgment of the House and cannot be further questioned. The judgment of the House, when the previous amendment was defeated, was that the word “restore” should remain in the motion. I don’t think it is competent for the House really to move any other amendments to the motion other than to the words after the word “restore.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to say that I think that the words “reduce” and “establish” are definitely different words and don’t mean the same thing. I also would like to say that I think it is only fair to the Members opposite that you have them an opportunity to take a little different stand on this thing. I think they voted a little quickly on the last one; maybe if they had another chance it might be taken.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, we will settle the question easily. I declare the amendment out of order but it can by leave proceed. Now is leave granted

Some Hon. Members: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — Then the motion is out of order. Now the question before the debate continues on the main motion.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn’t

intended to take part in this debate but due to the position of this Resolution on the Order Paper I think it is of extreme importance that we give it a little more attention. To begin with in the aftermath of the presentation of the Barber Report the Government Members thought that it would be wise to take a stand in this Legislature on the cost of farm machinery, so with almost indecent haste they prepared and did put a Resolution on the Order Paper, Resolution NO. 1. It is to be assumed that in their caucus they decided that the most important resolution should be the first one that their Members would put forward on the Order Paper. I know that in our caucus we do that. We put our most important resolutions forward first and the number one spot on the Order Paper is a spot of honor, Mr. Speaker, reserved for resolutions that will present and reflect the opinion of this Chamber when they are carried out.

Resolution No. 1 in order to be acceptable and to be meaningful to the people that it will be communicated to should first of all be accurate. I believe that this Resolution is not accurate, Mr. Speaker, because the Resolution in the last line says, "to take immediate action to restore farm machinery prices to a fair and realistic level." I think this is an unfortunate choice of phrase when we have so recently had the chance to examine the Barber Commission Report on the prices of farm machinery. Now if there has been one segment of the Prairie economy that has been looked at a considerable number of times, it is the allege, as this Resolution says, exploitation of the farmer through the prices of farm machinery. The Barber Report seems to indicate that this is not just an allegation but as a matter of record of fact that the people who buy farm machinery are being exploited. Therefore, the Resolution in itself, I believe, is inconsistent. It is extremely unfortunate that the Members opposite did not take the opportunity to agree to the amendment, which would have made the Resolution more consistent with the facts of the matter, and the facts of the matter are that the Prairie farmers are being exploited and have been exploited by the farm machinery companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — It is unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) sits quietly by; we don't know where he stands on this issue. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) says he was on his feet. Well that is true, Mr. Speaker, he was on his feet but we still don't know where he stands on this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He is hiding behind the Resolution, put on the Order Paper, that is inconsistent, which the Government refuses other Members the opportunity to make consistent. Consequently the Minister of Agriculture has compromised his position as a spokesman for Saskatchewan farmers and that is very unfortunate. I don't know what more I can say about the inconsistency of this particular Resolution except that the end result of the inconsistent Resolution is that the farmers of Saskatchewan will continue to suffer what the Barber Commission has said they are suffering and have suffered.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, this is a subject which has bothered farmers for many, many years. I can go back to the old Liberal Government way back in 1937 when we had Mr. Gardiner who was in Ottawa at the time — it doesn't matter where he was — and at that time they had an investigation on the high price of machinery. I don't think we got anything out of it because the machine companies in those days refused to give the Government the information that was required in order to assess what exploitation there was, and believe me every farmer knew at that time that they were being exploited. I don't have to go through the history of it all but only as far back as 1961; you have the submission of the Canadian Wheat Pool to the House of Commons concerning machinery prices. If I may be permitted to read on page 58 the Summary Recommendations, here is what the Wheat Pool says. It says:

In conclusion the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool submits that direct and indirect action along the following lines will contribute to the resolution of the farmer's problem of acquiring and maintaining adequate farm machinery at prices and real cost he can support and recommend: 1. That machinery companies move to reduce the price of farm machinery and repair parts by reducing the number of models, standardizing model components and repair parts, eliminating unproductive machinery features, consulting their machinery agencies and repair depots, improving the quality of service offered and improving facilities of the staff.

And you can go right through history since the farmers settled in the Province of Saskatchewan and you will find that they have been exploited and exploited and exploited. The only thing the Barber Commission has done is to bring this out into the open. The Commission couldn't do it in 1937, 1939 or whenever it was, but now it has come out in the open. Now what I object to is the Liberal trickery. Here they bring a Resolution into this House stating that there apparently is exploitation and then they ask us to vote to restore the prices of farm machinery to a realistic level. Now there has never been a realistic level, there never has been. What are you going to restore the prices to? Maybe a realistic level is a higher price. I don't know what the Hon. Member who moved the Resolution thinks but I know what we think as farmers. We want lower prices and we don't want to be exploited anymore.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — We don't mind if the machine companies make their decent profit like everybody else as we live in this kind of society, a profit society. We recognize that people are entitled to be paid for their investment, for their work, but we do not agree with exploitation and this Resolution says that apparently it has been discovered now that there is exploitation. Now how do you get rid of exploitation? It simply means that farmers are paying too much and if they are paying too much then they should be paying less. The Hon. Members there have had an opportunity today to vote twice on an amendment that would have done the people of Saskatchewan some good, because let it not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that what is done in this Legislature is going to be listened to very carefully by the same people who

are exploiting the farmers of Canada today, unless we say it in very strong terms, it may be misinterpreted; Ottawa may misinterpret it. So, to help the Government out of a dilemma — and it is in it right now — I would suggest that we can compromise in changing this Resolution by an amendment which I propose will be as follows:

That Resolution No. 1, moved by Mr. Gardner be amended as follows, Mr. Speaker:

That the words “analyze and assess the alleged” in the second line be deleted and the word “curtail” substituted therefore; and the words “if found correct” in the fourth line be deleted.

So I will read the Resolution as it would read after my amendment, Mr. Speaker. It will simply say this — and I hop the Members on the Government side are listening:

The Legislature of Saskatchewan urge the Government of Canada to make immediate steps to curtail exploitation of prairie farmers in the cost of farm machinery as reported in the Barber Report, and take immediate action to restore prairie farm machinery prices to a fair and realistic level.

Now that makes sense and I think we should al agree; I think we all represent Saskatchewan people and I can’t understand how anybody could vote against this amendment. I submit it to the House and hope that we will all agree to say what we really want to say. It is seconded by my colleague, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek).

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say a word on the amendment proposed by my seatmate (Mr. Berezowsky). I think there is ample evidence as has been expressed by other speakers that there is in fact exploitation. It is not a question of analysis and assessment as the Resolution proposes. The Commission has found conclusively that the farmers of Canada have been exploited by the machine-manufacturing companies. What is now required is action on the part of the Government to stop, to put a halt to further exploitation. I suggest to the mover and to the Government that they accept the amendment as was proposed. It would make the Resolution become meaningful and we call upon the Government of Canada to take all steps necessary, legislative or whatever might be required, to put an end to this exploitation. We have had enough study and it is no longer a question of finding whether these are correct facts. The Barber Commission has found the facts to be correct, that there is exploitation. We don’t need any further findings. What is required is action and it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the studies concluded by the Barber Commission would be strengthened by endorsing the amendment. There is no Legislature in the Dominion of Canada that should be more concerned or deal in more positive terms that we in the Province of Saskatchewan where such a large proportion of our population is farming population and are so dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. They are

March 31, 1970

exploited by all kinds of things; they are exploited by climate, they are exploited by the problem of markets. Surely the area where we in Saskatchewan can direct out attention to and call for a halt is in the area of farm machinery price exploitation. I do urge the Members of the Government to join us in making this Resolution meaningful, and I would hope that in this way the Legislature can become united and unanimous in helping the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I have one or two comments I would like to make on this Resolution. It seem to me that, as long as I have been in this House, the accusation has been made and continues to be made that farm machine are continuing, as they always have done and always will exploit the farmer. That is the whole trend of your statement this afternoon. I can recall back in the 1950s ...

An Hon. Member: — The Barber ...

Mr. Cameron: — Oh yes, the Barber Commission says ... I can remember what little Tommy Douglas said back in the 1950s. He said, "You know these farm machinery people are fleecing the Saskatchewan farmers and it is time that this Government and this Legislature did something about it." So we set up a committee, another legislative committee, and we sat and we heard hearings, and we heard witnesses under oath. We went through the whole formality of analyzing farm machinery prices. I am going to tell you, for those of you who weren't here and those of you who may have forgotten, that one of the chief witnesses before this committee was the Cooperative Implement Society. I am going to tell you what the President of that Society said. He said, "Considering the peaks in the valley of the price of machinery over the years, the manufacturing level of farm machinery is not too high nor is it unreasonable." He rejected an offer of the Government of that day for massive sums of money that was to be freely loaned to the cooperative association, if they would set up a machinery manufacturing company in the Province of Saskatchewan. And his answer to that request was: "I appreciate your offer but I must tell you that we can purchase our farm machinery from the major machine companies cheaper than we can manufacture it ourselves." Then he went on to say this — "The high cost of farm machinery is not attributable to the cost of manufacturing but it is due to the cost of distribution." This is where your cost comes in. He said, "I think it is time that the cooperative society said to the farmer, you continue to use your machine until it is worn out, then set it in the corner and then come in and buy a new machine. This way you have cut out the distributor, you have cut out that trade-in value with your local merchant, and this will reduce your machinery cost." I mention that just to keep the record straight. It is the same as what the Barber Commission had said and implied. Farm machinery costs are not too high at the manufacturing level. It is because of the distribution and loading on of excessive costs to the farmer after the machine in manufactured.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear to me that the Opposition have taken up this afternoon's time moving these insignificant amendments to this Resolution because they don't dare vote against it and they don't want to vote for it. So they are trying to bring in something that they can hinge it to and say, "Well, now we can give support to this Resolution, oh, it isn't to our liking but since it is amended we can give support to it." I say to the Members of this Legislature, defeat this amendment. We have a motion before us which spells out precisely what the situation is and we are asking the Federal Government who is in the control to take the necessary action to correct it and we are not going to quarrel whether you use the word "restore" or "reduce" or "stabilize", they all mean the same thing. Therefore I say let's turn down this amendment and get on with the motion and get it on its way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, as usual, but I have looked at this Resolution for some time. When there is more recommendation for further study and further analysis, it only means delay. I don't think that there is any need for delay. The Federal Government has spent enough time and money in study. When we talk about 20 years ago, I think we are going pretty far back. We are talking about today and the future. The future of our farmers in the West is very grim. Don't tell them to wait for some more study, and this is what this Resolution says — more study. I think the amendment makes the Resolution very effective and it is a place that the Opposition as well as the Government side can meet on. I think we should support the Resolution as amended.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to add one word. I cannot help but agree with the Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). If I have never seen the Opposition act more childish in trying to find a loophole in a Resolution that in reality they want to support, they don't dare not support it because they can't go back and explain in to their constituents. It is like the old fairy tale of "Sour Grapes". But just to show you how ridiculous the amendments that they have put forth, and particularly the amendment of the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood), I slipped out to look at Webster's dictionary definition of "reduce" and "restore". Let me give you the Webster's dictionary definition of the word "reduce" and it says, "to restore to its former state". Let me give you the Webster's dictionary definition for "restore" — "to return to its former state." Now if you can tell me what the difference is, this is a question of semantics. The Resolution is a good one, let's vote of it and get the Resolution finished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I felt as a Member representing a rural constituency I should also add a few words in respect to this Resolution. I want to agree with some of the statements that were made previously by my hon. friend from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank). This Resolution No. 1 is to

detract from the real issues of this Government and to prove to the Saskatchewan people that the Liberals are friends of the farmers. They are concerned about the excessive costs. May I read this Resolution and point out that the Government opposite does not agree with the results or the findings of the Barber Commission. In one portion of the Resolution it states — “if proven correct.” They don’t believe that the farmer has been exploited as reported in the Barber Commission Report. I maintain that the farmers have been exploited. The only thing that the Government and the Members opposite want to prove ...

The House recessed from 5:30 until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Michayluk: — When 5:30 was called, Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of intimating to the Hon. Members that this Liberal Government opposite does not have any confidence in the reliability of the Barber Commission Report with respect to machinery prices. It is not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural industry of Canada and particularly of Saskatchewan has been exploited as the Barber Report indicates. If it is convinced, then why this wishy-washy Resolution? And I mean wishy-washy. There is nothing definite, nothing offensive to the machinery companies and wishful hope for the farmers. The people demand that this Legislature have the courage to come out with a definite stand as to what this Government and what this Legislature want this Government of Canada to do realistically in respect to machinery costs in the immediate future. I want to turn attention to the part of the original Resolution introduced by the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardener), I quote:

That the Legislature of Saskatchewan urge the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to analyze and assess the alleged exploitation . . .

Note this, Mr. Speaker,

alleged exploitation of the prairie farmers in the cost of machinery prices.

Alleged exploitation, and note this particularly evasive phrase — “and if found correct.” They are not convinced that the findings of the Barber Commission Report are factual, they are asking the Government of Canada to analyse and assess. If this is correct, you gentlemen opposite do not believe that the Barber Commission Report and its findings are correct. This Resolution definitely maintains your stand and your attitude toward the Barber Commission Report.

An Hon. Member: — Don’t get excited.

Mr. Michayluk: — I’m not getting excited the Barber Commission Reports, Mr. Speaker, confirms in writing that exploitation in respect to machinery costs is a fact. The mover of this Resolution is not at this stage convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Barber Commission Report confirms what we on this side of the House have always maintained, that the machinery companies have been exploiting the industry by excessive pricing of farm machinery. May I again reaffirm my contention that the Barber findings relative to machinery prices confirmed what I and farmers always maintained that the farmers of Canada were charged all that the traffic could bear and is, Mr. Speaker, borne out by this report.

Several amendments proposed to the original Resolution were merely intended to put some teeth into this Resolution. Yet another amendment moved by the Hon. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) says precisely what should be in a Resolution of this magnitude, Sir, as it affects our primary industry. Machinery companies, Mr. Speaker, have over a number of decades been wielding a free hand in terms of dollar signs and profits over the agricultural industry. As Members of an agriculturally based province this Legislature should request action which is justified. As a representative of a constituency which is basically agricultural, I want to support a Resolution that will bring results and justice to the producer and purchaser of the tools of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the comments made this afternoon and, if I may say so, I buy an odd piece of new machinery myself. I can't very well afford to buy new. I buy second-hand, but I have to give my shirt and my wallet when I buy new machinery. I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the Members of this Legislature in this debate. I have listened very carefully and I detect the same old song of protection for the old Liberal friends, the corporate machine companies. Now this apologetic Resolution by the Liberals to your right, Sir, tried once more to pull the fat out of the fire for the big machine companies. The Liberals are famous for commissions, Mr. Speaker, we've heard of them before, commissions investigating commissions and so on. Words and more words and more words while the farmer is filched and Rome burns while the Liberals play the fiddle in Saskatchewan. We don't need words, Mr. Speaker, we need action. the Barber Commission has conclusively proven to us, to all of us, where the trouble is. What there is to do now is to get at the root of the problem, Mr. Speaker.

May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this is the kind of attitude and action we will be getting from our Liberals here in Saskatchewan and at Ottawa, then the price of farm machinery will continue to spiral. We ought to be presenting the Federal Liberal Government with a Resolution halting the ever steadily price rises of all goods, including machinery. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, this voluntary hold-up, what they call, of price increases of industry, is not going to work. Our agricultural industry is going to suffer, farmers and machine agents will be going broke.

The other day a Bill helping out the machine agents going out of business, Mr. Speaker, was very timely, and when we realize that approximately 50 per cent of our machinery agents will be broke from last year into this year then indeed it was needed. but with this waffling Liberal Government on the Barber Commission more agents, more farmers, and more people will be going broke, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it amazes me with what vigour and energy this Government jumped into price fixing the price of potash for the multi-millionaire potash companies, mostly foreign owned. but with what reluctance and with what trepidation does it move to help fix the prices for the farmer's machinery. For the farmer it's free enterprise in the farm machinery business, for the

March 31, 1970

potash people it's socialist protection. Heaven no, it says, let's first check to see if this Barber Commission is telling the truth, and all this time the farmers are being scalped.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) made a remark that Opposition Members' criticisms and comments are childish. Childish — tell that to your people in Cannington. Tell it to the farmers who is forced to pay outrageous prices for machinery. Tell it to the machinery agents who haven't sold a combine all year, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) had an excellent amendment and you turned it down. We want the people of Saskatchewan to see who is being defended and chaperoned by the Liberals. The Barber Commission Report doesn't need reinvestigation. The Barber Commission has said what we as farmers have said for years. Let's not conduct a post-mortem on something that's real, correct and conclusive and to the point — the Barber Commission Report. If you Liberals consider the Barber Commission dead then say so. don't introduce a wishy-washy Resolution, killing time while people in the agricultural industry continue to suffer under the exploitation of machine companies.

I will support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would consider myself very remiss as a lifetime farmer, and an MLA if I didn't raise my voice on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan. I can recall from the very earliest of days right up to the present that the price of machinery has been the big hurdle in the development of Western Canada. My colleagues have so ably demonstrated that the Barber Commission has done its part in revealing exorbitant prices that the farmers of Canada have been paying for machinery over the last sixty years. As pointed out by the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) we have had commission after commission on farm machine prices, but nothing has ever been done to relieve the farmers of this burden. Most commissions have merely been red herrings dragged across the tracks to divert the farmers' mind from many of the problems that face them. the word "restore" as used in the main motion leads me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that once again we have an attempt by the Government to use this question of farm machinery as a red herring to keep the farmers' mind off other serious problems like Operation LIFT, cash injection, taxes and what have you. You know, I too went to the dictionary and I found it turned to the very place I wanted right where the minister of Social Welfare left it. I discovered we had not been told the whole story of the various shades of meaning of the words restore and reduce. The word "restore" means "restoration" — "reparation." This is exactly what the Government means when it puts this word "restore" into this motion, on behalf of the machine companies, meaning they are going to restore anything that may have been taken away from the machinery price. The word reduce as proposed in the amendment means to diminish in size, Mr. Speaker. To diminish the amount, this is what we are after, to reduce the price of farm machinery.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — The dictionary says to reduce is to make smaller, that's

exactly what we want a lower price, I just can't understand to what we are going to be restored except that everything will be the same as it was before the Barber commission made its report. Once the smoke is cleared away, Mr. Speaker, it will be the same old difference in the same old way.

The amendment negatived.

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting since about 3:30 to give this two-minute speech I have here. This has certainly been an interesting debate. We have had a couple of hours of speeches mostly by Members who claim they didn't expect to take part in the debate in the first place. We have seen Opposition Members desperately trying to bring in meaningless amendments, so they could justify supporting this Resolution as explained by my colleagues from Milestone and Maple Creek. It is a good resolution and they know it. We listened to the two Saskatoon Members and the member from Regina North East. It is difficult to believe that they are sincerely concerned with the price of machinery. They are certainly not personally concerned as I am, as a farmer. I buy as much machinery as any of the Members opposite who spoke, maybe as much as several of them together. I want to see the price of machinery properly scrutinized. The Member for Regina North East listed all the ways in which the farmer is being exploited. I am surprised that he didn't mention the one he should be most familiar with, Mr. Speaker, the exploitation of farmers by labour, especially, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that grain movement is presently tied up by his friends at the West Coast.

The amendments, Mr. Speaker, regarding the word "restore" were certainly ridiculous. I am a farmer and a purchaser of farm machinery and in the Resolution I can assure you that when I said "restore" I meant restore to a lower level. We are pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) jump up and make his initial pitch for that very important farm vote. It is unfortunate that he didn't have time to acquire many facts, but we do have to give him full marks for a very impassioned political speech. Most of what we heard from the Members opposite was typical Socialist propaganda. In spite of all the righteous indignation expressed opposite, Mr. Speaker, there are certainly a few basic unanswered questions. I would like to bring these to your attention.

First of all, for over 25 years machinery manufactured in any part of the world could come into Canada duty free. In spite of this is it not strange that we still have no effective competition to the Massey Ferguson, John Deere or International tractors. We have to conclude, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, that the British operations of these companies are very efficient and it is difficult for their competition. No one in the debate, Mr. Speaker, has denied the fact that larger tractors which we use here are cheaper here than they are in Europe. The Massey-Ferguson 1130, the John Deere 5020 is cheaper here in Saskatchewan than it is any place in Europe. I am not overly concerned about some garden-size tractor used in Ontario or British Columbia, because I don't use them and not many of my constituents use them. We have had a lot of vague charges about exploitation and our farmers paying millions of dollars too much. No one opposite, Mr. Speaker, has got down to specific examples of tractors that we use. No one has refuted my remarks regarding larger mark-ups which are usual in Canada, inflated

March 31, 1970

trade-in prices in Canada, greater distribution costs in Canada which add to the price of tractors. Mr. Speaker, most important of all no one has answered the very obvious question: why has the CCIL, when it is importing the Deutz tractor from Germany as it has done for many years, or the Volvo from Sweden, not been able to sell these tractors to farmers cheaper? There are only two possible answers to this question, Mr. Speaker. Either the CCIL has been gouging and exploiting its own farmer members the same as other companies or the second alternative, it has not been possible for them to bring in these tractors at a cheaper price. These are the only two possible answers. You can take your choice, there is no other alternative. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the CCIL, I support the CCIL, I use some of their machinery, I have got a CCIL dicker — I think it is the best one on the market. But I think we are entitled to answers to these questions. The Barber Report generally has been worthwhile, investigation into prices is certainly in order and I hope it will continue. Investigation into prices of larger combines is needed perhaps even more than investigation into tractors as far as we are concerned in Saskatchewan. The Barber Report has stimulated countries all over the world to enter the Canadian tractor market.

I have a copy of the March 27th Globe and Mail; here it has a very long article indicating how various countries are trying to get into our markets. Tractors from Russia, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Japan are in the country now. Interest is being shown by Italy, Finland and several other countries. Our Provincial Government has made repeated and insistent submissions to the Federal Government regarding the material in the Barber Report. It looks like we may be getting some favourable results. I hope and expect that all Members will support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Would the Member answer a question before he takes his seat. The Hon. Member suggested that CCIL was not able to compete in prices with other comparable tractors. He referred to the Volvo and the Deutz tractor. Could he tell us what the price is of a T800 Volvo?

Mr. Gardner: — No, but I could tell you this that, if they could bring them in and sell them at a cheaper price, they would have sold all their tractors. If they are not, you are suggesting that the farmer is not watching the prices, that he is not concerned about the price. He checks around for price very carefully, as you well know when he deals. If the price offered by CCIL was better, CCIL would be selling all the tractors. They are not, so I think we are justified in checking into these prices.

Mr. Bowerman: — A supplementary question . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If he want to accept.

Mr. Gardner: — No.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 51

Thatcher	MacLennan	Blakeney
Howes	Heggie	Romanow
McFarlane	Breker	Dewhurst
Boldt	Leith	Meakes
Steuart	Radloff	Smishek
Heald	Weatherald	Thibault
McIsaac	Mitchell	Whelan
Guy	Gardner	Snyder
Loken	Coupland	Michayluk
MacDougall	Charlebois	Brockelbank
Grant	Forsyth	Pepper
Coderre	McIvor	Matsalla
Larochelle	Schmeiser	Wooff
MacDonald	Lloyd	Willis
Estey	Bowerman	Kwasnica
Hooker	Messer	Kowalchuk
Gallagher	Wood	Byers

NAYS — Nil

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. G. B. Grant that Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act be now read a second time.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose second reading of Bill No. 15. It is in my judgment a bad Bill and nothing short of the Government withdrawing will satisfy me. The Bill proposes to completely undermine the Medical Care Insurance Commission and the services required to be paid. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Government that in 1964 the Liberals made a pledge to the people of Saskatchewan that, if elected, it would maintain and improve the Medical Care Services. In 1968 it seriously undermined the plan by imposing the deterrent fee and not it proposes to torpedo the plan completely with this Bill.

New Section 4(a) reflects a serious change in the attitude of this Government towards the College of Saskatchewan Physicians and Surgeons. It violates in my judgment the Saskatchewan Agreement reached in good faith between the Government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which has worked. The Minister admitted this when he spoke to the Bill for second reading. Let me quote:

In the past there have not been any difficulties encountered in connection with the College and the Lieutenant Governor in Council coming into an agreement with respect to the appointment of physicians.

The Minister went on to say that this is purely a safeguard. These are interesting words, Mr. Speaker. In fact what the Government is saying is that it doesn't trust the College of Physicians, it wants some kind of a safeguard. May I ask what

March 31, 1970

has happened, Mr. Speaker. In 1961 and 1962 it was the great defenders of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. What the Government is really saying in Section 4(a) when added to Section 4, is that, if a Member of the Commission appointed on the nomination of the College ceases to be a member of the Commission, then the Cabinet can appoint a replacement for him without agreement of the College, if the Cabinet and the College have not reached agreement on an appointment within three months after the vacancy has occurred. The Government will in fact have power to make its own appointments because it can always refuse to make an agreement with the College on such an appointment.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring some of the Liberals skeletons out of the closet. On October 2, 1962 here is what the Premier had to say and let me quote:

We suggested that consultations and agreements with the doctors were indispensable prerequisite of any successful medical care program.

In speaking of the Government's appointment of the Commission, the Premier said:

Today if (the Government) is retreating somewhat from that position, but not far enough, but it is retreating some by appointing or adding three doctors to the overall body.

Take note of these words, Mr. Speaker:

I have real faith, I have real trust in the medical profession.

But in 1970, the Premier lost faith. It seems the Minister of Health lost faith and the Government has lost faith in the College. It is now saying we don't trust the doctors. Let me remind this House of the amendment to the Act moved by Mr. Gardner on August 2, 1962, formerly a Cabinet Minister of this Province. He said this:

The Commission shall be a body corporate consisting of nine members, three of whom shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, three by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Here are a few more ghosts which come to my attention. This Legislature should be reminded of what the Liberals said. Again on August 2, 1962, Mr. Gardiner, then the Member of Melville, has this to say:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. Snedker's amendment, as well as to draw to the attention of the House the fact that it seems very peculiar to me — and I think it must also be to the people of the province — that, after having the sole right to appoint seven members to this Commission, the Government still insists on holding some rights to appoint the other three members.

Personally I cannot see for the life of me why the Government should not be prepared to at least let the College appoint their own three members.

He went on:

I challenge this Government in this instance alone, they wouldn't accept the past motion which would have given them a free and fair commission to administer the act. Surely to goodness you can at least give freedom to the College to appoint their own members out of ten on the Commission, without the Government sticking its nose into the business at all.

Mr. Gallagher also during the time when the Bill was introduced in 1961 had this to say:

I think that the medical profession, the people who are supposed to provide medical services to the people of the Province, if they are going to have a seven-man Commission, and they have suggested I believe between six to eight, I think the medical profession should appoint three members to the Commission.

These are his words, Mr. Speaker.

Many more quotes can be brought to the attention of the House from speeches made. Back in 1961 and 1962, the Liberals were very much insistent that the medical members of the Commission should be appointed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. But here in 1970 they are making an about turn, they are denying the College the right to appoint this representations if they cannot reach agreement.

New Section 9(a) added again to Section 9, provides that, if a member of the Commission misses more than 50 per cent of the meetings, in any twelve-month period, the Cabinet can declare his position vacant and, if in its opinion his reasons for failing to attend were inadequate, then the Government would have the right again to fill the appointment without agreement of the College.

The Section I am most concerned about is Section 14(a). This is the Section that I have suggested really torpedoes the plan. what it means is that the Commission can make a regulation saying that an account for an insured service must be submitted to the Commission for payment within a dated period of time. then if a doctor or patient does not submit the account within such period, the service already rendered ceases to be an insured service. This means that the Commission will not pay for it, but the patient is of course liable to pay his doctor even if the delay in submitting the account was the fault of the doctor. This period of time for payment is to be set out by regulation. It could be three months or six months or a year, the Commission or the Government will set the time limit.

Here is what the Minister had to say, for example, I quote:

The regulation might state that the Commission need not make payment for an insured service where the account for payment for that service had not been submitted to the Commission for payment within a period of 12 months following the provision of service.

Then he went on to say:

At the present time the Commission is legally required to favour all insured services received by beneficiaries without regard to the lateness of the date upon which the account for payment is submitted.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be and that's what I believe should be the requirement of the law. Let me give you a few examples of what may possibly happen. Take a case of confinement. Women start seeing a doctor early in pregnancy, the doctor normally does not submit the bill until after childbirth. Often mothers have medical complication after the child is born. It may be several months. The doctor after complete medical attention then submits the total bill for attending the mother. The Minister is saying that medical bills incurred while the woman was seeing the doctor in the early stages of pregnancy will or may not be paid. This is in my opinion not acceptable. Deterrent fees were bad enough, but to refuse to pay bills by regulation really means the end of the plan, Mr. Speaker. the Minister on March 14th tried to persuade us that the reason he is introducing Section 14(a) is because the fee schedules have been changed, and bills, that may not have been submitted prior to the 1968 change in the fee schedule, now entail a high volume of administrative time and expense. Yet in the Annual Report we are told that administrative costs have dropped from 5.78 per cent to 4.94 per cent in 1969 of the total. The staff efficiency has increased he tells us in his Report by 5.7 per cent. More claims were processed with 12 per cent less of the staff. In the light of this, it would therefore seem to me that the cost involved to process such old bills is really infinitesimal.

There are no doubt other reasons why bills may not be submitted as promptly as the Commission may desire. I see a problem where people may require medical attention when out of province or may be referred to out of province medical clinics for treatment. Such doctors do not know our regulations, and may not submit the bill within the stipulated period of time. Under this amendment the doctor will still be paid, but, as I said before, the patient is held liable and the Commission may refuse to reimburse the patient. What about the bills that may get lost in the mail? And that happens at times. People move and it is not unusual for bills to be delayed. Again the people will get stuck for payment without the plan reimbursing them. There are a great many reasons why doctors, patients or approved health agencies may not submit bills on a specified date, all of which may be good and justified reasons. But the Government is saying that whatever the cost it has the right to deny payment of the bills because the Government prescribed a specific period of time. If the patient does not see to it that the bill is in on time in the hands of the Commission, the Government will not pay, but the patient still must pay the doctor.

There is perhaps only one way that this may be acceptable and that is that all bills be submitted by the physicians directly to the Commission, and if the doctor does not submit the bill to the Commission then the patient will be absolved of the responsibility for payment. So long as we have the three methods of payment, that is the approved Health Agency, direct payment to physicians and reimburse them to physicians, we must oppose Section 14(a) as is contained in the Bill. To outlaw payment of insured services through a time billing regulation it seems to me is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister today will announce that he will withdraw Section 14(a).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The amendment to subsection (2) of Section 45 extends the time, at which doctors' accounts can be reassessed, from 11 to 18 months. Then under the amendment of subsection (3) of Section 45 the interest to be paid by a doctor on money owing to the Commission by reason of assessment or reassessment of an account or accounts, on which the doctor has not paid after 30 days following a demand for payment, is increased from seven to nine per cent.

Finally the addition of subsection (7) of Section 45 has the effect of saying that, if the Commission has paid a doctor more than he should have received, because either the doctor made an error in his bill or the Commission made an error in assessing an account, then the Commission has an unrestricted right to reassessment and every assessment shows the overpayment to recover it from the doctor. I should add that it also means that the Commission can reassess and make further payments if the original error by the doctor or Commission resulted in the reason for these changes and the Minister sure did not help us to understand why he is proposing these changes when he spoke during second reading. Perhaps there may be cause for this amendment, but I would appreciate the Minister telling us what is the reason for these amendments to Section 45. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see the Government increasing the interest rate from 7 to 9 per cent on monies that may be owing to the Government. But it is also significant to note that, when the Government owes money to public servants on pension plans or on employee contributions, when an employee leaves the Government service it only pays the employees three per cent. One can perhaps describe this particular section as an inflationary one.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to the Bill; I would ask the Government to withdraw the Bill; and I would ask the Members to vote against it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, as I read the Act and if I read it correctly, it means that you can by Order in Council, after this Bill is passed, set the time limit in which a doctor must submit his bill or thereafter forfeit all claim to any payment by the Medicare Commission. But I read even more than that, Sir. I read that a patient, who is not covered by any medical agency, such as MSI or any other, and whose bill is not sent in by a doctor but most often paid by the patient to the doctor, is also in jeopardy of being left unpaid if sent in late, according to the regulation time that will be set.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most damning condemnation of this Government who, little by little, undermines the Plan. Surely to goodness if a Medicare Plan is to be comprehensive and all-inclusive no such restriction should ever be placed on any individual at any time. It is ironical, Mr. Speaker, that this Liberal Government isn't producing a Bill saying that an unpaid bill so many months after receiving service, the said bill is null and void and henceforth need not be paid by the patient. You don't hear anything about that. No, Mr. Speaker, the doctor of the patient has been instructed that they must collect the deterrent fee in plenty of time or they will be the loser.

March 31, 1970

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at this kind of attempt to once again lash out at the poor and the sick and the old. These people who need the money more than anybody else — and I know the Minister will say, “If they need it so badly then they will make sure that the bill gets in in time.” So easily said, Sir! Old people are forgetful people. Sick people are forgetful. Often and only after one reminds them months later are they aware that this bill hasn’t been sent in to the Medicare Commission. I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker, regarding exactly such a bill. The lady in question paid the doctor out of her own meagre pension. Months later she complained to her son, who had come to visit her from Winnipeg, about her difficult financial position and only by chance conversation did the matter of her bill come up. It was almost a year since she had paid her bill to the doctor, an amount of over \$200,000. Should she, or hundreds like her, be denied the refund payment by the Medicare Commission? Should people who, by the very fact that they are sick and most apt to forget such things, should such people be penalized? Should anyone, sick, old or young, be forced to such a strict penalty, Mr. Speaker? I say, No, irrespective of how long a bill is overdue. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, which in Liberal terms of human philosophy is meant as a penalizing factor; its tone and its concept are that of a paddle in a correctional institute, is effective in dispensing pain but of little benefit for its correctional effect. Not only should this Bill be changed, Mr. Speaker, or withdrawn, but the regulations regarding the refund of late bill submissions should be carefully studied and revised to benefit the patient, the patient I say, Sir, I know that once again I’ll be hearing, “It’s the cost factor that makes this type of bill and regulation to cut off payment necessary.”

Now going back again, Mr. Speaker, to the lady who submitted her bill almost a year late. Personally I was flabbergasted after investigation to be informed that the procedure for payment of this portion of money to this lady would take at least ninety days. Further, that again due to the cost factor, late bills such as this one are held until approximately 2,000 bills are accumulated and only then are these processed. Can you imagine, Sir, three or four months of deliberate Government procrastinations, (along with long overdue date) and I’m sure not deliberately done by the patient — will make the waiting period for a refund, in many cases, a very long time. Surely we can excuse a sick patient, Mr. Speaker, but where does the excuse come in for the Department of Health? I know that financial costs of processing smaller amounts will be given by the Minister — and the dollar-and-cents oriented that things pertaining to human values are quite mundane to them. Typical businesslike free enterprise philosophy, Sir, and quoted in legal terms, “Let the patient beware.”

Mr. Speaker, I ask you this: with the passing of this Bill will it really stop late billing? Or really is this Bill meant to save dollars for the Government at the expense of those least able to pay? You know, Mr. Speaker, according to the calculations that I received, it cost nearly \$100,000 to put Mr. Thatcher’s propaganda in issuing homeowners’ letters and cheques, but the extra cost of late processing by doctors and patients is cut so as to save money. what humiliating irony, Sir, for the poor, the sick, the needy, to cut out the money. for Thatcher propaganda, lots of money.

Do you realize, Sir, that this Government is going to cut

off thousands of people of the most needed dollars and cents, so much needed by the old, the sick and the forgetful. Do you realize, Sir, and you too, Mr. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that by your own figures from your own administration office that approximately 8,000 people a year stand a chance of not collecting their bills? Do you realize, Sir, that the principle of universal Medicare is becoming a mockery, a disgrace in this province. I ask you, Mr. Minister, to take this Bill back, recall it and I also ask you to amend the regulations, so that these late bills be processed in batches of 500, not 2,000, thus speeding up the refunds. Let's show a little bit of human kindness to the old, and the weak, and the sick. Let's just not look at dollar bills, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to take part in this debate because I was under the impression that the Minister was going to bring in a House amendment that had some substance and some realism to it. I'm a little disappointed that the amendment really doesn't perform the function that we had hoped that this House amendment was to perform. I think it leaves us precisely where we were before, Mr. Speaker; we are left in a position where more of the costs of medical care are going to be placed upon the backs of the users of the service, and we are ignoring more and more the basic principle that the cost of medical care should be borne by a fund which is made available out of the public purse. I am just going to make a suggestion to the Minister and perhaps qualify the argument that has been made by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who sits directly behind me. If the Minister (Mr. Grant) has some difficulty in deciding what course of action should be taken in terms of encouraging that doctors' billing should be provided on a regular basis, then I would suggest to him that perhaps I might offer a solution to him. After that period of time which is designated by Order in Council, if he wishes, the amount payable to the physician subsequent month the bill would be reduced by another 10 per cent and I think this in itself would provide an incentive for doctors to provide bills to the Medical Care Insurance Commission on some kind of a regular basis. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this represents perhaps a solution that the Minister may have been groping for. I would think that the Medical Carer Insurance Commission has indeed a bit of a problem on their hands when doctors may withhold bills for a period of several months and, as I understand, submit bills for as much as \$50,000 after the first of January.

I think, if this is the situation, it cries for remedial action, and I think the Minister (Mr. Grant) and I both recognize that there is a definite problem here. So, I am just suggesting to him that he withdraw the Bill at the moment, give some thought to some kind of remedial action other than that that he has suggested up until this point, because I can't see, Mr. Speaker, how the House amendment that he proposes will begin to accomplish what he suggests it should accomplish. I'm just suggesting to him that perhaps he might take a very serious look at suggesting to the medical profession that, if they do not submit their bills within a given period of time as established by Order in Council, for every month thereafter the amount payable by the Medical Care Insurance Commission to that medical practitioner be reduced by 10 per cent for every month that the medical practitioner is lax in submitting his bills. I think this suggests a solution

to the problem that the Minister is faced with at the moment. I recognize his problem and I would just call upon the Minister to take a little more time. We have had this Bill before us for a considerable length of time now. Perhaps this might solve his problem and I would recommend this to the Minister's thoughtful consideration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused from the comments opposite because in one breath they are suggesting I withdraw the whole Bill and in the next breath, a certain section of it, and in the next breath the whole Bill. I am not sure whether they really know what they want.

I am also almost pleased to hear the Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) coming to the defence of the medical profession. I didn't think I would ever hear such a heartened plea on behalf of the medical profession from the Hon. Member from Regina North East. I don't recall any such plea being made back in 1962 and I'm sure the College will be pleased to hear this. I'll convey your message to them, Sir, because I know they will be heartened by it.

Before getting on to the question of 14(a), I would like to comment about the Hon. Member's remarks concerning 4(a). I think he used the expression that we are destroying the Medicare Act, that we no longer trust the medical profession; he dug up ghosts of yesterday by quoting Mr. Gardiner and...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Gardiner is no longer here as you will recognize and so maybe we shouldn't pay too much attention to those statements made back in those days. I think I can say with sincerity, if the College was present I'd say it tonight, that I think the relationship between the College and myself is better than it has been with any Minister for quite a number of years. I don't think I'm losing the trust of the College and I don't think that they are losing my trust in the actions suggested.

The way the Act reads now there is considerable doubt in the minds of my officials that the Medicare Commission could properly act unless all positions are filled and this is the prime purpose in providing more protection in this area. We suggest that, in the case of the College not being able to fill a position or us not being able to agree with the, that provision is made to fill this position by an Order in Council. I don't anticipate that this particular section will be used. I certainly don't, under present circumstances, because the relationship has been good.

I'm not sure whether the Hon. Member questioned the 50 per cent requirement; if he did I can't understand why he would. I think this is a reasonable request that Members attend 50 per cent and I think it would be a good idea to include this on all boards and commissions. I realize that I may be throwing myself open to possible dismissal from the Saskatchewan Telephone Board, but I'm doing pretty good this year — I've attended 100 per cent.

Now to get on to the main question, this question of 14(a),

the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) in one breath said that I hadn't come up with an amendment and in the next breath criticized the amendment that I had been discussing with the Opposition. I do have an amendment for this particular section. The number of accounts involved here is not serious compared to the total number processed daily. We process about 11,000 a day and I believe the troublesome accounts would be under the figure of 100. But because of several fee schedules the handwork and paper work involved in processing these accounts is out of all proportion to their numbers. Bearing in mind what is in force in other provinces we feel that the action that we have suggested is justified. In the Province of Manitoba there is a 6-month limit and I believe there is no recourse on the part of the patient — I'm not sure on this point but I know it is a 6-month limit. One province even has a 3-month limit and how they are going to work that I don't know. We are suggesting not less than 12 months, although this is not covered in the Act, and I can give you my assurance that it will not be less than 12 months.

The Hon. Members brought out hypothetical examples such as out-of-province cases. These do not present a problem — I'm not aware of any out-of-province and medical account that has been late in being submitted. Cases cited such as those lost in the mail — there will be provisions in the Order in Council for exceptions under certain circumstances where through no fault of the doctor or the patient the time limit has been exceeded. The Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) merely repeated many of the points brought out by the Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), and I'm getting a little sick and tired of his caustic remarks about undermining the Plan and going after the poor, and the sick, and the old. This is pretty old hack and I am sure that he doesn't really believe what he is saying. When he speaks of action of this sort penalizing the sick, the old, and the poor, I'd like to remind him that under The Hospital Services Act in Saskatchewan and The Medical Care Act that the premium must be paid or else all medical and all hospital services are lost. The Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, brought this in. I recognize that we have not changed it because we realize that there must be some control to make people pay, but you must bear in mind that omission of payment of the premium represents about 16 or 18 per cent of the cost of providing medical or hospital care, and yet because that premium is not paid on time we deny that service for 30 days. I just wonder what the Hon. Member for Melville thinks of that fine humanitarian action initiated by the Members opposite and not by me.

I will take a look at the question of holding up late submitted accounts 90 days. I was not aware that they accumulated these to the point suggested by the Hon. Member. I must point out that if the patient has held them up for 12 months, another 90 days is possibly not as serious as he made out it would be. When he says thousands will be denied access or at least payment of bills, this is a figment of his imagination because I'm confident that with the imposition of a time limit the delinquent doctors will get their accounts in on time and there would be very, very few cases of delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, rather than read the proposed amendment dealing with Section 14(a), I'll summarize it by saying that a year ago I attempted to bring in something of this sort to put this matter in order and my legal brothers took exception to the fact that we would be shortening the statute of limitations, therefore,

it wasn't right to limit the period to one year. Now in an attempt to get around this the Act was amended in the manner to which the Hon. Members are taking exception. The only possible way of overcoming this defect and the danger they speak of is by putting a limit on the period and this will be in contrast to the statute of the limitations. The amendment has the effect of saying that, if the account is not submitted within a year, not only will the account not be paid but the medical practitioner will not be able to collect from the patient. Now the only exception to this is in the case where a medical practitioner has opted out of the Plan — I understand that these are pretty rare animals — but in this case where by pre-agreement the patient and the doctor agree to the terms and conditions, we feel that it is not right for us to have this amendment applied. So, Mr. Speaker, this House amendment will be introduced in Committee and with that explanation I'd like to move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) that Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Exemptions Act be now read a second time.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very few comments on this Bill. I think this Bill is rather curious. It demonstrates something about the Government which I think it wouldn't altogether be prepared to admit. The Government has with great fanfare introduced a Bill to provide for livestock loans. The Government wants to guarantee loans made by banks and credit unions to farmers in order to buy livestock. Mr. Speaker, it wants to do this but it wants its loans to be in a very special position. It doesn't want to abide by the ordinary rules governing the rights of farmers and the rights of other citizens. It wants to have more rights against the farmer than an ordinary banker would have or an ordinary credit union would have. The Exemptions Act now provides that a farmer's animals shall be exempt from seizure. It says that all animals necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the debtor's farming operations in the next 12 months shall be exempt from seizure by the sheriff. It also says, for example, that tractors and farm machinery shall be exempt from seizure. and notwithstanding the provisions of that Exemptions Act, tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars have been lent to farmers to buy tractors and to buy cattle by credit unions all across this province. But nobody provided any protection for the credit unions nor did they ask for any. They said, "We are willing to take our chances, we are willing to lend money to these farmers to buy machinery and to buy cattle and we are not looking for the last pound of flesh. We are prepared to abide by The Exemptions Act. We are prepared to say that if a farmer needs some cattle in order to make a living we won't send the sheriff out there and grab it." The Exemptions Act does say that some loans don't fall into this category. These are ones under the Farm Loan Board, under the Federal Home Improvements Loan Act and The Farm Improvement Loans Act. But they are not in there for a very good reason, and the basic reason is that the Provincial Government couldn't legislate against them any way. I ask you to look at The Exemptions Act and I ask you to see whether there is any single type of loan within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government which is said to be free of The Exemptions Act, where the creditor has the right to go out and

grab the last thing. If the money is lent on the security of a chattel mortgage there aren't any exceptions, perhaps where the chattel mortgage secures the purchase price, but that's a particular legal problem. but there are no exemptions for credit unions, there are no exemptions for finance companies, there are no exemptions for anyone who wants to lend money on chattel mortgages to farmers. There are no exemptions for anyone except the Federal Government, who wants to lend money on chattel mortgages to farmers to buy cattle or to buy machinery. Now the Provincial Government with all its munificence brings in its plan — its Livestock Loans Guarantee Act — and is it willing to take its chances? You bet it isn't. No, it isn't. Is it willing to say, "Where the sheriff couldn't seize on behalf of a credit union we won't seize?" No, it isn't. It says we are going to be able to go out, send the sheriff out there and seize every last one of those cows. This is what it says. There is no real reason for it saying this. The Provincial Government doesn't need this sort of protection any more than the credit unions and the finance companies and the banks. But for some reason the Government has decided that it is going to take this extra measure of protection and it is going to erode this legislation which protects farmers.

If ever there was a time when the legislation protecting farmers should be enforced and strengthened rather than eroded, it is now. If there ever was a time when farmers should be given additional exemptions from seizures by sheriffs, additional exemptions from seizure by people who lend money on chattel mortgages, it is now. But instead of that the Government decided that for its new program it wants to have extra protection. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this provision in the Act is unnecessary. It indicates a point of view on the part of the Government which I think does it no credit. I think the Government should guarantee the money lent under The Livestock Loans Guarantee Act. I think the lenders and the guarantors should have no more right than the credit unions and banks who, as I say, have lent millions and tens of millions of dollars to farmers to buy cattle and to buy machinery which were exempt from seizure.

I say again that there is no reason why the Provincial Government should take onto itself all the powers of the Federal Government which this Legislature would have legislated away if we could have. There is no reason why this Provincial Government in carrying out this plan should not stand in the same shoes as other creditors. When it wants to put itself in this preferred position, I think it indicates all too clearly that it is thinking only partly of the farmers and very much of the pocketbook of the Provincial Government and is prepared, evidently, to send its sheriffs out to seize these cattle, even though if the money had been lent by ordinary banks or ordinary credit unions, the lender could not have done so. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this provision of the Act ought to be rejected and I will vote against it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, we have been treated this evening to the second of two leadership speeches that we have had today. We had a very entertaining afternoon with the Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) trotting out his wares for the

edification of all the future delegates to the convention in July and now we have had the entry of the post starter, the No. 1 starter. The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), with a great deal of fanfare attacks the principle of this Bill. I would be quite impressed by at least the oratorical eloquence if not the substance of your remarks. First of all you make a point about including or exempting from The Exemptions Act this livestock guarantee. Here is the position.

If we didn't have this exemption in you would be in this position that a farmer — and I don't think there would be very many of the, but you might have some — who might go to the bank or to the credit union and get his loan of \$6,000. The Government would guarantee it and he would buy his stock. I say that this is the kind of thing that you have to face. If there wasn't any security on those animals, he could turn around the next day and sell those animals and then the bank or the credit union would be out the security and the Government would be out the security.

If we don't have this protection in here it opens the door wide open to abuse. So all we are doing here is putting these people in a position where they have security where they could effect a seizure for the subject matter of the loan. If the farmer goes and uses the money to buy the cattle, we have the security or the bank or the credit union has the security and that is all this Act does: it puts the lending institution in a position where they have some security. Now I don't think that is an unreasonable proposition.

The Exemptions Act has the same kind of proceedings as The Farm Improvement Loans Act of Canada which Act, after all, is the pattern for our Act. Our Livestock Loans Guarantee Act is patterned after The Farm Improvement Loans Act of Canada and so in putting this exemption in we are simply following in their footsteps. I am amazed at the criticism, I really am, because I have never heard any criticism before of the exemptions that are in there under The Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act of Canada or The Farm Improvement Loans Act of Canada. This is the same kind of a situation, an extension, and I am amazed that my hon. friend from Regina Centre would take exception to this kind of a proviso.

It is a very interesting reflection, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, on the philosophy of the Members opposite. Any time you talk about exemptions, any time you make a move to extend exemptions, you have to look at the other side of the coin, I suggest. You have to keep an eye out for the rights of creditors as well as debtors. The creditor, you know, is not always a company. The creditor sometimes is a plumber, an electrician, the corner grocer, and he's got some rights too. He has the right to be paid for his groceries. He has the right to be paid for his plumbing bill or his electrical bill and, if you get exemptions too high, you interfere seriously with his rights to run his business and earn a decent living.

Mr. Speaker, the differences here, I think, the fact that they are going to vote against this Bill highlight the very sharp philosophical differences between the people who sit to your right and the Socialists who sit to your left. The Socialist philosophy is not to equalize upwards but rather to equalize downwards. I am rather interested in an article I read in The Leader Post the other day, "Burmese life grim under Socialist

Government .

In a geographic colouring book the instructions for Burma would have to be 'Colour it grey.' Eight years under a Socialist Government has drained the country of its vitality, the bright hues of Burmese Life have faded into drabness, dullness and uniformity.

That's the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of philosophy that is epitomized in the opposition of the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist world is truly a grey world. They want to equalize everybody but they want to equalize them down not equalize them up. This kind of philosophy of course is foreign to the people who sit to your right. This is a good Bill. This is going to do a good job for the farmers of Saskatchewan and with great enthusiasm, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The University Act be now read a second time.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it was several weeks ago now that I adjourned the debate on this Bill and at that time had the opportunity of saying just a very few words on it. Let me briefly restate what the Bill proposes, as I understand it.

It first of all puts our friend, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in the Senate. Albeit, as both he and I have said, perhaps the wrong Senate but nevertheless in the Senate. It secondly would establish positions for two students from each campus on the Senate of the University. Thirdly, some of the powers which presently reside in the Senate are being passed to the General Council and some of the General Council powers are being passed to the Campus Councils.

I think very obviously there is nothing to resist in the Bill, nothing to oppose and certainly those of us on this side of the House will be supporting it. There really isn't very much in the Bill at all. One might almost say there is in fact nothing in the Bill. What is remarkable about it is the extent to which it fails to recognize the kind of changes which there ought to be in university administration. The other thing that is remarkable about it is the way in which the present Government has changed its mind, done some flip-flops over a period of a couple of years. I have, for example, an amendment which I moved in the Legislature in 1968, which would be provided that there be students placed on the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan. My hon. friends opposite all voted against it. At that time a number of other reforms were proposed, at least two were voted against. Perhaps if we wait long enough we may get some of those as well.

I have used the reference before in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, this year to a funeral horse. A funeral horse you will recall was one that was trained to trot magnificently while at the same time it was actually moving at a speed slower than a walk. And that is the rate at which the Government applies change to the university administrative forms.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This is not only a funeral horse but a very old and a very tired and a very lame funeral horse, but we are getting there little by little. It will be recalled that last year the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) did introduce a resolution urging that some students be placed on the Senate. This year we get an Act to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, we are still, however, in taking this action, considerably behind what is going on in a great many other provinces with respect to a number of universities. For example, just recently the Manitoba Government has provided for eight student seats on Brandon's University Senate, eight student seats whereas this one will provide for four student seats from two campuses. A similar amendment just about a month ago provided for one student seat on Brandon's University Board of Governors and this legislation does nothing to give the students or the faculty, as a matter of fact, representation on the Board of Governors and this seems to me to be a rather serious oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to detain the House at great length in this argument. I could go back and reread references which I made last year and the year before and the year before, go back and read the *Hansard* themselves and I shall leave it at that. Sufficient to say that there is a considerable body of opinion and a growing body of opinion in support of making it possible for students to take part in influencing decisions at the level of committees, at the level of the Senate, and at the level of the Board of Governors. And I had hoped that this Government might move more quickly and more comprehensively in that way.

I am disappointed that the Government has not as yet seen fit to provide for representation on the Board of Governors for the Faculty, somebody elected from the Faculty of each of our campuses on the Board of Governors. I think this ought to be done. I would remind the Government that I think two years ago the various bodies at the University asked the Government to do just that. This Government has had representations from the Board of Governors and the Senate and the Faculty of the University. They have had representations to make available a place for faculty representation on the Board of Governors and this Government has been extremely slow in moving in accordance with that request. As a matter of fact, it shows no indication of doing so and I think it is a weakness of this Bill that it does not move in that direction.

With respect to the proposals which will transfer some powers from the Senate to the General Council and some powers from the General Council to the Faculty Campus Councils, this as I say is a good move. It brings the decision-making in each place closer to the respective campuses. The question that I do raise, Mr. Minister, is why after all should we have this in the Act at all? Why after all is the decision about who makes these academic decisions not left in the hands of the University itself? Why after all should we in this Legislature really pretend that we know enough about it to make a decision with respect to who exercises those powers? I would urge the Minister, at some later date, to take a look at the Act and remove much of those powers which are now vested here with respect

to academic decisions and leave them in the hands of the various university bodies themselves, because I don't think we need to have that power at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — In short, Mr. Speaker, we will support the Bill as it is. I don't think that the two members of study body from each campus is adequate. I don't pretend to know what an adequate number would be. I do think that, if the Government had done, as we urged them to do last year, established a comprehensive committee to get the point of view of the whole university community and the public with respect to change in university administration, we would have been in a much better position to legislate. I am disappointed that it doesn't provide a representation on the Board of Governors of Faculty and also of students.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, saying only once again that we are falling further behind in respect to this broadening and modernizing of the governing structure of our University. When I say further behind we are falling further behind the other universities of Canada, and I think that the Government ought to look much more comprehensively and act much more incisively in this respect than this Bill does.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that this matter was brought up a few weeks ago. At that time when he did make a few remarks and then continued tonight, he indicated that we on this side have actually no concern and somehow or other, I don't know how it was, but in the Press it was reported that the Leader of the Opposition was the one that was responsible in the beginning for instigating this Bill. I think here I would somehow like to have this impressions corrected. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition didn't do this deliberately at Attorney General, but I would like to clear up this matter as far as the Press is concerned. To the best of my knowledge it seems to me that I had the privilege of introducing the motion during the last session that instigated this Bill. Then the idea that the Leader of the Opposition has when discussing the Bill that is before us now, to bring in the Board of Governors and the Faculty, I really think this is wandering off the point of debate. This isn't what we are discussing here at this time. And it seems a very funny thing that no matter what we strive to do by way of improvement in our society or in our educational institutions, we are accused of not having concern, that we are not doing enough and so on. Well, God only knows these fellows were in long enough and I don't recall them doing any one single thing in this direction as far as the University is concerned. I don't want to be critical of the Leader of the Opposition, but I am sure that we are all aware of the fact that he was at one time the Minister of Education and had plenty of time to bring these great ideas of his forward at that time.

Now there is another aspect here and that is the fact, when we speak in this manner, that what we are doing here is nothing, it doesn't amount to anything, that the Senate is nothing, I think this is detracting a great deal. It detracts

from the importance of our Senate and our Senate is an important body. It is part of the University. To say that representation doesn't mean anything and to compare it with Manitoba where they have eight or something like this, at least this is a step forward. the students were anxious to have representation on our Senate. they wanted this in order to contribute to the scholastic values of our university. I am sure, as a result of the proposed change that we have here, that it is going to do just exactly that. You know now to say this is nothing for the student that strives and achieves the recognition of being placed on as a member of this Senate, to be now told that this doesn't mean anything, that you haven't achieved anything, this is a sort of destroying. I think it is just simply not right that we belittle all these attempts to go forward. To belittle the importance of the Senate, this surely to goodness is wrong. We should respect the University and what it stands for and the make-up that it has. This is a traditional thing. The University has been constituted in this way ever since it was started. Now why should we say this means nothing. This isn't enough. I don't agree with this.

Surely again the image of our University is important to us. You know we say the University of Manitoba is doing this. The University of Alberta is doing that. He is talking about the great free spending of all the other universities and ours is apparently achieving nothing. Let's not kid ourselves. It has been pointed out to us time and time again by Members of the Opposition what great free spending that they are having in the University of Alberta, what great strides they are making. But I think that they are quite aware of the fact that they have put a complete freeze on their spending in the University of Alberta. they have found that they are not getting value for their money. And I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, about our University. At least this Government here sits down with our University with the Board of Governors, if you want to bring the Board of Governors into this debate. They have thrashed out their spendings and what they are going to do in that University. As a result of what we actually have through good bargaining between the University and our Government, we have without question one of the finest universities in Canada. And I don't think we should forget this. Now then to go and belittle every doggone thing that we do, surely to goodness this is a mistake.

Then we talk about the representation on the Board of Governors. This may be alright. We don't say that this isn't possible, but I think that it is proper that we take first things first. We don't suddenly jump into this and let the students take over the University and start to run it for us. I think we recognize here that they have a place and they want to be recognized in their proper place. I say that, if we try for a year or so and see how it goes, and I am sure that it should go alright. Then would be plenty of time to consider student representation on the Board of Governors. But let's not try to belittle what we are doing here. They talk about red herrings — I don't know what you call this. But I am sure that if we put into effect what is proposed in this present Act that we will have something that is well worthwhile. I think we all recognize it as such and so certainly I will be voting for the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I have never before seen such a demonstration of egotism as I have seen today from the Member who just sat down, the junior Member from Saskatoon. If he knew my Leader as I have known him over the years he would agree as I can only say that there has never been a greater fighter for the rights of students and the universities of our province in all the years that we have had this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The Hon. Member wants to take credit for this Bill. Last year he says he brought in a resolution but I recall quite well that the resolution was so full of confusion that it had to be my Leader who had to go ahead and amend it to make it sound right.

Mr. Charlebois: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would this hon. gentlemen be kind enough to bring in any amendment that was brought in last year. There was no amendment that passed last year.

Mr. Speaker: — That's not a point of order!

Mr. Charlebois: — Holy smoke, Bill, you've got a lot of nerve. Are you trying to mislead the whole House?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I was really surprised to see the junior Member get up there and talk for 15 minutes, trying to take credit for himself for something that he does not deserve credit for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Over the years my Leader and the Government that I was with brought in progressive ideas and legislation and if the students at that time...

Mr. Charlebois: — Mr. Speaker, this fellow is...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! What are you rising on?

Mr. Charlebois: — His Government brought in a Bill about the Senate. It never did any such thing.

Mr. Speaker: — That's not a point of order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — It just goes to prove how ignorant the Member is. He doesn't know what a point of order is.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — What point of order? You made your speech, I am making mine. And I say you are ignorant on the point of order.

March 31, 1970

Mr. Charlebois: — I beg your pardon!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I don't have to beg yours. But I am not going to have somebody get up in this House and insult a man that does not deserve these kind of insults, a man that is a credit to the Province of Saskatchewan, and to the university and to the educational processes of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — And that's all I wanted to tell you, sir.

Mr. Charlebois: — I wouldn't insult your Leader and you know that.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I will have very little further to add in closing this particular debate. I noted the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. His opinion is that the Bill is not doing anything. I believe he said that at one point, but then he did go on to say that he did appreciate what was being done in the Bill, even though it was not going far enough to suit the wishes of the Members opposite.

I want to suggest that the Bill that is here, Mr. Speaker, may not perhaps go as far as some members of the House and some members of the university community would wish. I don't know whether two members from each campus is an adequate number or what particular number would be an adequate number. I do suggest that two student representatives on the Senate of the University elected from each campus SRC will, I think, be adequate. Certainly this number does meet the approval of the Students' Council groups at either campus.

I was interested in one comment of the Leader of the Opposition when he mentioned that many of the details with respect to the duties of the general University Council and each campus council could well perhaps be left out of the Bill and left entirely to the University. This may well make sense. I am sure that the Member from Biggar is aware that it was only a couple of years ago when we brought in a good number of these amendments and I certainly concur in this suggestion. Undoubtedly we will be bringing in further amendments updating The University Act as times goes on, Mr. Speaker, and we will consider some of the suggestions put forth at that time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act be now read a second time.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Bill and not to speak for a judgeship.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This Bill makes amendments

in The Education and Health Tax Act. It is six full pages long. It follows very extensive amendments to the Act in 1968. In places, Bill No. 40 amends the Act which appeared in the Revised Statutes of 1965. In places it amends the amendments which were passed in 1968. I defy anyone in less than one-half an hour to figure out just what Sections apply, never mind reading them but just getting them in the proper order and figuring out what is still there and what is repealed. The overall result is a labyrinth of complex obscurity. I invite the Minister the next time he makes any amendments to this Act to bring in a consolidation, I invite any Hon. Member to go over to the Legislative Library and see if he can follow through the Act and the amendments pasted in by the Library staff.

I am not surprised that even they have fallen into error by having pasted in some of the amendments out of place because after all the amendments to one page go about one foot and a half long and once they get them folded up a few times it is not difficult to make an error or two.

An Hon. Member: — All those taxes!

Mr. Blakeney: — That's right. All these many taxes. They add new taxes, Mr. Speaker, not by the tax but by the foot.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Nor is the understanding of this Bill particularly assisted by the comments of the Minister who, when saying this, said, "Yes, this could mean that it would apply to plumbing. Or yes, it could mean to apply to electricity. That's right. But we are going to bring in some regulations which will apply to that." And he gave us a fairly long list of the things that he said the Bill wasn't going to apply to by reason of regulations to be introduced. But he didn't tell us what the Bill did cover.

Let's look at some of the things. I invite Hon. Members to look at the first string of amendments which say — and string is the word — when anyone is producing, fabricating, processing, printing or imprinting any tangible personal property, the tax must be paid not only on the tangible personal property but on the labour content. Let's figure that one out. If you hire someone to build some kitchen cupboards for you the situation now is, or is now thought to be, that the contractor who builds the kitchen cupboards for you must pay education and hospital tax on the lumber he uses and the door hardware he uses. But this Bill will say that he will pay tax not only on the lumber and not only the door hardware, but on the value of the kitchen cupboards, on his labour that he incorporates into the cupboards. A person will have to put a value on the kitchen cupboards after the contractor has done all the work and then pay tax on that. Or a plumber who comes into your house and installs a few pipes, the rule now is that you pay education and hospital tax on the pipe. But if under the Bill the plumber takes a half an hour to thread the pipes and hook them up and then charges you \$4, you pay education and hospital tax on the \$4 labour charge as well. Then if he forgets his tools and goes back to the shop to get his wrench, you pay tax on the time that he spent getting his wrench.

March 31, 1970

If a lady takes a bolt of cloth to a dressmaker and has paid education and hospital tax on the bolt of cloth and the dressmaker makes up the dress, the Bill now says that she has to pay tax on the labour which the dressmaker puts into it.

An Hon. Member: — Tax on the labour?

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, indeed, it says these things. I think we will all like this one. I invite all Hon. Members to look at Section 3(b) of the Bill. It is entirely capable of being read to mean that, if I get a telephone call from outside the province, my first duty shall be to immediately report the matter to the Minister.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — “Every person residing in the province who received in the province a taxable service in the form of a telecommunication service shall immediately report the matter to the Minister.”

I invite you to look at this definition of telecommunication service and see if it doesn't include telephone calls. But that is one of the more tolerable aspects of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Every person who purchases personal property in the Province of Saskatchewan from a person who is not a vendor shall immediately report the matter to the Minister. So if I pick up The Leader Post and buy an automobile second-hand from an ordinary citizen who will obviously not be a vendor, my first action must be to report the matter to the Minister. If I go to the Hadassah Trade Fair and buy a second-hand razor — and I double whether the Hadassah Trade Fair is a vendor — my first action must be to report this dastardly act to the Minister. I suggest to you that this Section 8(b) says that, if I buy any personal property in the Province of Saskatchewan from a person other than a vendor, buy it on an ordinary second-hand basis, not from a dealer, I am to report the matter to the Minister and I am to pay the tax if a tax is payable.

An Hon. Member: — What are you doing on weekends, Davie?

Mr. Blakeney: — The Member asked what the Minister is doing on weekends. I hope he's not going to rummage sales, because if he is he should be coming in here Monday morning and reporting the matter to the Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill contains a profusion of newer and harsher penalties and for the first time, Mr. Speaker, for the first time these new penalties will apply not only to vendors who are licensed and who might be expected to familiarize themselves with the provisions of the Act, all four feet of them, and might therefore be reasonably responsible for violating the Act, but will also now apply to the ordinary citizen who fails, for example, to report the fact that he bought something at the Hadassah Trade Fair or who fails to report the fact that he bought a souvenir at Banff and brought it into the province or

in some other way transgressed this Act. up until now, Mr. Speaker, the Act has said that, if the citizen violated the Act in this way, the Minister could go after the citizen for tax. That is reasonable because the average citizen violates the Act every time he goes out of the province and comes in and fails to report something. It is a trifling matter and no one ever goes after him for tax and that is fair enough. But now the Bill for the first time will say that not only will he be responsible for tax but he will be responsible for penalties, and minimum penalties are built into the Bill. The citizen for the first time will be under those penalties. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think these provisions with respect to penalties, particularly as they apply to the individual citizen are really quite inappropriate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I have no way of estimating how much extra revenue these many new measures will bring in. For the most part they seem to be enforcement measures which are designed to harass rather than to raise revenues.

I suspect that the biggest single raid on the taxpayers' pocket books is the change that the Act contains with respect to the tax on meals — the so-called hot-dog tax — the foot-long one — my colleague says.

Now, the tax will no longer apply only to meals of \$2 or over but will apply apparently to almost everything that is edible. The tax will hit the people with low incomes particularly hard. It is they who consume many of the meals which are sold for less than \$2. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) seems to have a particular aversion to some people in this province. One of the classes of people for whom he has a particular scunner are commercial travellers. Two years ago he taxed almost every item which is part of the budget of a commercial traveller. He raised the tax on registering his car; he raised the tax on gasoline; he imposed a tax on hotel rooms and he imposed a tax on meals of \$2 or more. Now this year he is on the attack again. He has raised the tax on gasoline again and apparently he found out that some commercial travellers are eating meals that cost less than \$2. So he is going to cut down the exemption to 14 cents. That will surely catch the leanest and most hungry traveller. I think they'll have to carry their lunch.

Now my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, will have a good deal more to say about this particular tax. I will confine myself to saying that it is a tax which will be expensive to collect and will impose a further tax on some of the people who are the least able to pay.

For reasons which I think I have outlined satisfactorily I cannot support this extra tax and I cannot support the many other harsh and punitive provisions in the Bill. Accordingly I will be opposing the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I see that I have a lot of moral support here tonight. Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to admit my mistake of last Thursday, and I want to apologize to the House

for my slip-up dealing with Bill 39. When I am in error it is my desire to apologize at the earliest opportunity. I want to say that it is not my intention when I am in a bind to resort to remarks derogatory to the Members of the House or to resort to remarks ridiculing the Members of the House, because I believe that this kind of performance displays lack of respect and a low level of parliamentary debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is another piece of legislation imposing additional taxes on the people of Saskatchewan. It would seem that every move this Liberal Government makes is an expensive move for the people of this province and one that means new and additional taxes. In almost every case the taxes are against the rank and file and the people least able to pay. The principle of taxation as applied by this Liberal Government in imposing taxes, I say, is wrong, regressive and certainly not acceptable. Ever since this Government, Mr. Speaker, took office in 1964 over 1,100 new and additional taxes have been imposed, and nearly all of the taxes were levelled at people least able to pay, and this by a Government that was elected on the promise to reduce taxes, this, by a Premier (Mr. Thatcher) who across the breadth of this province and beyond the province into the United States, where no one could question him, spread the falsehood of stagnation and oppressive taxation in Saskatchewan. Our American friends, after hearing the Premier, if they should come to know the truth about Liberal tax policies and industrial development, would be shocked and at a loss to understand how unscrupulous a Premier of a province could be. This Government has of recent date started on a game of trying to make the people of Saskatchewan believe that the Government is devoting itself to relieving property taxes. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) claimed that he has already started to shift taxes from property to other base sources. It won't be long before the property owners will be receiving their tax notices and I can bet that the tax bill won't be any lower, and in many cases will be higher.

The increased grants being provided to local governments, municipalities, schools and hospitals, will be far from sufficient to meet increased costs. What the Government is really doing is shifting taxes from one source to another with the idea of confusing Mr. Taxpayer and hoping that he believes that his taxes are being reduced. This Government has no intention of relieving property taxes unless the same taxpayer is taxed in another way. I want to quote what the Premier said when he addressed the SARM delegates about two weeks ago, Leader Post issue March 19, 1970, entitled "SARM tax proposal leaves Premier cool". I quote his remarks:

I feel, if property taxes are to be lowered over a period of time, the alternative burden will have to be shifted to numerous other tax fields such as resource development, sales tax, liquor tax and other consumer taxes.

Now this well indicates the position of this Government in so far as property taxes are concerned. Action in shifting taxes onto consumers is contained in the Bill before us. This Bill is evidence that consumers will be paying more tax when buying food and meals. Two years ago this Liberal Government imposed a 5 per cent tax on meals priced at \$2 and over. Now the

Bill before us taxes food and meals priced at 15 cents and over. The Provincial Treasurer explained that by bringing the exemption down to 14 cents many of the administrative and collection problems would be solved. Just how far could he be from the truth. Who is he trying to kid? The reason for taxing food starting at 15 cents is for one purpose only and that is for additional tax revenue. I want to tell the Provincial Treasurer that, by doing what he is, he will create more administrative and collection problems than he had before. Might I suggest that the best way to rid of any problems respecting this tax is to abolish the meal tax completely.

As I said earlier this legislation is being aimed at the people least able to pay: community and church organizations, the pensioners, university students and the young people. This legislation as written would compel community and charity organizations to collect tax on food and meals sold by them at dinners and teas, and at concession booths at fairs, sports days and other activities. It would follow that the organizations before collecting the tax would have to apply for licences to give them collection authority. I can visualize the difficulty and the impracticality facing these organizations having to collect the tax, and at the same time attempting to keep a record of the collection without any cash registers. If this Bill is to become law in its present state, I would urge and plead with the Government, for all practical purposes, to amend the present legislation exempting all non-profit organizations from being subject under this tax.

This Government wants to get at everybody when it comes to taxation. The victims this time under this tax are the pensioners and the youth of this province. By reducing the exemption to 14 cents the Government intends to collect at least \$600,000 more taxes and most of these taxes will be paid by the young people and the university students, because they make up the majority of the population. Pensioners who eat out will be hit as well. Let us make some calculations as to how much tax some of these people will have to pay. If we take a pensioner who eats out, he would be subject to tax of at least 25 cents per day or \$90 per year. A university student who eats out would pay a tax of at least 25 cents per day or about \$7.50 per month or over \$50 per university year. Now let us make a calculation to see how much tax a youth would be subject to. Basing my calculations on taxable expenditures of 50 cents per day, the tax would be 2 cents per day or 15 cents per week or 60 cents per month or \$7.50 per year. In a family of three young people the taxes could amount to at least a sum of \$20 a year. Now as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, the meal tax is mainly directed at people with least ability to pay and those who may have no alternative but be subject to the tax. The pensioners and the university students are having a most difficult time financing their costs. This tax will only add to their hard times. The tax legislation as it is written imposes an unfair tax. The young people who receive a bit of spending money from their parents will not be taxed when they buy a hamburger, hot-dog, French fries, vico, milk and so forth. What the Government is really doing is taxing cones will be exempt from tax unless taken with a meal. No mention is made of milk. It would mean that milk and its products would be taxable. Because of this tax policy, milk is being discouraged from consumption. This I say is wrong economics, wrong in that milk which is an all-round health food is being demoted and hence will result in less consumption...

March 31, 1970

An Hon. Member: — They'll catch up with you, Davey!

Mr. Matsalla: — ...and wrong in that lesser consumption of milk will diminish the market for milk. Now this is difficult to comprehend the thinking of this Government. On the one hand it talks about diversification and encouraging livestock and dairy production and on the other hand it discourages the use of livestock and dairy products. Where is the logic, Mr. Provincial Treasurer?

If this Bill is to become law I ask the Government to reconsider this exemption list by adding to it milk and its products.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — In concluding, I want to remind the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer and the Government of the petition that was submitted to them by some 330 Canora high school students protesting this meal tax...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — ...and saying that the tax is a tax on the youth of our province. Their message was loud and clear.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — I am sure that these young people have spoken for many other young people of this province. At the time of receiving the petition the Provincial Treasurer remarked, "They'll have to give that petition to the Government side to get any action. No use giving it to the Socialists." Now, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, you have the petition. Are we going to have action?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Well, Mr. Speaker, the second reading of a Bill, as we all know, is supposed to be on the principle of the measure that is before us. It seems to me that what we are really debating here today is the Government's unprincipled, insatiable desire to collect more taxes on more taxes that they have already collected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows, Mr. Speaker, that the per capital Provincial taxation has increased \$109 or almost double since this Government came to power. This resulted in Provincial revenues rising from \$120.1 million to \$228.6 million during the time since this Government came to power. It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that the rate of taxation advance is equally as startling in the areas of per capital taxation — and I have the examples here taken from the Government's own reports. Per capital property taxation advanced during the last four years of the previous Government, an average increase of \$5 per year, followed by a Liberal Government at an average increase of \$12 per year. Average mill rates, Mr. Speaker, the

last four years under the previous Government advanced 0.8 mills per year; under the present Government the average increase is 3 mills per year. The average school mill rates, Mr. Speaker, under the previous Government advanced 0.5 mills per year; under this present Government they advanced 2 mills for the four years following that. The average rural mill rates in Saskatchewan advanced under the previous Government at the rate 0.8 mills. For its first four years in power this present Government advanced them, Mr. Speaker, at the rate of 2 mills. For municipal non-property taxes in Saskatchewan Mr. Speaker, under the previous Government the average increase per year was \$197; under the present Government the average increase has been \$697.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, shame, shame!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, debating the principle of this particular Bill is totally lost when the members view the monstrous form that taxation has taken in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — We can recall just a short time ago that the election promise of this Government was that it would lower taxes and not raise them. It appears, Mr. Speaker, from the continuing cascade of tax bills that come to our desks that this Government is exploiting every nook and cranny that is available to sink its tentacles in and draw more money out of the people of Saskatchewan.

I know that my constituents in Saskatoon Mayfair are still reeling under the last blast of taxes from the Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Premier in his early years went about this country talking about the terrible tax burden Saskatchewan people had to bear. And it would be an altogether different story if the Premier were to go down to the United States and visit some of those cities again and the people were to ask him point blank, “Well, Mr. Premier, what’s the story since you have been in power? Have you corrected the situation?” I could well imagine how the Premier would puff himself up and he would immediately switch the topic to something less dangerously revealing to himself.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, a short while ago when this Government introduced a new tax, on detergents. You know that never before had the previous Government put a tax on detergents, but this Government put a tax on detergents and this was automatically dubbed as a “dirty tax.” Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that particular tax on detergents has lost the title of the “dirty tax,” because the Minister, the present Provincial Treasurer, has brought in a new tax and this is most certainly the “dirty tax.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier loves

March 31, 1970

to say, "You had 20 years." The CCF did have 20 years. Well, well in 20 years did we impose a tax on 14 cents worth of food?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In 20 years. No, this is Liberal policy. Not only has this Government introduced this type of tax but it has introduced it at the worst possible time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, by imposing a one-cent tax on 14 cents worth of food it has increased the price of food purchased in a restaurant or other eating establishment by 7 per cent. It represents a 7 per cent increase in the cost of food. No action it could take could do more to promote, increase, expand or aggravate the inflationary price of food for those who eat in a restaurant. There may be left in their ranks someone who has the audacity to indicate to us that this tax fights inflation. We say to the Provincial Treasurer, prove it. On the basis of its increasing the cost of food one would vote against it, but there are other reasons as well. At a time when the cost of food is a hardship to pensioners, to those on fixed incomes, to large families, to young working people, this is a Bill that says clearly, "We are going to make sure that your days of eating in a restaurant are numbered." This is the straw that breaks the camel's back, Mr. Speaker.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says in effect, "If we need the money, we're going to get it." This Bill is one of the methods he is going to use to get the money he needs to — and I quote him — "Get Saskatchewan back on the track to prosperity and economic well-being."

An Hon. Member: — Hard-hearted Hanna!

Mr. Whelan: — And who does he get it from? Who does he get it from?

An Hon. Member: — Teenagers!

Mr. Whelan: — 1. The mother who stops to have a sandwich and a cup of coffee while she is shopping.

Mr. Steuart: — Unmarried mothers!

Mr. Whelan: — 2. The teenagers who have a hot-dog or a plate of chips. 3. The pensioner who goes out in the evening from the Salvation Army home to have a snack. If he runs it over 14 cents he helps "put Saskatchewan back on the track to prosperity," and 4. The family who goes to the drive-in. Their trips to the drive-in are over. the whole food industry will be in jeopardy. Not only is the food industry going to be driven up the wall keeping track of 14 cent hot-dogs and 16 cent hot-dogs and 15 cent sandwiches and a 17 cent plate of chips, it will require extra help. But this Bill contains the steel jaws of Liberal justice to make sure that they pay interest on tax that is in arrears at any rate that this Government wants to set. And if they don't pay up and if they don't do certain things, there will be a fantastic increase in the fines.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the restaurant owners had better act as tax collectors from the pensioners and the kids and the mothers out shopping or else. That's what the Bill says. To lower the exemption on meals to 14 cents hits at the lowest of the low-income groups. It is the lowest tax on the taxpayer yet from a Government that was elected on a policy that would — and I quote from its advertisement — “lighten the tax load.” Mr. Speaker, Liberal times are hard times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In addition to increasing the cost of food and adding to the cost of living by lowering the exemption in order to tax the smallest possible purchase for a 14 cent hot-dog, this Government is making war on the poor, rather than war on poverty. The suggestion has been made that there will be an exemption, an exemption of the education and health tax on homes that heat with electricity. There's an exemption for you. Imagine the kindness of that. That's a fact. It's in the Bill, I found it, it was there. I am sure there are so many of them in Regina that this will make a great impression on the voting public. It is as generous to the people of Saskatchewan as was the exemption for turkey saddles.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh. that was even more generous.

Mr. Whelan: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all the people with turkey saddles heat with electricity!

The people of Regina pay a 10 per cent levy over and above their electricity bill as part of the agreement to purchase the city power plant. The unkindest, most unreasonable tax of all is the five per cent education and health tax that is levied on this payment along with their light bill. The Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) assures us that this is the now legal, that no one will be able to escape their clutches, that he is absolutely certain they will have to pay it; he has written it into legislation. The people of Regina pay 10 per cent in addition, and I understand this applies to other communities as well. But to pay tax on a levy that is added to the regular price of electricity is the unkindest act of all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In 1964, the last year we were in government, we budgeted for \$37,500,000 education and health tax. This year the Estimates show an increase to \$65,300,000. The increase in the cost of food over the province as a result of this tax has jumped at the expense of the pensioners and the mothers, from \$125,000 to \$600,000. The Provincial Treasurer claims that communities will get this back in the form of grants. What has been the record thus far? The gasoline tax has jumped from \$27 million in 1964 to \$51 million, an increase of \$24 million; education and health tax from \$37.5 million to \$65,300,000, an increase of \$27,800,000; and the income tax has gone up to \$69 million from \$15 million, a total increase of \$105,800,000 from these three taxes.

And in the most blasé-fashion the Minister opposite says

March 31, 1970

that there will be more for each community — snow removal, police protection, library grants, health grants, and Regina will get the staggering sum of \$1.55 per capita in new grants. In these three areas alone, after you allow for the homeowner grant, after you allow for school grants, after you allow for the library grants, the health grants, and police protection, streets and arterial roads, it's still a mighty poor deal. We are paying out a bucketful in Provincial taxes and we are getting back a thimbleful.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In 1964, in these three areas, the Government collected \$79,500,000; in 1970 it proposes to collect \$185,300,000, an increase of \$105,800,000. It is no wonder people question the Treasurer's promise to pass on the benefits from this tax. Look at the gasoline tax, the education and health tax, taxes that are collected in our communities. It is no wonder his statements are viewed with suspicion and with distrust.

Mr. Speaker, this Government opposite was elected on a program of larger grants for municipalities, a greater share of the gasoline tax, larger grants for education. The record has been so good that taxes on an average bungalow in Regina have risen by \$140 in five years and even after the homeowner grant of \$60 — when it reaches that figure — still represent a \$90 increase. But since the Government got elected you have to give it credit; you can't avoid accepting the fact that it has exempted turkey saddles and it has exempted electricity for heating homes. To the citizen who has failed to get the education grant he was supposed to get, as a result of paying the education and health tax; to the sick person who has to pay a tax when he goes to see a doctor, or to a hospital, or to see a therapist, putting a tax on his food now, after imposing the deterrent fee is an outrageous infringement, unless there is a concession, a direct concession that will relieve him of this onerous, unfair, unjustified increase in his health costs through the deterrent tax.

Mr. Speaker, this is one more tax that adds up to the levy of \$238 for every man, woman and child in this province in Provincial tax revenue. In 1963-64, as the Hon. Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) pointed out, the average per capita tax in Provincial tax revenues was \$129. In 1969-70, this year, they are going to take on a per capital basis according to their own estimates, \$238 per capita. In Provincial tax revenues this is an increase of 84 per cent from the Government that was elected to "lighten the tax load." That's from its election material, that's exactly what it says. If those in the cities and on the farms, those who pay higher mill rates had received any tax relief as a result of an increase in the education and health tax, Mr. Speaker, whether it was the form of a removal of deterrent fees, or lowering the mill rate or direct grants, they would not be so embittered. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence, no assurance and no guarantee that there will be a reduction in the tax load. Like an overloaded burro the Saskatchewan taxpayer is having one pound after another heaped on his back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — His only hope, the only hope that the Saskatchewan

citizen has in order to escape, is to go to another province or stand up under it all until there is an election.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the pensioners — and I say this particularly to the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and he is babbling away as usual, he is really a comedian and he is the only one that doesn't know it — on behalf of the housewife, the students, the restaurant owners and the owners of eating establishments, the people who pay the bills, the proprietors who will be forced to collect this inflationary tax. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely must oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I just have to say a few brief words about this situation. I am in the habit — you know I have the unfortunate incapacitation, Mr. Speaker, of being wired for sound. I try to ignore these things and I have to shut down the volume in order to accommodate this infernal machine. And that is always hard for me. And I apologize again to the House. You know when I have had for a number of years to have to gear my own sound box to face the northwest wind in any kind of weather when I am on the auction block, it is a little difficult to tone it down when you are in the House. But I will try to stay within the confines of this infernal machine.

I am in the habit once in awhile visiting in Alberta. As I told the House before my daughter now is in Edmonton — my 21-year old daughter — and she got one of those 80,000 jobs that Ross promised, in Edmonton. Along with half of the graduating class from Reeves Business College, they all went to Edmonton and Calgary. This was the half-year graduating class from Reeves Business College in North Battleford. Oh, I am just leading up to that, Wimpy. If the rotund Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) would just contain himself a little longer, I will get off the preliminaries.

Mr. Speaker, I can now understand some things that have happened this Session. I was rather enthused when the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said that he was going to increase the allowance for welfare people and thank goodness he did, because they are going to need this to pay the extra tax when they happen to go downtown to buy a meal or whatever little snacks they buy here and there, as our financial critic said. As if former increases were not enough, now there have been several other increases. You know we have heard about creeping inflation and we've got creeping taxation. I was amused to hear the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) hold forth when he announced last fall that once again we have been able to hold the line. We have not had to raise the per capita or the family tax or premium tax — we had that lesson yesterday — on hospitals. But you know I happen to have a friend or two and I also happened to have an unfortunate little kink in my neck. I was taking physiotherapy at the hospital and I saw all the elderly ladies and men who suffered from strokes and various things, taking physiotherapy at the Union Hospital at North Battleford. Tell them, Mr. Minister, that you didn't increase the tax. Tell them! When you happen to pay \$1.50 each time you have physiotherapy it is tax and then again mostly on the needy. The old age pensioner that walks downtown out of his inexpensive room and has his bowl of soup and crackers is now going to have to pay that extra, in some cases two or three per cent and up to

seven per cent.

I know that the Provincial Treasurer has been improvident and I know that you need this money in order to shore up your sagging coffers in order to make up the deficit. You have already milked the Socialist ventures in this province in order to protect your deficit to the tune of \$10 million for power, out of power, and \$6 odd million for telephones and that is not including the tax that you put on telephones. There was another couple of million for you, Davey. All of these taxes are still not enough. All these major increases and now we have this one, the famous hot-dog tax. I feel rather badly. I was sitting here just minding my own business and thinking that I should just say nothing about this and tolerate it. But I happened to look at my watch and my conscience started to bother me.

You know last I happened to be fortunate enough, along with our friend from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) and Mr. Larochelle from Shaunavon, Mr. Weatherald and some Members from this side of the House, to go to British Columbia to attend the Area Parliamentary Conference. I did a terrible thing, Mr. Speaker, terrible. My Rolex Oyster stopped when we got to Edmonton. I stopped in Jasper and bought a Timex and you know I owe the Provincial Treasurer 55 cents. I feel so badly about this, and I just happened to be short of money. You know I have had the watch for a year. So I will give him the watch. Would you please take that across to the Provincial Treasurer, Page. Maybe he can get a buck out of it. Accept it with my compliments and do the best you can with it, Davey, as I know you need the money. I hope that by this time next year you don't try and devise some way that you can possibly put a tax on the moose tracks and the Premier's Primrose Path.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — I am against the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, if this situation wasn't so sad, it probably would be amusing. but really, Mr. Speaker, everything that has been said here tonight is true. It is amusing but it is sad. And sad because just a few years ago the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Members of the Government opposite went up and down the province telling the people of Saskatchewan, "If you elect us we will make this province blossom like a rose in the desert. We will reduce taxes." Oh, yes, you have done so, for the corporations, for the pulp mill and potash companies. Sure, and that is what the Premier said. If you look up *Hansard* you will find that that is exactly what he said when I asked him a few years ago, before you were the Government, when I asked, "Who are you going to cut the taxes for"? He was honest enough and he told the truth. He said, "For corporations." But you know what the sad part is, Mr. Speaker, it is that the people of Saskatchewan didn't catch on. The Premier told the truth! He never intended to cut the taxes for the people of this province, only for the corporations and this Government has done that. It has to live with it now and it is going to go down in defeat with it. I can tell you that much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You are going to be...

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well I'll tell you I wouldn't want to lead people like you. I recall, Mr. Speaker, something about this Government and the first step it took to reduce taxes. I recall the first year that they were in Government, in 1964 — and there was a lot of money then — you sent out instructions to all your men, "For goodness sake spend this money," and you spent it like drunken sailors. That is how you tried to reduce taxes. You are still doing it today. I have a sheet here. Do you know that there is \$100,000 that you didn't know what to do with. You vired this money and you put it into other branches of Government in order to spend the vote. You come down here and say you need certain monies and then, my goodness, you've got to spend it. You don't think of the people back home who are paying taxes to provide money. You don't think of that. All you do is spend, spend and spend. Just talk a look at the situation. I know there is inflation, Mr. Speaker, all of us know that. And it has been pointed out here tonight that over the years when we were the Government, as shown by the report here, I find that the education and health tax, for example, requirements, increased from \$21 million in 1960 to \$38 million in 1963. It was a modest increase and we had all kinds of developments. We didn't have to load people with high taxes. But you know what you did since 1964? You increased those taxes on the people of Saskatchewan by \$30 million on hospital and education tax alone. You budgeted last year for \$68 million and it is not enough. You want more. And it has been pointed out today whom you want to get it from. the man that gets \$111 a month and can't afford to get a decent meal. He is going to go uptown and buy a bowl of soup and a slice of bread and he is going to have to pay a tax to fill your coffers and at the same time you are exempting other people that could pay tax you require.

Why don't you tax the MLAs a little more and others? Well, this is what you have been doing.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that it is 10 o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the adjournment motion. and the adjournment motion will be that we adjourn now until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — If the House doesn't mind the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.