

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Seventeenth Legislature
7th Day

Monday, August 9, 1971

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Bertha Army Worm Outbreak In Saskatchewan

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, there are many people who are very concerned and raising questions about the seriousness of the army worm outbreak in Saskatchewan. I'm sure that all Members in the House are interested in the progress being made on the salvation of the very important crop of rapeseed in this Province. Possibly the Minister could inform us as to what progress the Government is making in that direction.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member's question for further information pertaining to the army worm outbreak, might I say that it indeed has become a very serious problem for our rape-producing farmers in Saskatchewan. We have to date brought in three aircraft of Lannate, the chemical to control army worm, a total of 90,000 pounds has been brought in by those aircraft. There is another aircraft enroute now from Houston, Texas with another 30,000 pounds of chemical to control this worm. We have found the problem arising since last Friday in regard to aircraft to apply the chemical. We have therefore sought south of the border for crop-spraying aircraft. We have brought in to date, I believe, ten aircraft to help encounter this problem. We are seeking further aircraft now. We still don't at this time know how major an outbreak it is. The Department has contacted all rapeseed growing areas in the province and we are getting reports that there is evidence that in most of these, army worms are beginning to show their presence. It is unfortunate that the time from when they were first noticed is very short until they are a major concern, in fact, they can destroy a crop in several days. However, we at this time have enough chemical to control the problem. We have all the aircraft possible to apply the chemical so that we can curb or defeat this problem as soon as possible.

Mr. Weatherald: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are there any crops that are actually past the point of salvation or over 50 per cent destroyed?

Mr. Messer: — Well, there may well be because of wind conditions and rainy showery conditions that prevailed over the weekend and where perhaps aircraft are not available because you can understand we just simply can't cover 2.5 million acres of crop all at once. In such areas we have told farmers, even though there may be some loss to the crop, to try and mount their sprayer in a way so that they can get it up above the heights of the rapeseed and spray the crop by means of mechanical spraying apparatus that they already have available so that they

don't suffer a complete crop loss. But we do not know of an extensive area or of any extensive acreage where there has been complete crop loss. However, there no doubt will be some fields that will fall into that category.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-In-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. B. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, before I make my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, I should like to congratulate you on your elevation to Speaker of this Assembly. I am one of the last results of the June 23rd mandate, my late arrival being due to a judicial re-count which took place in Gravelbourg. To my satisfaction there was no change in the count.

My remarks to day will concern four main issues that I feel most concern for my constituents and this Province as a whole. This past weekend I have spent travelling in my constituency and attending several social functions. During my travels I took note of a new feeling throughout the district — a happy, satisfied feeling which arises from what has taken place so far in the new Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — It is the farmer presently and throughout the past who has been receiving a bad deal. While the cost of his machinery and operations are constantly rising, the value he receives for his product has been dropping along with the sales to a near or completely uneconomic state. Several farmers in my area are at a point where the cost of operation, land payments and numerous taxes have become equal to or greater than their income. These are good, honest, hard-working people who do not deserve this and it would be a shame if we were to allow creditors to seize land and machinery because payments cannot be met. The Act will allow a one-year breathing space to give them time to get straightened out and an opportunity to operate next year. It is only fair due to the farming dilemma that the creditors carry the load for the farmers for a year so he can catch up and make needed adjustments. This is the kind of immediate relief that the people of this Province were looking forward to during the election. Many people in my area expressed congratulations to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for the good program he has formulated in such a short time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — They continue to urge that the Government keep up its responsive action so that in the near future the land bank will become a reality.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — In my constituency the removal of the deterrent fees is another issue which has sparked enthusiastic response from the people everywhere I go. The tax was an unjustified tax on the aged, sick and the injured. This is certainly a step in the right direction that is back to the original design of the medicare program.

Education, Mr. Speaker, is one of today's highest priorities. We have seen in the past few years our educational program cut back in every direction. The pupil-teacher ratio was a program that was taking the teacher from the student, the result being a degradation of the quality of our educational system. The Government must take an active role in the future to guarantee that the children of our province receive their required attention needed to provide every chance for a full education. We must, as Government authorize a close look at where our education program is headed. The present system is obsolete. It is based on the competitive structure that surrounds us today. It offers little or no solutions to what confronts society today. It is a highly competitive era we live in with interest directed mainly to ourselves and very little concern shown for our fellow man. This attitude must be changed and the place to change it is in the educational program and at an early age. Thus, we shall have people growing up who realize the wrong that is going on and who will be educated in a way that will help reshape society into a new and far better form. Right now there are very few educational centres with programs designed to create understanding of society and its problems and I feel that we should undertake to change this. More study of racial problems, pollution and any number of social struggles should be carried out in depth and solutions sought out. Constructive rather than destructive attitudes should be taught to the people. The immediate step we should take is: (1) the removal of the ratio; (2) the setting up of responsible teams to start laying ground rules for this new education program. I would suggest that we use personnel who are highly aware of society's ills and are capable and are willing to offer constructive solutions. These people in turn would set up the new curriculum and start educating the people who will be going out into the education field.

My final topic, Mr. Speaker, is pollution. The word "pollution" has become as common as any in society today and everyone has heard it more than once, I'm sure. Let us hope that it doesn't become so common that people will forget about it and start talking about something else. Let us further hope that the causes will be understood by more people and the needed solutions will be worked out. All over the world the biosphere is being upset either mildly or severely and the thing that is upsetting it is a menace which seems incapable of controlling itself. Yes, man is the cause of most pollution and unless he limits himself and his activities there will be little that can be done to halt havoc being created in the world. To me again a counterpart in this situation would be to name another villain, called technology. Together they make a formidable foe for nature to battle. Think of it, 3.5 billion in the world and at present trends, an increase of 7 billion in 29 years. I can only see a large increase in present problems coupled with a few problems nobody but a few far-sighted people have even thought of, if this is allowed to happen. The present rate of

usage of water, oxygen and other essentials is outstripping the natural and man-made regenerating systems. Countries like United States are wasting so many resources that now they want to start wasting everyone else's as well. I think it is high time a totally new concept was brought forward and an example set to the rest of this country and to the world by Saskatchewan by controlling pollution. An active stand must be taken in industrial expansion, urban regrowth and foreign ownership so we can preserve our beautiful province and country. If people are the cause of pollution, it is our job to control people in charge of it. I feel a great relief, Mr. Speaker, now that the under the capable leadership of our Premier, Allan Blakeney, dealings with Karl F. Landegger and Company have been cut off and our province saved from further exploitation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — I am overjoyed that this deal was recognized for what it was: (1) it was a financial fiasco; (2) it was a certain polluter of the Churchill River system; (3) a forest-destroying rape of our northland. If this kind of protection for our beautiful province can be continued in the future, our children and grandchildren will bless us for it. Now that this program has stopped we must find new means to make proper use of our north. Tourism should be considered as an alternative and will be a definite boom to the economy. It is natural for people to want to enjoy the outdoors but safeguards against misuse by tourists, hunters, fishermen must also be assured. One trip to an overcrowded resort or a place such as Yellowstone National Park will soon point out that tourism can be as detrimental to the environment as industry. Rows of money-grabbing hot dog stands, crowds of pushing people fishing in fished-out lakes will soon show you that this is not what we want in Saskatchewan. Our Government realizes the long-term effects such policies can have and will continue to take a tough stand against them.

Mr. Speaker, as a New Member of the Legislative Assembly I'm looking forward to the next four years in office and hope that I shall be able to offer constructive suggestions and criticisms to the debates. I will also use my energies to ensure that my constituents receive the necessary representation.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to say that I speak against the amendment and favor the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with all the other Members of this House in congratulating you on your appointment to your important office. I, with all the others, am confident that you will deal fairly and honorably with all matters coming within your jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I had not originally intended to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. Being a hard-nosed farmer I should like to see things done with dispatch. I had anticipated that we could, with a few pertinent presentations from each side of the House, have proceeded with the business at hand. I guess I was naive to think that Government could act so quickly. No doubt I shall learn to be patient in the next few years.

I should like to congratulate the Premier and his Cabinet for preparing legislation to deal with some of the priority items on which the people of this Province had a right to expect early action. The removal of deterrent fees and the extension of the Act to exempt our senior citizens from the payment of hospital and medical care premiums were certainly in the forefront of priorities demanded by the people. I'm happy to see that even the Members opposite are willing to agree that they should never have been applied in the first place.

During the election campaign just past, farmers of Saskatchewan spoke out loud and clear in their opposition to the kinds of programs being brought forth by the Federal Liberal Government and concurred in, for the most part, by their Provincial counterparts. There can be little doubt in the minds of the tattered remnants of that Party opposite or in the minds of the Federal Liberals or the people of Canada, that the farmers of Western Canada are not ready to accept bribes in the form of \$100 million payment to which they are entitled in return for a stabilization plan which in its present form does little but guarantee stabilized poverty. Our farmers have a right to expect more than that and are prepared to say so. In a world where all other segments of society are demanding and receiving increases in salary and allowances in order to meet the increasing cost of living, it seems strange that the agricultural industry should be expected to be satisfied with a stabilization plan of this kind, a plan which not only does not take into account increasing costs, but which, in fact, because of the drastically reduced income in the last few years will start on a downward plane because of the five-year average on which it is based.

Farmers do not accept the proposal as laid down in the Task Force Report and apparently concurred in by Mr. Lang and his associates that the best way to increase farm income is to reduce the number of farmers in Canada. Because the Task Force was composed of economists and lawyers who know little of the value of the way of life in our rural communities they failed completely to comprehend the extreme importance of maintaining a viable agricultural population on the Prairies, in order to guarantee a sufficiently large population base in our rural communities to provide the many services in the fields of health, education, recreation and so on, which we need. The same farmers and their supporting communities rejected out of hand the assumption that small towns and villages have outlived their usefulness and should be allowed to wither and die. It is of the utmost importance that some real long-range planning be done to establish a real income stabilization plan for Western Canada. It is just as important that when such a plan is established it must be done in full consultation with our farm organizations and community groups. There can be no question that the survival of the entire rural community hinges on the maintenance of a viable agriculture. It will be the task of this Government to see that machinery is set in motion to ensure that proper programs are initiated quickly.

Last winter on a CBC free-time telecast, the Hon. Mr. Andras, Minister of Housing in Ottawa, spoke of the housing crisis in Canada. He spoke of the billions of dollars which Canada will have to spend in the next few years on housing and related services. He stated that within the next five years, 75 per cent of the people of Canada could be living in the ten major cities and that 50 per cent would be concentrated in the

four major metropolitan areas. He went on to tell of the huge expenditures which would be required to meet the needs of housing, sewer and water facilities, social services, police protection and pollution control. He even questioned whether it was possible to meet these demands. Now it seems to me that there is something very wrong with a society which dictates that we should uproot thousands of people from our farms and rural communities where they live in a clean unadulterated environment and demand that they be transferred to overcrowded, polluted and crime infested cities all to satisfy some god called efficiency. It doesn't make sense to me or the people of Western Canada and yet this is exactly the kind of solution being proposed by the Hon. Mr. Lang in his farm legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we are committed to spend these huge sums of money on some kind of program to help people, we have to take a long hard look at where the dollars go. I suggest that a very first priority should be to use it for programs which would discourage the influx of people to the large metropolitan areas rather than encourage it. What better way than to use it on an Income Stabilization Program which will make it possible for large numbers of farmers to remain on their farms. A stable farm population means a stable rural community where people want to stay in the first place.

Now, I know that some will be saying that this is a Federal matter and I agree that it is. However, the extreme urgency of some really new and radical approach to the agricultural problem is so great that it must be faced now or it will be too late. Make no mistake, one of the reasons why the benches across the way are so sparsely occupied is that that Government and their Ottawa counterparts failed to cope with this very urgent problem in a meaningful way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — The same fate will await any other government which fails to act. Certainly in the provincial jurisdiction, we can implement programs which can be of assistance to farmers in the line of credit programs, loan protection, extension service, etc., and we have started in this Session with The Family Farm Protection Act. We shall be proposing many other programs such as the Land Bank Commission and others in the near future, but the real problem lies in the need for more real income in the hands of farmers. A real effort will have to be made by our Government in co-operation with all western agricultural groups to impress this on our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt at some length with some of our agricultural problems, as I must, because I present a rural constituency. However, the constituency of Saltcoats, which I have the honor to represent, is not only an agricultural area but contains within its boundaries the largest potash mining complex in the world. The International Mineral and Chemical Company plant, which is known to most of us as K-1 and K-2, are located only a few miles from my farm and are capable of producing approximately 3-1/2 million tons of refined potash per year. The impact of the development of this industry has been tremendous on our rural communities such as Esterhazy, Churchbridge, and Langenburg and others.

But there is also trouble in the potash industry. Because

of uncontrolled development an acute overcapacity for production has occurred in Saskatchewan. This resulted, a couple of years ago, in very competitive pricing of refined potash on world markets and created a very severe problem for parent companies in the United States. Because we have a very high grade of potash in Saskatchewan and our recovery rate is probably the highest in the world, we can produce at prices which are impossible to meet in the depleted areas. As a result, a great deal of pressure was brought to bear on the previous Government to set up prorationing to cut down Canadian production. At the same time the companies were guaranteed a minimum price for their produce which was some \$6 per ton higher than the going rate at that time, to compensate for the loss of production. In actual fact, a worldwide potash cartel came into being. As a result we have guaranteed the survival of some very inefficient mines in New Mexico and elsewhere in the world at the expense of the loss of from 400 to 500 jobs in our own mines. Many of the miners had just purchased new homes in our communities and have been forced to abandon them and to move to other areas. Because of age or other personal reasons, some have remained and some are now on our welfare rolls. Population loss in our area totalled almost 1,000 people from the time the mine started until now. Layoffs are still continuing and are, in my opinion, totally unjustified in the light of reported profits being made by this plant.

Mr. Speaker, I am not nor do I pretend to be an economist or a specialist on potash or potash marketing, and I do not have a solution to offer to this problem at the present time. I urge this Government to make a very thorough and comprehensive study of the entire potash industry in the province at the earliest possible date so that proposals can come forward for the expansion of markets in order that full production can be restored.

The potential for additional employment in this industry is tremendous and I believe it should be exploited to its fullest extent.

Before closing, I should like to take this opportunity to tell you of another matter which gives me some reason for pride in our area.

My home town of Churchbridge which has for many years been known for its outstanding baseball teams has done it again. This year three of our minor ball teams are presently in the Provincial playdowns, with our senior sandlots now in the Provincial finals. I should like to congratulate both the players and their dedicated coaches who have brought them this far. Certainly they have helped to bring a measure of fame to our community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — In summing up then, Mr. Speaker, you will have no doubt that I have confidence in this Government to meet the pressing needs of our people and that I will be supporting the programs as outlined in the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, seeing this is the first time I've had the opportunity to speak in this first formal debate, I, too, want to join with other Members of the Assembly in extending to you the usual congratulations. You have certainly demonstrated in the very short time that the House has been in Session your capabilities in that regard.

I also want to say a word to congratulate the new Members who have participated in this debate for the first time. Certainly they, too, have indicated the next four years should be a lively and interesting period on both sides of the House, particularly by the contribution that will be made by these new Members.

I also want to say a word of congratulations to the new Members of the Cabinet or the front benches opposite. Certainly to be a Member of the Treasury bench is indeed a challenging one and I'm sure that they too will look forward to four years with interest. However, I am a little concerned about those fellows who sit in the second row — the fellows who are not in the Cabinet — I find it very difficult to try and analyze the reason why some of the Members in the second row were overlooked. I think, for example, of Russ Brown, the Member for Estevan who for so many years made an important contribution; I think of Ed Whelan, the Member for Regina North West, who certainly seemed to indicate that he aspired to that lofty position but the only conclusion that I can come to is that he put his money on the wrong horse in the last leadership convention, and it would now look and appear as if the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) doesn't have quite as much influence as he thought he was going to have. I think about the young Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) and I find that he had his money on the wrong horse as well.

But the one who really bothers me most is the former mayor of the City of Regina (Mr. Baker). You know, the NDP certainly haven't been very kind to poor Henry. First of all, because he lived in Regina North East, he decided that he should run in that constituency, and of course what happened? They whistled him right out of that constituency. Then he decided that he had the qualifications to be the new leader and, of course, he got a rather rude awakening on that score. And then we found that the next thing that happened was that he got defeated as mayor after ten years in the City of Regina. And now we find that not only was he overlooked for the Cabinet but here he is unemployed and he still was overlooked, too, as a Member in the appointment of Legislative Secretaries, one of those individuals who are not going to travel around the province on behalf of the NDP, and I'm going to have a few words to say about that a little later on, Mr. Speaker.

I want just to take a few minutes this morning and talk about two factors that have concerned me about the direction of the Government in the first five weeks of office. I want to take a moment, first of all, to analyze the Throne Speech — what are its priorities, what will be its effect on the Province of Saskatchewan.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Session will go down in the history of the Province as the Session that declared war on investment and business in Saskatchewan and in Canada. Industrial businessmen, investors, will avoid Saskatchewan

like the plague. Never, Mr. Speaker, has a government in Canada taken a more vicious stand against industrial development and job creation. You know, on June 23rd when this Government was elected, most of the people in Saskatchewan said that with Allan Blakeney and Roy Romanow at the helm, that there would be a moderate left wing Government. But in the five weeks since the election we have found that it isn't a moderate left wing Government. Look at what happened since this Sessions started. When you strip it of its tinsel, when you remove the theatrics, when you look behind the showboat, it is nothing more than propaganda for the NDP at the taxpayers' expense.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has pointed out that the majority of this legislation could have been implemented without a Session. Removal of utilization fees, medicare for the aged, Bill 2 could have been suspended until the spring session, with no use — instead it has turned into a Session that has put the fear of the Lord in the business and investment community.

During the campaign and in the previous session, the NDP continually harped on two basic problems. One, the high rate of unemployment and the need to provide jobs for our young people. Second, the need drastically to improve the farm income to protect the family farm. Instead of attacking these two problems, they have acted to generate fear, suspicion and hostility among those people whose help Saskatchewan needs if we are going to solve these two basic problems.

An Hon. Member: — . . . 20 years!

Mr. MacDonald: — Unemployment — Oh, No, it's going to be brought up to date here. Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has experienced serious unemployment problems. Saskatchewan was no exception, except under the Liberal Government it had the lowest unemployment in Canada. In fact, in the June report, in the statistics it was 2.7.

The NDP have continually wept crocodile tears on behalf of the unemployed but since taking office a little over one month ago, they have done more to destroy employment opportunities than at any time in our history. They have declared open war on the business community. They have threatened the entire business community. They have created an atmosphere of suspicion and fear for any investor interested in Saskatchewan.

Let me document this record. Firstly, the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Industry, stood on an election platform and publicly stated that he and his Party would not honor an agreement signed by the legal Government of Saskatchewan. He also stated that if the company proceeded, they would do so at their own risk. This agreement was signed after one year of strenuous negotiations. The Act was passed in this Assembly authorizing the capital requirements for this Bill. The agreements were tabled and made public property. There was nothing illegal or immoral in the agreements signed. Surely no Premier in Canada's history ever started his term of office with such a threat to a company developing their province. Even his Socialist cohort, Ed Schreyer of Manitoba, went out of his way to assure the business community that his Government would respect and honor agreements made by his predecessors. Let me quote something from the United States of America, and the date is May 24, 1971, not two years ago but two months ago; "Manitoba woos industry":

A welcome mat it out for United States investors in Manitoba, the Canadian Prairie Province with the only Socialist Government in North America. Premier Edward R. Schreyer is the first member of the New Democratic Party, NDP, to head the Government in Winnipeg. He wants a bigger American stake in the economy plus a United States market for his goods.

And it goes on to explain what has happened and why he wants the United States to be investing in the Province of Manitoba. Not Allan Blakeney. Private enterprise has received better treatment in South America, Africa, and other areas of the world under dictatorship or other governments.

Number two, next he cancelled the Choiceland Iron Mine project. This was done without even consulting the principal developer, Denison Mines. Surely common courtesy, if not the good of Saskatchewan, would have demanded that he contact Steve Roman, President of Denison Mines.

For over a decade both a CCF Government and a succeeding Liberal Government had tried to interest a major mining company in the Choiceland project. What was his reason? The margin of profit was too narrow. Since when has the NDP started to worry about the profit of a corporation? I wonder how the young Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) will explain this to his constituents. This project, Mr. Speaker, was not just an iron mine and pelleting plant. It was the basis for making Saskatchewan the centre of the steel industry in Western Canada. Every corporation in Canada will soon learn of the treatment of these two companies.

An Hon. Member: — It's all down the drain!

Mr. MacDonald: — Saskatchewan will once again become the never, never land in exploration and development.

Three, they have threatened to seize the Prince Albert pulp mill and place it under public ownership. The entire country is aware of the deplorable record of the Socialists when it comes to the development of our timber resources. They know the record of the Saskatchewan Timber Board. They know the record of Wisewood Limited of Hudson Bay in which they were partners. Here, a Government that couldn't run a shoe factory, a box factory, are going to run a multi-million dollar business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — With the problems of marketing our products, particularly our pulp, this would be the biggest disaster ever to face Northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Surely Mr. Blakeney does not expect that this threat will have no effect on investment in Saskatchewan.

Fourth, the NDP Wafflers have demanded that Premier Blakeney "cancel without compensation" the Athabasca mill and public ownership of the Prince Albert mill. Here the left wing extreme element of his Party, led by one of his own MLAs is telling him

and the rest of Canada what he must do.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they had another meeting in Fort Qu'Appelle last weekend. Let me review the news report. This, by a new Legislative Secretary to the Cabinet, the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards).

Among the demands that the Wafflers will be making are that the party take a pro-labor stand, that it bring about changes proposed by the 1970 convention with respect to agriculture and resource development and return it to a firm Socialist program.

I wonder what the investment community thinks of that.

There was an uncertainty as to what the NDP victory means. Does it mean that there is just going to be a continuation of what was happening from 1960 to 1964 or is this going to be a return to a very enthusiastic Socialist response to the problems of the province and there was that feeling of uncertainty as to what was going to be the direction of the Government and realization that "we must not allow a honeymoon period" in which we allow the Caucus and Cabinet to make all their own independent way.

Well, Boy, he's made it very, very clear and Allan Blakeney has made it very clear. He said:

The Waffle is going to have a right now to be actively participating in making sure that the Government does in fact pursue the NDP policy in a firm, Socialist manner.

I wonder what the investment community thinks of those statements? If ever a newspaper article would make an investor interested in Saskatchewan freeze, it would be this report. Surely, he does not suspect this will have no impact on investment in this Province.

Five, one of his own Ministers stands up in this House and refers to Karl Landegger, a partner of their now Government, as a 'Robber Baron', in the middle of what the Premier tells us were continuing negotiations with Parsons and Whittemore of New York. Surely, he does not suspect that this will have no impact on investment in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Six, his party has continually stated that they will tax the rich to help the poor. The favorite target of the NDP has always been the corporations. They are everybody's whipping boy. Nobody wants to defend them. I just want to warn Mr. Blakeney and his Socialist colleagues, and particularly the starry-eyed boys over there. The greatest single factor in the discouragement of new investment and increased production is corporate taxes and personal income taxes that soar above their competitive neighbors. No one questions that corporations must pay taxes. They themselves readily admit that this is their responsibility. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they are the key productive element on which the nation's income, wealth and economic growth depend.

The Socialist have run all over this Province telling people that they are going to pay for their promises by taxing

the corporations. Why don't they quit lying? Why don't they quit this hypocrisy?

One point on the corporation tax brings less than \$2 million to the Province of Saskatchewan. Do you young fellows realize this? Less than one point, less than \$2 million. If they raised the corporation tax so that it was the highest in Canada, it wouldn't pay 50 per cent of the increased cost of the existing education system in one year. Not one program, just the existing escalating costs. And if they did this, they couldn't attract a peanut stand to this Province and they know it.

The real revenue from corporations comes in wages, in production costs, in equipment, in purchase of material, transportation costs, capital investments. That's where the real profit and the real revenue comes from a corporation, not in taxes. This is a warning the NDP must heed. It is obvious that if we tax them out of Saskatchewan we shall drastically reduce the incentive to new investment and the consequent increase in jobs, good wages and economic growth that everybody is calling for.

Then, Mr. Speaker, number seven, the Premier's dramatic announcement Monday stating that they would not proceed with the Athabasca mill. I shall not repeat the discussions of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Members on this side of the House regarding pollution and forest management. They have been adequately covered. I just want to say now, they are the Government and they have control of setting the terms of reference of forest management and pollution. Because they have been polluting the South Saskatchewan River in Saskatoon for 50 years, you don't burn down the City of Saskatoon, you pass laws to control the pollution and that's what you have to do with the mill.

However, I do want to refer to two arguments used by the Premier. He stated that the native people of the North did not want this mill and then he brought in the resolution from the Montreal Band signed by Chief Bird and Chief Link. But, Mr. Speaker, I do have some figures that turn that resolution into a fantasy. Let me quote the electoral results of the native communities that would be most directly affected by the mill, Beauval and Ile-a-La-Crosse. In 1967, during the last election campaign the Liberals got 129 in Beauval and the NDP 178, almost 50 per cent or 45 per cent majority for the NDP. In Ile-a-La-Crosse the Liberals got 88, the NDP got 95.

Mr. Bowerman: — Tell us the whole story.

Mr. MacDonald: — What is the story? I'm telling the whole story. The Liberal Member lost both those polls convincingly in 1967. But in 1971, where the pulp mill was the one over-riding issue in these communities, look at the results. In Beauval the Liberals got 154 and the NDP 31. 154 to 31 and he says that the natives of Northern Saskatchewan don't want this mill. Ile-a-La-Crosse 205 for the Liberals and 143 for the NDP.

Mr. Bowerman: — Now tell the rest.

Mr. MacDonald: — That is the rest. All the garbage you peddled and all the untruths and half-truths, these astonishing results indicate

the complete hypocrisy of the Premier's statement. The native people of this area not only wanted the mill but wanted it in a convincing fashion.

Mr. Bowerman: — I am sure the House would like the rest.

Mr. MacDonald: — You know, I would like to see you get up after I'm finished and make a speech. You haven't said anything since you came in this House but surely as a Member of the Cabinet you should have enough courage to get up and express it. If you've got a story to tell about Northern Saskatchewan we want to hear it and I know that the native people of this Province want to hear what you have to say.

Second, the Premier threatened the partners in this project that if the areas of compensation could not be satisfactorily solved between the two partners by means of negotiation he would then bring an act before this House which would solve it once and for all. He did not state that if they were unable to solve these matters by mutual negotiations he would then follow the due process of law. I want to quote from his statement and I think this is one that every industrialist in the Dominion of Canada and every potential investor in Canada will read:

Finally (the letter states that) unless this issue can be satisfactorily settled at a reasonably early date it would be the Government's intention to introduce legislation to deal with this matter.

To turn around and threaten the company that if they don't come to terms that they will bring in a law and pass it, instead of taking it through the usual process of law, is a threat that no government in the Dominion of Canada, to my knowledge, has ever made against a potential investor. So he threatened them with an agreement or else. Come to our terms or else. You will take what we give you or we will give you no choice. We will pass a law in the Legislature of Saskatchewan, where we have a majority of 45 Members. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that never in the history of this Province, in this country, has a greater threat been made to a corporation than that made by Allan Blakeney, NDP Premier of Saskatchewan. How will this be taken by the business community of North America? Never has a more disgusting irresponsible threat been made by a premier of any province.

For 20 years while the NDP were the Government of Saskatchewan their greatest weakness was their inability to develop Saskatchewan. They frightened businessmen from coming to our Province. Saskatchewan cannot exist without jobs. Our young people will be continually forced to look elsewhere. This is the major failure of this Session. The most astonishing aspect is that the new Minister of Industry, the Premier, has made no statement, announced no new jobs, and expressed no concern about our economic growth. All I want to say is, get off your backsides and generate some jobs.

I also want to suggest that some of those glassy-eyed Members over there had better wake up. Government and Socialist enterprises will never solve the economic future of Canada. We don't have the required capital. In 1955 the Socialists said they would solve the unemployment problems by building Socialist enterprises and despite what the Member from Saskatoon Nutana

Centre (Mr. Robbins) said the other day, you know he talked about the great, great contribution of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, but he forgot to mention the Guarantee Fidelity Company. He forgot to mention that these were all monopolistic. He forgot to say, for example, that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation ten years ago was making just a little over \$1 million for all the total investment.

Mr. Romanow: — What does the Guarantee Fidelity do now?

Mr. MacDonald: — Certainly we got rid of it and we had to protect the people that had the premiums. But I want to tell you something that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation after seven years of Liberal management is now making \$20 million. The only Power Corporation in the North American continent that hasn't raised rates. Remember those 22 corporations, well, I'll not take the time to tell you the fiasco that resulted. By the time we became the Government in 1964, 12 of these Crown corporations had gone bankrupt and been disposed of. Others were kept operating by repeated government grants. Without exception those that had to compete with private enterprise on equal terms lost huge sums of money regularly and consistently. Even those that had a monopoly displayed business inefficiency, their profits for the total investment was unbelievably low. These experiments cost the taxpayers millions of dollars. All you starry-eyed Members over there who have never invested 25 cents in your own business, wake up and come back to reality.

I just want to mention a word on the Task Force on Public Works. The line in the Throne Speech pointing out the formation of a task force to evaluate the needed public works is more window dressing. Public works have several features; first, they must be needed and not a waste of the taxpayers' money; second, they do supply some continuing employment for the construction industry but rarely generate new jobs; third, they have no long-term benefits in job opportunities. In fact the majority of public works' projects are very small and short-termed. If great care is not taken in the selection of priorities in public works, they drain much needed funds and operating costs for years to come. This is perhaps a worthwhile venture but it will not fill the gap in job creation in Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I wager the NDP Public Works' Program will not contribute to the solution of this problem one iota. It is a deliberate attempt to hide their unconcern and their absolute negligence in this particular debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one more thing very briefly and that's the welfare state. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have always had a continuing interest in the field of welfare and health in the Province of Saskatchewan but I am concerned about the direction taken by the present Government. The Province of Saskatchewan, under the hand of Allan Blakeney, is rapidly steering a course to become the complete welfare state. On June 23rd the NDP were elected to become the Government of Saskatchewan. Their program was designed to bribe the people of Saskatchewan with the philosophy of something for nothing, for young, for old, for rich or poor, employed or unemployed. The principle of selectivity according to need was thrown out the window for the principle of universality, even the very rich, even those who did not need government aid. This Session has been called to demonstrate that the welfare state is on its

way. The removal of utilization fees, free medicare for those over 65 are the first steps down this road. The Socialists have chosen to ignore the realities of their policies and what is more frightening, they have chosen to hide them from the people of Saskatchewan.

What are the consequences of their policies on the people of Saskatchewan? Government welfarism with its ever increasing army of beneficiaries is fatally easy to launch, and fatally easy to extend but it is almost impossible to bring to a halt. It is also almost impossible politically to reverse no matter how obvious and catastrophic its consequences become. It leads to inflation, state bankruptcy, political disintegration and ever increasing government control. Why do I suggest that Saskatchewan is racing down the road to a complete welfare state? The removal of utilization fees and free medicare to the aged are programs with major implications, but would not necessarily destroy the economic stability of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, this is only the first step. Examine their program called the New Deal for People. It is, without question, the biggest give-away program in the history of Canada. It is a blatant attempt to buy peoples' votes by using their own money. It is the most unrealistic, uneconomic, deceitful program ever offered by a political party in Canada.

In addition to these Bills before us here is a further list of a few promises related to the field of health and welfare. Prescription drug program, hearing aids, eye glasses, braces, wheel chairs, reduced costs, insured dental care service for those under 12, free nursing care service to Level III patients in special care homes, increased government support of public and non-profit nursing homes and geriatric centres, expand and improve ambulance and emergency service in both rural and urban Saskatchewan, chiropractic services under the Medical Care Insurance programs. And you could go on. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) indicated there were 50 promises we haven't even started to catalogue. These, Mr. Speaker, are only a few of their wild irrational promises. If even these in their totality were implemented, no state on the North American continent, perhaps in the world, would have travelled down the road of the welfare state like the Province of Saskatchewan.

Referring to these two specific Bills, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat my personal position and that of my colleagues. The people of Saskatchewan have spoken, we will abide by their decision. However, I want to emphasize that though we approve of these amendments at this time we insist that the NDP provide some very important answers. How are these wild promises to be paid for — not only this year when they have been left a healthy surplus, but five years hence? I want to repeat another promise made by the new Santa Claus, the Premier of Saskatchewan. Speaking in Assiniboia during the campaign, the Premier promised, and I quote:

An NDP Government would at least hold the line on the present medicare premiums of \$72 per family and perhaps eventually reduce it to the 1964 level of \$52 per family.

We intend to see that you keep that promise. If what you say is true, then how do you pay for these costs and all the other wild promises?

Saskatchewan is not the only state that has attempted to

look after people from the cradle to the grave. Sweden, Britain, France, and many other countries soon learned that to extend social services indefinitely, it is essential to develop their economic base. This is the tragedy of this particular Throne Speech and this is the tragedy of the start of the first five weeks of NDP Government in Saskatchewan. Get off your high horse, get off the Marxist garbage and come to reality. We need investment, development, economic growth, we must provide jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one more thing. I was very disappointed the other day when the Premier came into the House and refused to permit the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to sit in the House after his re-count. I just want to read and put in the records of the House a statement made by Mr. Dalby. This is in the Prince Albert Herald of July 10th:

The NDP Candidate Dalby said he was naturally disappointed at the re-count results, 'but I will continue to work for the North in any capacity that the public wants me to. It's my home and intend that it always will be. There are other elections.' Mr. Dalby declined comment on future plans saying that the decision on whether to appeal the re-count outcome is in the hands of a solicitor. 'I think the re-count could not possibly have been fair.'

All I am saying is I don't think that Mr. Dalby would have objected to have the Member for Athabasca sit here, it certainly in no way would have prevented a controverted election or whatever other steps he wants to pursue with. It is unfortunate that the Member for Athabasca is not here to make his contribution to the House, particularly, Mr. Speaker, because so many of the things that have happened in the first five weeks of this Government are related to the North. The cancellation of the Athabasca mill, the threat to take over the Prince Albert mill, cancellation of the Choiceland iron mine. It is no wonder that they didn't want the Hon. Allan Guy, the Member for Athabasca sitting in this House.

I have one more little point, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to talk about and that's this business of legislative secretaries. If there is anything that the NDP have always said, you know, they turn and they always project an image of sanctimony and hypocrisy. You know, they always say, Oh, it's important to have integrity, principles always come first with the NDP. Well, I want to quote here a little bit about what the Premier said away back in 1965. Here is what he said — I suppose he knows, that's why he's leaving.

There is further reason why parliamentary secretaries are necessary and legislative secretaries are not. It is the custom of the Parliament of Canada for the House to sit and for the committees of the House to sit at the same time . . .

We, in Saskatchewan, have not found it necessary to schedule our committees to sit while the House was in Session so this reason for having a legislative secretary is not valid. Indeed none of the reasons which are ordinarily advanced for having parliamentary secretaries at Ottawa are valid in a provincial government such as Saskatchewan, which has a short legislative session.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, that was the Premier, now let's listen to what the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) said:

One of the things about this bill that worries me is that there are no duties listed. I was thinking of some duties that might be listed or might be explained to us. They might have one of these assistants file wastepaper basket letters.

I wonder if that's what he's going to do.

One candidate is extremely good at this. Perhaps one of the other duties might be to fan the Cabinet Ministers in warm weather.

I wonder if he is going to do that.

We might have one of them set aside to polish their automobiles.

My automobile is pretty dirty!

Another might chauffeur the Cabinet Ministers around the province. Another one might light their cigars.

I am not sure if any of you smoke cigars over there but I know that some of them smoke and maybe he could do that. I wonder if the Member for Regina North West is really going to perform all those duties as a Legislative Secretary. You know their great integrity. Principles first. Then . . .

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should not try and kid one another here in this House. The real duties of these people will be that of paid organizers . . . Just a wonderful set-up for six organizers to roam around the province.

Too bad Roy didn't have those during his campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bad precedent, as my colleague from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) just said — a bad precedent for every legislature in Canada. We can only conclude that this is another first for Saskatchewan.

Now, its' a second.

It is the first time that Saskatchewan citizens have paid for political organizers under a thin disguise.

I wonder what section of the province the Member for Regina North West has as a political organizer.

Now I want to talk about the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Robbins), he made a speech and he even quoted a poem. I'm going to quote a couple of stanzas from his poem.

An Hon. Member: — Nutana Centre!

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, Nutana Centre, is it? Well, this is Mr. Robbins:

So you see a lot depends on the interpretation that is placed on things. I think it should be remembered

that this Liberal party in the election campaign promised that it would have a Cabinet of 12. I heard this quotation from many platforms. The Premier did not promise a bakers' dozen. Now it's true, he lost one of them, but nevertheless, the anticipation is that this appointment will later be filled, and we would have a Cabinet of 13 and six legislative secretaries, presumably.

Now what does the bill say? The bill says that the appointments shall terminate on the 31st day of December each year. Well perhaps, this is one way of keeping the Guys and Gals in line. It also says that they shall be paid a salary of \$2,000 a year and shall be paid in monthly installments, \$166.66 a month . . .

(Have you got your first cheque yet, fellows?)

. . . presumably \$166.74 on the last day of the year to bring it into line at \$2,000.

He even calculated that!

Other members have commented on the expenses. It says reasonable expenses. But again, this is subject to interpretation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is an extremely onerous task for the Premier, in terms of selecting legislative secretaries, and if I may, I would like to present to him and to Members on the Government side, a little bit of assistance from the Opposition side. We are concerned of course that he makes the best possible selections.

He went on to talk about —

Ottawa has its Guy Favreau,
Montreal has its Guy Rouleau,
Also Guy Lord and Guy Masson,
The Federal Liberals are rolling along
From enquiry A to enquiry B
Furniture, extradition and fiddle-dee-dee.

(They should have changed it to fuddle-dee-dud!)

I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, here is what it says. I want to tell you what one of the Cabinet Minister's says, this is Mr. Snyder:

Delegate your responsibility in the normal, logical fashion and for Heaven's sake, do not run around appointing these people to act on a temporary basis, to be political hacks . . .

I wonder if the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) feels like a political hack? I wonder if the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) and the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) feel like political hacks? Or the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris). Oh, is he a political hack! Well, I'll tell you that if that was the last speech, listen to him. Quoting Mr. Snyder again:

. . . to run around the province doing your political work.

Well, of course, the Member from Arm River, that's all he did anyway!

Pay your organizers and stand up and be counted. Appoint them as political organizers. Call them as such. Let us not have this back-door method. Appoint Cabinet Ministers for doing Cabinet Ministers' jobs — political organizers for doing political organizers jobs.

Now, the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) he said:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I do not believe the public of Saskatchewan should be required to pay field men for the Liberal Party.

I wonder if he still feels that the Government of Saskatchewan should be required to pay for the field men of the NDP.

Here is another Cabinet Minister (Mr. Smishek) that has a Legislative Secretary:

I support the proposition that if there is need for more ministers, then the government should proceed to appoint them, but not bring in Legislative Assistants who at this stage appear to be nothing else but ribbon-cutters and possibly political organizers.

Another point (Mr. Wood):

Another point that comes to mind is the matter as has been indicated in the House, that these assistants would be changed off from year to year. That you would have one man in one position one year and another year you would have another man in the same position. This is very good insofar as spreading around the experience and the knowledge that might be obtained, but it would not be very efficient insofar as the department is concerned. Just about the time that the man is getting to learn something and be of some use to the Minister, he will be changed and another person brought in. This idea of having temporary staff that is changed from year to year, I don't think would be a good one.

And then we hear from the man that didn't make it, Mr. Baker:

I wasn't going to say anything on this question but seeing that everybody gets into the discussion, it isn't fair that I sit by and listen all the time.

I think that's right, Henry!

I think this money can be better used by paying the country MLAs more money.

He had a real soft spot for the rural Member.

These people must maintain two homes. I mean that sincerely. It's not quite the same thing for those of us living in the cities, but the country Members come here, they have to leave their farms and hire people to take their place and all they are allowed is \$4,000 with \$2,000 expenses. I think this is where the Government should have directed its attention to see to it that our MLAs got a decent pay.

Henry always did have a concern for the MLA.

As far as I am concerned, if there was a division marking the receipts for city or town or urban MLAs to country, I would certainly like to see them get much more than what is being offered here to these Legislative Secretaries. These people are not going to make any money by getting this \$2,000. They'll probably have to pad their expenses in order to come out on the right side of the ledger.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to say more. I just think it is another indication of this particular Government over there. They are all for principle when it's somebody else's principle but they don't have much integrity when it comes to their own principles.

Mr. Speaker, as you can gather I am particularly disappointed in this particular Throne Speech because it does absolutely nothing for the farmers of Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the small farmer under the only proposed legislation is threatened. It does absolutely nothing for the crisis in agriculture. Mr. Speaker, it does nothing to solve the unemployment problems in this Province, and most important of all, it has jeopardized the future potential of the Province of Saskatchewan to obtain investment and job creation enterprises.

I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to participate in the Throne Speech Debate this morning. I think it is the eighth or ninth time that I have had the privilege of doing so over the past years. I have tried very hard in listening to the former speaker from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) to get something worthwhile out of his remarks and I have had much difficulty in doing so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I notice in the records of the House over the years, they used to refer to Herman Danielson and Minty Loptson as the "gold dust twins" — I should now like to classify the Member from Milestone with the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) as the featherweight twins in this House. I notice wilful Wilf was here a few moments ago, I see he's gone and I presume he is keeping a watchful eye on his children and keeps the records up to date so that he has them when he takes over the leadership of that party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — It is most heartening, Mr. Speaker, to be here again. When you think of the hatchet job they did on my seat, my constituency not too many months ago. I want to express appreciation to the voters of Wascana for the confidence they once again placed in me.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. No one could fill that post better in this House than yourself, even that 13th century hat, I must say, suits you.

I congratulate all those who were re-elected and those newly elected Members who grace this Chamber for the first time. I wish the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) well in his new role as Leader of the Opposition. Premier Blakeney deserves great commendation on his marked success. It is up to us on this side of the House to help him become one of the best.

I said in this House during the last session that the main issues of the forthcoming election would be agriculture, unemployment and humane policies in taking care of our people. The results of these warnings are now evident as to what we see across the way. It seems to me that the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) must be feeling very uncomfortable these days. Three of his cherished achievements have been rejected by this Government and by Members of the Opposition. Surely there must be a flicker of remorse or a tiny twinge in the heart of the former Minister of Health. It is not likely that anywhere in any legislature or assembly in the world that within a few days three pieces of legislation which were touted as useful and necessary by one government had been rejected by a new government with the support of the former defenders of the legislation. The former Minister of Health has been repudiated by this Assembly, the Members of the Government, and by his own colleagues. Is it now time for him to speed up his retirement plans. It is well known that he is just keeping his seat warm for someone close to him.

The people of Whitmore Park would be very interested in the philosophy expressed by the Member for Whitmore Park in this debate. By his statements he has said that he has no trust in the people. He has charged that they will abuse the medicare and hospitalization plan now that they don't have to pay deterrent fees. It was amazing to hear him advance the argument that he was able to get an appointment with the doctor very easily in July because citizens were waiting for the removal of deterrent fees. It is likely that the Member for Whitmore Park could get an appointment very easily at any time and he would not have to worry about where he was going to get the money for deterrent fees.

The former Minister of Health referred to a deficit at the Regina General Hospital which the city council of that day would not accept. Why? Because first he requested additional services be given, then when it came time to pay for it, he reneged. Every move he played politics. Why did he really turn his wrath upon the Regina General? Because I got city council to remove the \$25 deposit deterrent fee to be paid upon admittance and permit patients to pay this cursed tax on their own time. In every way he tried to make deterrent fees stick so he held back sufficient grants to give hospital care necessary for our people. He was one of the ring-leaders for bringing in deterrent fees.

His policies closed hospitals needed in many areas for the sick and for a good health plan. He ridiculed the CCF Government from 1944 to 1964 saying, I believe, the care for patients was a disgrace in our mental institutions. I strongly challenge that statement and I think that I have a right to do so.

My work took me to where our civil servants worked there. I was shown how patients were cared for prior to 1944 under a Liberal Government. I saw how the care for these people was completely changed by our CCF Government. For once in their lives all patients were put in a bed, a clean bed in which to rest. They were put in rooms where they had the freedom of

movement. I saw how they were given full care by trained psychiatric nurses and aides, how they were given a bath in modern bath facilities, how they were trained to use washroom facilities, how they were trained to dress neatly and participate in many recreational and social functions. The most shocking thing of all was when I was shown how many of them had lived and were treated before 1944. I saw cell-like rooms where some of those who now had beds and decent quarters were placed. They were kept in these cell-like rooms like caged animals, not dressed and served at tables. When it came to have a bath the hoses were turned on them, not with warm water but with ice cold water. The inhumanity to man practised by a modern society by a so-called sophisticated administration and government before 1944. I could go on and tell more but I believe I have got my points across as to the merits of the former CCF Government carrying out good mental health care. The same kind of story, Mr. Speaker, will no doubt be told to the voters in Saskatchewan four years hence about our increased care.

What else did they do? They turned out the patients to fend for themselves by the hundreds after 1964. Regina got more than her share in numbers. Mental health executive officials came to me pleading to get the Government to change its ways. We cannot cope with the large number of patients sent here and put in 2-by-4 rooms. Many of them passed away and the death notice read "by natural causes". Oh, what many of us thought of the possible unknowns in those death certificates.

Our citizens, the pioneers of this great land, will welcome a free health card January 1st as a gift from younger generations. You and I here must look upon it as a small fee of appreciation to them for services rendered. We cannot do enough for our parents and grandparents in providing them the necessities and the comforts of life during their twilight years. Let's eliminate their sufferings and wants and fears that seem to engulf the minds of our people in this world of frustration and insecurity. I thank my grandparents who brought my mother and father over as a young boy and girl in the years 1893 and 1894. While they are not living today, what a joy it was for me to stand up this past week to provide these measures for those still with us. Complete health care should always be considered a right for all, and not a privilege for the few.

I understand the Member for Regina Whitmore Park referred to a plank in my program in the relocation of our city power plant taken by the Government a few years ago. He stated it would cost \$15 million to \$16 million to relocate. Wrong again. It will cost a whole lot more than that, probably double that. Because I, too, want to see a good electrical generating plant adjacent to our city. We need it for Regina and the surrounding areas. Your Government was to have moved it by now under the terms of the agreement when it was taken over some six years ago. But again nothing done by the former Government or recommended by him. They are not concerned about the noise or air pollution caused by the plant. I can tell him this we on city council were considering plans at that time for relocation when it was taken over by them.

All he did was get the Saskatchewan Base Hospital started after much prodding from this side. A hospital that should have been completed at least three years ago. And what kind of a hospital did he get underway, spending I believe, around \$14 million. He talked about an \$18 million or \$20 million

hospital when he started. Inflation has crept in since so we are probably getting a \$10 million building as of a few years ago. A hospital twice the size should have been built here to take care of Southern Saskatchewan.

It has been repeated time and time again across the way that the deterrent and utilization fee episode is dead. We don't ever want to concern ourselves with it again. Imagine this sort of repentance. I want to tell my friends opposite the removal of deterrent fees, utilization fees and the whole medicare plan will be kept alive and more alive then ever in every election that New Democrats will be participating in. Our health programs in the years ahead will call for complete health and medicare plans for all of our people. I am looking forward to the inclusion of an insured free chiropractic treatment which I hope will be negotiated and brought into force in not too many months. The Bill was passed unanimously in this House in 1966 to include chiropractic treatment under medicare. Nothing was done. I knew then nothing would be done until we took office.

Priority must be given as well to a dental program for our children, at least under the age of 12, because of spiralling costs proper care must be given to the health needs of our youngsters. This will be a godsend to our younger families who have a difficult time to make a living in this inflationary, high-cost living economy. This is another plan we can do cheaper by pooling our resources and help keep a better health and living standard for many.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this Session has been a real revelation to me while observing the Opposition these past seven days. I see a victorious party of 1964 and 1967 completely in disarray, completely bewildered and broken. Why do I say it? They, by their own admission are saying we were wrong in putting on deterrent fees, we were wrong in not providing free care for our aged. We were wrong in taxing our helpless mental patients and their families. We are voting with you to throw these cruel measures out. In other words, we admit that over the past seven years what we did as a Government was absolutely wrong. Please forgive us, Saskatchewan voters. Please forgive us for not having a program then and we frankly admit we haven't one now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — We are now faced with extinction or less representation than what we had over 25 years ago, which I believe was something like five in number. Yes, it is too late now the damage is done, and we are seriously worried that we might be replaced by another group. It is no wonder their supporters are completely bewildered. To them it is now clear that they supported a party that had no policy and that they, over the years, were playacting and did all the window dressing. The only kind of thinking left over there is revealed by the Member from Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant), because that man at any time did not want a health or medicare plan, and still doesn't want one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — And if he could have done away with it entirely he

would have done so. Thank goodness the Federal Government was forced into the program a few years ago or else many more of the good health measures would have been eradicated. Yes, we were the ones in Canada who brought health insurance of one form or another to all of our fellow Canadians. Three cheers for the Democratic Socialists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Yes, by them voting with us against deterrent fees and other health changes this Session, it can also be termed a conscience vote. When you think of the sufferings of the sick, the sufferings of the aged, and particularly the unnatural ills of our mental patients, the pains of wrongdoings must be cutting pretty deep. No one wants to be self-righteous about these things. At all times we must show some human kindness to those less fortunate than we are.

Yes, out of this could emerge a new group who will take over the Opposition. Policies and programs help to make or break a political party. But sometimes the most disastrous effects that can happen to leaders and political parties is by the insurgency and discontent from within. I believe the decadence within your Party started several years ago. You could feel the growing uneasiness towards some in the Party and it came to the fore by a former Member of the Cabinet.

I think that we can honestly say parties and governments are defeated by their actions and sometimes, mainly, from within.

I am really surprised that the Opposition would oppose a protective bill for the family farm, in declaring a year's moratorium from seizure and foreclosure of assets in which they may have substantial equities.

All these problems have been caused by poor marketing conditions, and policies of the Federal and Provincial Governments. Had my plan of wheat marketing which I advocated in 1965 in this House been applied, such as selling the first 2,000 bushels at a top price of \$2.95 or \$3.00 a bushel, bills like this would not be necessary to introduce today. The plan would have maintained the family farm over the years with a good measure of security and in essence would have brought back many farmers to their homesteads. With wheat quotas of only seven or eight bushels, how well this plan would have worked. We are all saying, do something for the farmer. We know that as long as the agricultural industry is buoyant, cities, towns and villages flourish. We know that we must put more money into the pockets of the farmer. We know, too, that farmers should have the right to enjoy our recreational areas, our resorts as well. Many cannot afford it. We see that workers have good hours of work and we continually better their working conditions.

The farmers' working conditions have been advanced only due to modern equipment and scientific methods of farming. We all agree that the farmer is not getting his fair share of the national income. Subsidization, over the next few years, will be necessary to save the agricultural industry here, and in Canada. A good portion of monies received and spent by the farmers usually ends up in the government coffers anyway. This Bill to protect farmers temporarily from going under is a necessity if we want to stop the erosion and exodus of many small farmers.

I am concerned, however, that this Bill might work a hardship on some farmers who will be unable to meet litigation costs. May I suggest to the Minister that the Government assume these costs in extreme cases, and that we also take a look at accepting legal costs for the implement dealer, where he may be faced with contract implications with his parent company.

As far as industry is concerned, I want to make my stand on policies clear in this regard. We must welcome honest capital to this Province. We must see that there is public, private, co-operative and joint private and government capital available for our industrial growth. We must welcome investment, whether it comes from Germany, United States, China or Japan, but not capital that will exploit our people or our resources, but investment that will help build our mixed economy. Investment must be encouraged as well from our own people.

One area of our economy, namely that of agricultural lands, must always be owned by Canadians or by those who move, and live here.

Let's say welcome to investors, we shall give you an honest and fair return. We must provide a sound, buoyant and economic base in establishing sound industrial projects to create work. Saskatchewan industry has far too long played the role as wholesalers of our raw products. We should assume the position of being manufacturers and retailers of these, too. Refine and manufacture the raw products that we produce and this will create real employment.

What about our laborers today? The unions will never forget how the former Government tried to destroy collective bargaining over the past seven years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Their dictatorial approach to place the workers back to peasant and feudal conditions was rejected with a strong voice and will never be forgotten.

The changes requested in The Labour Standards Act should be supported. A 40-hour week is fast becoming the order of the day. The application of this amendment to cities is long overdue. There may be some instances where temporary hardship will be encountered, but the answer to this is to create a base for a proper economy, bring in a plan to stabilize and expand present business, and create new small business as well. Substantial funds must be provided for this very soon. We were the first of the provinces establishing the 44-hour work week and we should be proud of being first again, just as we were first in pioneering hospitalization and medicare; just as we were first in starting a government car insurance scheme with other government insurance plans; just as we were first in setting up a completely publicly-owned power and grid system in this Province, the envy of others in Canada; just as we were first, and still are, in bringing in The Homestead Act to protect farms and farmers and city dwellers; just as we were first in building new and super highways. We were the first to complete the Trans-Canada Highway in all of Canada; just as we were first in getting old age pensions through Ottawa, with the help of the famous J. S. Woodsworth, just as we were first to propose unemployment insurance for the workers in the Federal House. We took the

August 9, 1971

lead in bringing in holidays with pay for our workers. We took the lead in bringing in shorter hours of work and set up a Workmen's Compensation Board, outdoing any plan of its kind; just as were first in establishing new and better parks and recreational areas; we were first in opening up the North to provide a standard of living for our natives there; just as were first in establishing an air ambulance service, know as Flights of Mercy, the first of its kind in the world. A plan must be worked out for overseeing ground ambulance services throughout Saskatchewan. We were first in developing our potash industry and sodium sulphate deposits. We were first in developing an oil and gas industry, where today we have over 6,000 oil and gas wells able to produce. We took over a dying telephone system and turned it into the best in Canada.

I could go on and on telling you about the accomplishments of our Government from 1944 to 1964 and the building of a just and human society.

Mr. Speaker, in reducing the hours of work to 40 hours a week for cities, I understand that, as mentioned earlier, many follow and work under that rule now. How many of us would like to work in this day and age 44 to 48 hours per week and live on an income of \$1.45 to \$1.50 per hour, and in most cases raise a large family? This is the area in which we as a Government must move swiftly in some way to help these people have a minimum guaranteed income and do our best in creating a good business plan, so that they will be in a position to pay wages to help raise their standard of living.

It is not asking too much in this Bill because from every direction throughout this continent, a three to four day work week is being pressed for. Anywhere from a 30 to 40 hour work week is now on the negotiating tables. You and I will see it come more rapidly than we think. It will come by necessity because of a cybernated society.

Shorter hours are here for the laborer so let's be first in approving the 40-hour week as the Federal Government did some time ago. Farmers, through mechanization have been able to cut down their hours of work over longer periods, except in the case of dairying and diversified farming. First, we must press for proper prices for the goods he produces, not only for Saskatchewan, but for Canada and the world. We speak of holidays with pay for workers and farmers who are workers — and darn hard workers — are not compensated, so that they can take time off and enjoy the many sights in Saskatchewan and in Canada too.

I have a clipping which reads like this: "Farmers of Norway"

Norway will soon become the first country in the world to introduce paid vacations for farmers. Under proposals to be submitted to Parliament, farmers and their wives will receive four weeks vacation each year and about \$280 in cash. The plan begins May 1st for a four-year trial period.

What would be wrong with a cost-sharing plan of this type between Ottawa and Saskatchewan? If Ottawa objects to it, let's go it alone. It isn't a great deal when you realize agriculture is our primary industry, the life blood of our economy here and for Canada. I recommend this to my colleagues on this side of the House and I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to take this under advisement and do some research and bring it in for

action. I say it would be a small gift for services rendered.

So in conclusion, let me say, let us be the first province to bring in the 40-hour work week. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, on an earlier occasion I congratulated you on your election to the high office that you hold. Today I should like to give my congratulations to those who have been elected to this Assembly in the last election, especially those who have been elected for the first time. They have been chosen by the people of their constituencies to represent them in this Legislature to debate and make the laws that govern the province and to sit in this, the highest governing authority in the Provincial scheme of things. There may be defects, Mr. Speaker, in our electoral process by a democratic process and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is miles ahead of any other form of government. It is true that many of our ways of doing things are strange to many of the new Members and some of these things may seem to be outright stupid, maybe some of them are. Basically our procedures are based on hundreds of years of parliamentary history and are well proven ways of ensuring that within reason each has his right to speak. I ask the new Members to bear with us for a time and they may come to agree that the old parliamentary system is not so bad.

Also, I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the new Members may find some very valid points of criticism that we should be prepared to listen to. I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the proportion of the Members on your right as compared to those on your left and the fact that their positions were reversed from what they were at the last Session, would lead one to believe that the people of Saskatchewan have roundly rejected the former Liberal Government. I think this should impress some things upon us in this House, upon both sides of the House. I maybe don't need to pound this point home to the Members opposite, I think that they have been having some rather agonizing appraisals themselves as to why they lost this election and lost it by such a wide margin. But I think that there are points that we on this side of the House should consider when looking at the results of the last election which should not be missed by us. I cannot escape the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that a win of such magnitude places an even added responsibility upon us on this side. The people of Saskatchewan are not satisfied with the way things have been and they are not satisfied with the way things have been going for some time. This is very apparent. It is up to us, this new Government, to come up with the answers. The best that we can do, Mr. Speaker, the best that any government can do, is not too good for the people of Saskatchewan.

I think that there are undoubtedly several reasons that the Members opposite can find as to why they lost the election. I think that such a resounding defeat did not come about because of only one mistake on the part of the former Government. We might even go so far as to surmise that part of the reason for the upset was due to Federal Liberal policies as well as Provincial. But I think that one of the main reasons was because of the proposed Dore Lake pulp mill. Before, during and after the election, I found that many people, some of whom I have reason to believe were not voting for us, were opposed to the

building of the mill. One lady who didn't even live in the province but had been listening to some of our programs in Medicine Hat said she thought that that television program which won the election for us was the one that showed the hands stacking two piles of money on the table and the words that said, "It's a bad deal." Now I think it was, I think it was a bad deal. I shall not reiterate the details of the proposed negotiations as they have been discussed in this House many times before, but I think that financially it was a bad deal and I think that in terms of pollution of our northern rivers and wanton destruction of our forests, it was still a worse deal. I firmly believe that the Government did the right thing in rejecting the proposal to go on and build this mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I think that Premier Blakeney was right when, as Leader of the Opposition, he said that Parsons and Whittemore were more interested in building the mill than in operating it because their profits lay in the building. I believe that the people of Saskatchewan are satisfied that we have done the right thing in not going ahead with the mill under the proposals put forth by Parsons and Whittemore at this time. We may be stuck with some costs which we may have to pay in regard to costs incurred by their Company in their progress in building the mill up until that time when they were told to stop all steps towards construction. But who is responsible for that, Mr. Speaker? Is the New Democratic Government which served notice when we were still in Opposition that we would not be prepared to proceed with the mill under the proposed terms if we were elected to form the next Government? Or is it the former Liberal Government when they well knew that we had thus declared ourselves, and who knew that we might well defeat them in the election, went ahead and signed the contracts and they did not have to, Mr. Speaker. This is the part that hurts. They weren't forced at all to sign this contract. They had plenty of options and, in fact, they went ahead of what they were supposed to do in signing this contract, thus enabling Parsons and Whittemore to go ahead with construction only days before the former Liberal Government was turned out of office. I'm not going to attribute motives, Mr. Speaker, but I do maintain that this action by the former Liberal Government makes it the one that was responsible if it costs the people of Saskatchewan any considerable sum of money to get out of this deal.

Now I should like to turn to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. I notice that there is a clause in the Speech that reads as follows:

My Ministers have already moved to increase the number of jobs by setting up a task force on job creation which is undertaking a crash review of government projects to identify those which can be accelerated or set in motion before winter.

This, indeed, we have done. The Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), my seatmate, and the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Snyder), and myself have formed a committee to sit down and see what could be done about implementing the possibility of putting up a crash program in construction that would provide employment at this time.

The first thing that we found, Mr. Speaker, was that the Public Works' budget that was brought down in this House last year was a farce.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — We have here a Public Works' capital budget, Item 28 in the Estimates of Expenditures for the year ending March 31, 1972. It says the total for capital expenditures was \$15,775,000. Well, when we started looking at the situation as it is, we found that only \$7 million, \$7,080,000 was actually committed at this time. The rest of the budget, over \$8 million, of it was frozen, Mr. Speaker. It was not intended to be used. This was purely a budget that had been drawn up for election purposes to try to fool the people of Saskatchewan, and this budget was frozen to such an extent that the Department was instructed not to go ahead and at present finds itself unprepared to go ahead with much that was indicated in this budget.

The Members opposite talk about unemployment. But what did they do when they were the Government of this Province? The Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), with whom the Deputy Speaker undoubtedly is acquainted, in the last session of the House presented us with some figures in regard to what was being done by the Government at that time. As you will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government in the fall of 1970 came forward with what they claimed was a crash program to assist in unemployment at that time. This was bruited about as a great thing that they were doing for the people of the province and they were going to provide the answer to unemployment by the setting up of winter work for the people of the province. I believe that the total figure that was given was some \$17,966,000. The Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair, I may add, found that the item of \$2,108,000 of low-rental housing from the Department of Municipal Affairs had been added in twice. But this brought the total value to some \$15,509,000. But this, in itself, sounded like a pretty credible figure that was being spent to provide employment for the people of Saskatchewan who are unable to find employment elsewhere, and who were leaving the province in such large numbers.

But the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair made some inquiries and came up with some rather startling figures. He found, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as of March 21st, which is the day the sun crosses the equator on its way north and is technically the end of winter, that at that time the only money that had been expended out of the some \$15 million was \$883,812, that was all that had been spent, all that had been spent out of that \$15 million. There had been some \$6,952,000 worth of projects which had been indicated would be started and on which nothing had been spent. And there was over \$5 million which hadn't even been started. There hadn't been any move made to get them started by March 21st, and this was the big program which was supposed to provide employment for the people of Saskatchewan last winter.

The Hon. Member who had been speaking this morning about unemployment and what should be done on this thing himself was one of those whose actions last winter were far from being very successful. And I think that again they used large figures, but were able to come forward with very little in regard to the results that the people of Saskatchewan could really know that they had got their teeth into.

Now, to go back again to this capital budget of \$15,775,000, over half of which was frozen by orders of the Treasury. I should like to say that a case in point in regard to this is the provincial office building to be built in Regina. You'll find it here on Page 51 of the Estimates. It shows it here — provincial office building, Regina, Subvote 19 — \$2,230,000. Well, I wonder if you can find anywhere in the City of Regina where there are any signs of a \$2 million expenditure on an office building. It's needed well enough. Departments are scattered all over town and they're paying hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in rent. The savings would pay for the interest charges on the building, at least, and this would be much better accommodation for the departments and would cost the taxpayers of the province very little more than what they are paying now. Look at the employment opportunities it would have provided. It would have kept our artisans in the province instead of them having to tear up their roots and move elsewhere. And it may not be so easy to get them back again.

This \$2,230,000 project was frozen and the Department of Public Works told to forget about it. It was just window dressing for a budget in an election year. Now there are not even designs ready to go ahead with it. At the very best, construction could not begin on this building until it was late in the spring of next year and this is what was put in the budget last year, \$2,230,000 for construction in the City of Regina.

But, Mr. Speaker, the heat was turned on the Liberal Party on June 23rd and we are going to do our best to get this budget that was in the deep freeze, we're going to do our best to get it thawed out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — This committee on job creation, composed of the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), and myself, has examined the needs of all departments of Government, and these have been assessed by the people in my Department as to what they honestly feel can be gone ahead with this year. Now, our figures may not be as spectacular as those put forward by the former Government but these, to the best of my knowledge and from the people of my Department, say this is what they feel that they can definitely go ahead with this year. The Government has approved an accelerated Public Works' program of some \$8 million, \$8,050,000, and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that instructions were issued on July 30th to the Department of Public Works to proceed immediately to get these projects under construction, with the expectation that at least \$3-1/3 million could be spent in the present fiscal year. I didn't wait for the announcement to be made publicly on this. I told my Department that as soon as this was approved by Cabinet to go ahead and get going on this. And this they have done and instructions have gone out from the Deputy to the different branches of the Department to proceed as quickly as possible in regard to these projects which have been approved.

Now I have only a few of them listed here but I thought the House might be interested in some of them. I've just listed a few of some of the larger ones. The first one the list I have here is an item which was in the budget last year but which was frozen and had not been moved forward for use. It was renovation of the first floor of the south wing and the third floor of the

north wing and site development for the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon, an item of \$190,000 which we feel that we can get started in August of this year and spend some \$180,000 before the end of the fiscal year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — We have renovations of the third floor of the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon, an item of some \$220,000. This is one that had been approved earlier, Mr. Speaker, but had just not been proceeded with. But we find that now even though it had been approved earlier, we don't — the people in my Department — feel they can get started with it until February of next year, and only \$38,000 can be spent on this.

Another one is the construction of an equipment repair depot in Prince Albert for the use of both the Highways and the Natural Resources Departments. Construction of \$1,261,000 — this was something that was in the budget last year but it was frozen. Now the extent is that now they feel they can get going on it, possibly by December of this year and spend some \$250,000 before the end of the current year.

We have renovations to the Swift Current Court House. I was just talking to Judge Moore about this last night. He happened to stop by my house and there is \$168,000 approved but for one reason or another has not been gone forward with. We're hoping that we'll be able to get some of the wrinkles ironed out and proceed with this in October and spend the full sum of \$168,000 this year.

The renovations of the south wing of the first floor of the Legislative Building was in the budget last year but was one of these items that was frozen — \$225,000 for the project. We're hoping to get going on this in December of this year and expend \$49,000.

This list becomes rather boring to the Members of this House, I realize, Mr. Speaker, even though it contains only the larger items in what we are proposing. I think I shall cut it short and I say that one item of \$706,000 which we are proposing for construction of equipment and storage building and materials research laboratory for the Department of Highways in Regina, an item of \$706,000, this is one item that was approved earlier but was frozen. We think we can get going on it February of next year. Another item was construction of an equipment and repair depot for Highways in Swift Current. This was approved earlier but there had been some difficulties in regard to site and such, but I think these are pretty well out of the way now and we can get going on this and trust that we can spend some \$240,000 on this.

Another one of the larger ones is the renovation of the Psychiatric Centre, Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn, some \$322,000 which had been approved earlier but had not been proceeded with. We hope \$150,000 can be spent on this in the present fiscal year.

A new item, Mr. Speaker, is the renovation of the Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital at Weyburn, Stage III, in regard to administration and dietary facilities. Its facilities for the administration offices, central kitchen and dining areas,

an item of \$420,000 of which we hope we can get started on in December of this year.

Another large one is \$455,000 for the construction of Stage II in a small motors repair shop at the Provincial Correctional Centre in Prince Albert. We hope to spend some \$35,000 on this this year and get started in January.

I shall close my discussions of these items with these few words because I don't wish to bore the House by giving the full details of even the larger items.

These that I have quoted, Mr. Speaker, have been approved by the present Government and directions have been given to proceed with them, as I said earlier. It's expected that these projects will give real impetus to construction trades this fall and throughout the winter months. These are not inflated figures but rather conservative estimates of my Department as to what they believe they can actually start construction on in the near future. And this is another of our election promises which we are proceeding to keep at the earliest possible time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — We said that we would provide a Public Works' program and this we are proceeding to do as the best that the Department says that they are able to do at this time.

These figures are in regard to projects which are the concern of the Department of Public Works. There are many other projects, Mr. Speaker, which departments carry on or are associated with but which do not concern our Department. There is also construction carried on by Crown corporations, such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, SaskTel and others. I do not have full particulars on these at present but preliminary estimates would indicate that proposed acceleration of some of these projects would add another \$6 million to our total Public Work's program and some \$2.5 million to the amount which we could be expending in this current fiscal year. And besides these there are such things as house construction. I shall give credit to the former Government in their provision of \$500 housing construction grants for houses which were constructed and occupied before September 1st of this year. As you know, Mr. Speaker, our Department has extended this to the end of the year on condition that these houses are occupied by the end of the year and the projects were started before September 30th.

There is also the low-rental housing program. There are now some 224 units under construction in the province at a value of \$2,394,000. There have been 265 units which have been approved but are awaiting Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation finalization and these are valued at \$3,012,000. Today, Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Hon. Robert Andras, Minister-in-Charge of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation asking his co-operation in endeavoring to expedite these projects in view of providing employment this fall and winter and as soon as possible.

If these steps which I have spoken of, Mr. Speaker, are carried out in total they will provide a real impetus to the construction trades and employment in this Province. I am glad to be able to report on this item in the Speech from the Throne and what is in progress at this time and I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, at the very outset, I should like to extend my congratulations to you on having been elected to be the Speaker of this Assembly. I want to add my voice to those already in expression of confidence in the job that I know you will do for all the Members of the House, although, personally speaking, I find it sometimes difficult to add to the decorum of the House during the course of the debate. I want to assure you, Sir, that I will endeavor to respect your rulings at all time.

I'd like also to congratulate the new Members on both sides of the House to their election to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan. This is certainly a very high honor which all too few people in this Province are fortunate enough to have. It's a terrific duty, I'm sure, that is on all of us, a terrific trust that is imposed by the electorate to carry out our duties and to speak our minds the way we see issues and problems ought to be resolved in the Province of Saskatchewan. And so I congratulate all of the new Members. I was elected three and one-half, almost four years ago, as a first time Member. After a couple of days in the Session you will get acquainted with the procedure and it becomes almost — although it may be misinterpreted by those listening — like a club within the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate on the Speech from the Throne has been a very interesting and enlightening debate for not only myself but Members and the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I regret very much that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition Party won't be here to listen to the few remarks that I have to make respecting him but I'll come around to that in just a minute. It has been a very interesting and enlightening debate for a number of reasons. I find it interesting and enlightening because of the total and complete reversal taken by the Members opposite now that they are in Opposition, now that they suffered a defeat at the hands of the electorate with respect to so many issues which were integral and fundamental and basic to the philosophy and the concept of the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan. A lot of the new Members and I myself heard this morning a very fine speech by the former Minister of Welfare, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), who talked about principles and politics, who admonished the Government for allegedly going back on certain principles, he brought out the example of legislative secretaries. I want to say that if there is any Member or any political party which has turned its back on its own principles and philosophies, Mr. Speaker, it is the band of Members opposite who occupy the benches of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I'm not going to spend time now to relate the various reversals in deterrent fees with respect to the amount of legislation introduced by this Government, legislation, as in the Speech from the Throne, legislation which the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) fought every inch of the way to preserve — at every hustings that he took part in in the last election — fought to preserve in every speech that I heard him take part in in the Saskatchewan Legislature, tried to tell the Members of the House and the people of Saskatchewan that this was integral to a responsible fiscal policy when it comes to

health programs. And now in this Session we witness the spectacle — that is I suppose about the only word that one can readily think of — of the Liberal Party turning tail and reversing its principles and voting for the very legislation that it endeavored to prevent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I recall once the quotation from another very famous Liberal who now happens to be the Prime Minister of this Country, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and I suppose that if the freshmen Members really consider what the Liberal Party opposite has done in voting for all this legislation, they will find that it doesn't vary too greatly from the principles and philosophies as enunciated by Liberals since time in the morning that I've understood them. The principles and the only principle that the Liberal Party in Canada has ever believed in was enunciated by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, back in 1963 when he said:

Thus, the only principle and philosophy of the Liberal Party is say nothing, do nothing, think nothing, but keep in power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And that is precisely the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition, precisely the attitude of the Members opposite. I think a very eloquent speech was given this morning by the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) who talked of the question of the need of a political party putting forward a philosophy of programs and policies as alternate solutions to the people of Saskatchewan. He said, and I concur heartily with his point of view, that the moment a political party stops generating new ideas and stops advocating solutions and resorts only to name calling, to actions of divisiveness, to actions of dividing the farming people and the laboring people, then it is doomed to sickness and opposition and that's what will happen to the people opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I don't go for any of the speeches, Mr. Speaker, by the Members opposite who tell us about their great chastisement at the hands of the electorate. I don't think that we can dismiss the types of vitriolic and bitter, I say downright offensive public policies of the former Administration which were intended, not to unite our people, but to divide our people. I recall in the election, Member after Member on the opposite side, young people, not seeking to give them a step in the ladder of life, No, but bringing them down by name calling them as kooks, hippies, weirdoes and beardoos, used by the Members opposite. I recall during this last election, we hold various philosophies and political point of views, but when we are in Government we represent all the people of Saskatchewan, I would say it is one of the functions of a government, any government, to seek to unite our people, not seek to create divisions amongst our people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So what did we have, the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), and the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) getting up during this campaign in every town, village, and city, name calling our working people, trying to bring them to heel with legislation such as Bill 2, using pamphlets about labor courts, using every bitter and mean speech about our working people, not because they really believed that was a solution to the labor problem, although some of them may have, not because they really believed in that, but because they hoped that it would get them some cheap political advantage in the country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And the seeds of mistrust and misunderstanding were planted. In 1944 to 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan had one of the best records, if not the best records, in terms of hours lost due to strikes of any province in the Dominion of Canada. Whenever we did have strikes, the Government and the employers of the trade unions were able to explain the differences to the farming people, explain the purposes and rationale behind the strikes, try to get the two parties around the whole table, and to negotiate a final and complete settlement. And it could be done, Mr. Speaker, because the climate in Saskatchewan was ripe. We didn't have divisiveness. I want to tell the people of this Province and the Members of this House, labor courts, Bill 2 and all of the anti-labor legislation that was concocted by the Members opposite was not presented with a view to having labor peace, it was presented to divide our people; it was presented to inflame the passions of our people; it was designed to be unfair; and the best thing that happened for all of the Province of Saskatchewan and the unity of the people was the defeat of the Liberal Government and the boys opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now this morning the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) talked about the regret that he had about the Government not seating the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I recall the Member for Milestone in his speech early this morning saying that he was very sorry that Athabasca was now denied a voice in the Legislature. He said he was now sorry to hear that their views weren't represented. Well I find that pretty strange coming from a former Minister of the Crown who I presume was party to decisions taken by the then Government, a decision I have to remind the Members of this House, a decision that effectively barred representation in this House for a Member from Melfort-Tisdale — the old riding — and then the constituency of Melfort-Kinistino after the gerrymander, for a period of well over one year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now the Hon. Member five weeks after his demise from the trusted position of Minister of the Crown has the audacity to come to the House and plead the case of a need for a voice in the Saskatchewan Legislature when he and the Government opposite were the main perpetrators to basic anti-democratic law

such as the gerrymander bill of 1971. When he and the Leader of the Opposition were privy to the decision that was made to keep out of this House the legitimate voices of the people from Melfort-Kinistino and Melfort-Tisdale.

I was also very interested in the Member from Milestone's comments that the program of the New Democratic Party with respect to welfare was deceitful — I think that is the way the words were used. Oh, I'm sure that the Member for Milestone will live to regret the use of the word "deceitful" four years from now when a legislative program of this Government with respect to the promises is up before the public scrutiny. I am sure that the Member for Milestone will live to regret it personally when it comes up for his own election or re-election in Milestone. The thing about that comment and about all the speeches made by the Members opposite is that it was the same old tired speech of the same old tired defeated Liberal Party that we have been hearing now for the last seven or eight years, the same anti-labor rhetoric, the same social welfare legislation rhetoric, the same bogey man about scare of investment. I should have thought they would have learned. After all, they fought a campaign, Mr. Speaker, on that very point up until June 23rd. MacLaren Advertising told them that this was a good political issue. All their professional public opinion pollsters thought that they would wipe out the NDP on that issue and they went into the election and they were wiped out and yet the proposed Leader of the Liberal Party when the convention is called sticks to the same old tune. I knew that Liberals were slow learners but I didn't think they were that slow. I think that this calls for an elimination of the Member for Milestone as a contender for the Liberal Party. In my respectful submission we have to get a man who at least brings his thinking up to about 1967, if not earlier, and I think this may be very difficult for the Liberal Party but perhaps maybe the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) can get us into 1969 or thereabouts. Maybe the freshman Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. D. MacDonald) around 1969 or thereabouts and I'm sure yet the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) really hasn't given us the pearls of wisdom as to his political thinking and his political philosophy, although I am frankly fearful about him because I heard his speech — or saw a report of his speech respecting Bill 2 — and I'm not sure whether to say it is 1971 or 1871, but in any event we shall keep it in abeyance until he makes more contribution to the Saskatchewan Legislature.

Now I was very interested, and I'm very sorry that the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has left his seat. He is a man in my view who makes an interesting, if not very deep contribution to the Saskatchewan Legislature. He is the former Minister of Highways who I want to tell some of the Members in this House — the new Members — the Member who got up and said that we are trying to penalize our civil servants, we are trying to bludgeon them, we are not men to call them in, we are not men because we don't give them six months. "We treated our civil servants like men" was the argument that he advanced. It is too bad that he didn't look around him to see who was sitting behind the rail because I could tell this House, Mr. Speaker, from 1964 under the Liberal Government the Province of Saskatchewan saw a scale of firings of civil servants, unprecedented ever in the history of the province and likely never ever to be seen by the Government opposite. The Member from Regina Albert Park says, "Oh, boy, they talk about political freedom." I recall a Power worker, who as I

recall wasn't even in a position of policy in the Government, who took part in some political activity on his own time and right after 1964 within a matter of weeks, the General Manager and various officials of Saskatchewan Power Corporation were summoned to the office of the then Premier and told directly from the Premier's office that that man had to go down the road and down the road he went and it was the subject of a long protracted arbitration proceedings. And the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) knows of this and you can multiply that particular case literally by the tens and tens and dozens and dozens of the Liberal Party. They did it as late as 1971 when they coldly and bluntly fired one of their own people who was the head of Homecoming '71, Mr. Wilf Gardiner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You know what kind of men they were, Mr. Member for Moose Jaw North and Mr. Member for Regina Albert Park, you know what kind of men, those who occupied the Treasury benches then, they told Mr. Gardiner that he was through and Mr. Gardiner read about it in the Regina Leader-Post. You know what kind of men they are about severance pay? Ask them about the severance pay and what they have given to Mr. Gardiner in severance pay. Do you know what they did with the Labour Relations Board, as my colleague said in 1964, fired them summarily when they heard it on the radio. Don't let any Member of the Liberal Party come to this Legislature and pretend to lecture this Government about political firings because the political indecency and immorality exhibited by the Government opposite will be unparalleled in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And there was nobody more flagrant in his abuse of authority than the former Minister of Highways, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), nobody. He would get up in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, during the course of Estimates, and if anyone of us dared to enquire as to the reasons behind a particular expenditure, if anyone of us even pretended that we had any authority or any privilege to question some aspect of the Department of Highways' spending, what he would do was cut off, virtually the allocation of spending in the questioning Member's riding. I have a whole series of clippings here which I want to direct to the more junior Members over on the opposite side. It is a result of certain questions asked by my colleague, the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). I recall the former Minister of Highways, not even in a Cabinet meeting, getting up in his place and simply saying, "Okay, you are questioning the expenditures, I'm telling you — just like the headline says — no highways at Redberry, says Boldt." Not even a cent to be spent on repairs, not a cent even to spend with respect to construction. Talk about autocratic rule, talk about decisions being made without any consultation, talk about abuse of political power and political process. Mr. Speaker, and Members of this Legislature I say that you will have to go a long way to match the actions of the Minister of Highways in that regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'm glad to say, if I may use a rather poor pun, I'm glad and the people of Saskatchewan are glad that he is

down the road as Minister of Highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to just spend a few minutes about this myth that is attempted to be propagated by the Liberal Party about investment and the investment climate in Saskatchewan. I've heard this speech since 1957, 1958, at least, I'm sure in the Liberal Party it has even gone back further than that. This myth that somehow the province becomes industrialized under the free enterprise Liberal Party. Somehow it doesn't become industrialized under the so-called Socialist CCF then, now NDP Government. Those facts simply are not true. The greatest period of industrialization and economic activity according to a political scientist and economist and others, but I'm just going to quote one, from the University of Saskatchewan, Dr. Norman Ward, happened between 1944 and 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And there was a bit of industrialization under the Liberal Government right after the change of government in 1964 because of an ongoing potash program that to a large extent was initiated and started by the then CCF Government, and you had the continuation of the boom for a period of a year or two.

And then around 1965-67-68 after the construction came in, after the indecent haste of the Liberal Party to glut, to create a glut on the potash market just so that they could go back before the television cameras and announce another new industry. After that Cinderella period which was an offshoot and a continuation of the CCF, after that period ended, what were we left with? I'll tell you what we were left with. The highest population exodus, thanks to the Liberals since the Dirty Thirties. I'll tell you what we were left with. More bankruptcies in more towns, villages and cities since the Dirty Thirties. I'll tell you what we were left with. Less younger people in Saskatchewan, more having left the Province of Saskatchewan than since the Dirty Thirties. I'll tell you what we were left with, Mr. Speaker. The lowest retail sales recorded since the Dirty Thirties in the last period in the period of the election.

And they have the gall and audacity, as I say, to come to the people of Saskatchewan and now say that their Party is instrumental in solid economic achievement and growth. I say they will never be instrumental, they will never make a solid contribution to a stable economic growth of Saskatchewan as long as any one of them remain adherents to the private enterprise system which is based on a catch-as-catch-can philosophy, a private enterprise system that "herks" and jerks along, that reacts to crisis, does not act to meet those crises, a private enterprise and philosophy that the Members opposite adhere to, one that is concerned with giving thousands, millions of dollars away to corporations, be they foreign or Canadian, one doesn't care, in order to provide relatively few jobs for the Province of Saskatchewan.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Liberal Party tells us about industrialization, ask any small businessman in Saskatchewan and he'll tell you that that is a big political lie and if the Liberals . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . don't believe what I have to say, then I shall invite the Members opposite to just go back and read the June 24th newspaper of either the Star-Phoenix or the Leader-Post about the election results and analyze whether or not the people of Saskatchewan agree with them that we had a great period of economic growth in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a few brief minutes on a very important topic respecting the recent decision made by the Government with Athabasca. I want to get it very clearly on the record before this House and the people of Saskatchewan about the actions of those who are now in Opposition, those who occupied the Treasury benches when it came to the Athabasca deal.

I think it's important for the people of our Province and all Members of this House, especially the younger ones of the Liberal Party opposite, to fully know the sordid facts of how the negotiations were carried on by these efficient free enterprisers opposite, and what kind of a legacy those negotiations have left the people of our Province. It's true as I'm standing here that every political party leaves a legacy behind for future generations, it's either a legacy which is of benefit to all of us; or if a government makes an error, it's a legacy which all the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, a cross that they have to bear. I'm going to ask the people of Saskatchewan and the Members of this House to judge what kind of a legacy the Liberals left behind as a result of Athabasca in a minute or two. It's a legacy, I want to tell the Members of this House and the people of Saskatchewan, that I am happy and proud not to be a part of .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'm going to now just very briefly document this legacy. The Hon. Premier during the course of this debate told the House about certain facts respecting the signing of various agreements relating to Athabasca. May I, in order to tell the people the factual situation, very briefly set out the facts as follows:

For the purposes of my comments this morning we're talking about essentially three agreements, three agreements that are matters of concern in assessing the signature of the then Government on June 14, 1971 of a so-called General Amending Agreement No. 1. I'm going to ask Members of this House and the people of Saskatchewan to assess the effects of that Government signing on June 14th the General Amending Agreement No. 1. Now, in order to do so, I want all Members to keep in mind these facts.

There are, as I've said to you, Mr. Speaker, three agreements. The first agreement is an agreement called the Infrastructure Agreement which bore the date of March 15, 1971. The second agreement is an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Athabasca Forest Industries Limited dated April 30, 1971 — about a month and a half after the first agreement. And then there is a third agreement, the agreement that I am going to make a comment or two on, the agreement known as a General Amending Agreement No. 1 made between the Government of Saskatchewan and Parsons and Whittemore which was, as the

August 9, 1971

Premier has told the people, dated June 14, 1971. If Members opposite will bear with me as I repeat again three agreements — Infrastructure Agreement dated March 15, 1971, agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Athabasca dated April 30, 1971, and a General Amending Agreement dated June 14, 1971.

Now, I'm talking about the first agreement, the Infrastructure Agreement, March 15, 1971. It says a lot of things but what it says for the purpose of my discussion is as follows. It says, and I'm quoting directly from paragraph 2.4:

Athabasca and the Minister shall ascertain from the Government of Canada the amount Athabasca will receive by way of a Federal capital incentive grant and will in 30 days following the receipt of confirmation of the Federal grant, deem whether the amount in terms of said grant on the assurances received are satisfactory. In the event that the said amounts, terms and assurances are unsatisfactory then . . .

(And I want Members to keep this in mind)

. . . this agreement may be terminated by either Athabasca or the Minister upon written notice to all parties and the parties in this agreement shall from the date of such termination be released from their obligations hereunder.

What does Section 2.4 in effect say? What it says is that the Athabasca and the Minister shall determine from Ottawa the Federal capital incentive grant, they'll then determine whether the amount is satisfactory, the terms and the amount are satisfactory, and if they are unsatisfactory — that is the Federal incentive grant from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, then the agreement may be terminated by either Athabasca or the Minister upon written notice to all parties. It was, as the Hon. Premier says, an escape clause for the Government if they felt that the grants given from Ottawa in terms or conditions were unsatisfactory, then they could back out. That's what the first agreement, the Infrastructure Agreement said.

Now I refer to the General Amending Agreement. This is the one signed June 14th.

Mr. Steuart: — By whom?

Mr. Romanow: — Signed by the Deputy Minister of Treasury instructed and on your authority, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And you can't escape any liability . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . never tried to!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . Oh, sure, you're going to try.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, no . . .

Mr. Romanow: — If I were in your position I should try to escape the

legacy that you left behind for the people of Saskatchewan too . . . except that I don't think that you will be able to escape.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Except I think that when the people of Saskatchewan know what kind of a deal you yourself, and the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), and the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) made for them, you won't be able to escape no matter how hard you try and you'll be lucky to come back to this House next time round.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . picking your little brain . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Now, what does this General Amending Agreement No. 1 provide for the Leader of the Opposition, because obviously he hasn't read the agreement so I'm going to read for his edification the paragraph 1.1. One June 14th this agreement was signed of which the following paragraph is contained therein:

Athabasca and the Minister hereby waive any right of termination as provided in Section 2.4 of the Infrastructure Agreement . . .

(As I have just read to you).

Mr. Steuart: — Right! We . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Right, you bet you did! Now, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, now we have a Federal incentive grant, we're dealing about a number of things, amount and terms and conditions of it and I want to tell the House and the people of Saskatchewan that the only written, the only written record which we have been able to find relating to this Federal capital incentive grant is an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Tom Kent, Deputy Minister of Regional Economic Expansion for the Federal Government, and the former Provincial Treasurer and now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). The initial relevant letter was dated May 17th and noted, simply noted, to have been received by the Provincial Treasurer and now Leader of the Opposition on May 25th. The letter indicated that the Federal Cabinet — the Federal Cabinet, Ottawa — had agreed to undertake negotiations for the grant, agreed to undertake negotiations — May 25th, May 17th — and asked for a meeting of the officials to discuss it. That's what Mr. Kent asked for.

The then Provincial Treasurer and now Leader of the Opposition replied to that letter and he named the Deputy Provincial Treasurer as the Province's representative in those negotiations. Mr. Speaker, the General Amending Agreement was signed on June 14th waiving our right to pass judgment on the Department of Regional Economic Expansion grant, the terms and conditions. The first meeting of the officials wasn't held until June 16th, two days after we'd given up our right to assess whether or not the grant is a good grant or not.

What the Leader of the Opposition, and I don't put it only on him . . .

August 9, 1971

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, I hope you . . .

Mr. Romanow: — . . . the Member from Wilkie, the Member from Milestone, Members of the Treasury Board, what they did by signing that agreement was to waive any obligations, to waive the right of the Province of Saskatchewan to get out with respect to that grant. They waived it not having held any meetings with anybody in Ottawa.

Mr. Steuart: — Ah-h-h! . . . ?

Mr. Romanow: — They waived it — no meetings on the record of the Government. Oh, well, the Leader of the Opposition talks about informal discussions and the like. I've heard this always bandied around about a discussion but isn't it strange that we're looking at millions of dollars and not one word down in writing about it. Not one word that we know of, so what the people of Saskatchewan have here — and I'm sure the Member for Milestone isn't here — the great negotiator of the private enterprise system, we have a situation where the people of Saskatchewan have a right to take a look at the grant, had a right to get out if the grant wasn't according with the needs of the Province of Saskatchewan, we would have had that right. We had that right waived by the Leader of the Opposition, waived two days before they even have a first meeting to negotiate what the terms and conditions of that grant are.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this June 14th General Amending Agreement No. 1 waived the right of the Province of Saskatchewan to terminate its obligations under conditions where the provisions of Paragraph 2.4 of the Infrastructure Agreement applied. And I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Read the whole thing!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . that in the judgment of the Government that action was a legacy of which I'll explain further after the noon-hour break, a legacy which all of us will be paying for dearly, a legacy of the Liberals who sit now to your left.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it 12:30.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed at 12:30 p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this morning when I called it 12:30 I was in the process of delineating for this House some facts concerning the proposed Athabasca pulp mill operation, some facts concerning the effect of the signing of the so-called General Amending Agreement No. 1 between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Company on June 14, 1971. I was endeavoring to tell the people of Saskatchewan what those effects were going to be to them, or might be to them, as a result of the actions taken by the now Leader of the Opposition and by his Cabinet colleagues. I don't mean to put this on his shoulder by any means, he, of course, was acting on behalf of the Government. And I was telling the Members of the House that the Infrastructure Agreement, March 15, 1971 gave the Government a condition

whereby the agreement could be terminated if the Government wasn't satisfied with amounts, terms and assurances respecting the Federal grant. I was telling the House this morning that under the June 14th agreement, Clause 1.1, that escape clause — If I may call it that — was waived, the right of termination was waived. And then two days later, the first meeting by the officials to discuss the grant, two days after giving up the Province's right to look at the terms and conditions of the grant, we sit down for what appears to be, at any rate, our first meeting to determine whether or not the grant is coming through in the terms and conditions of the grant. And I was making the point before lunch that that action by the former Liberal Government coming as it did, June 14th just before the June 23rd vote, put the Province of Saskatchewan in a very difficult situation, in a difficult situation which may cause undue hardship for the people of our Province. And I want to continue on to tell the people of this Province in the House one other aspect respecting this agreement.

There was a further provision of the Infrastructure Agreement, that's the first agreement that I've told you about dated March 15, 1971, that provision was contained in Paragraph 2.6 whereby by that paragraph it was mandatory that negotiations for long-term financing not proceed until the Government and Athabasca were satisfied on three counts. Firstly, that the cutting rights on the Air Weapons Range — which is under Federal control — had been arranged. Secondly, that the Government and Athabasca were satisfied with the amount and terms of the Federal capital incentive grant; and thirdly, that the Government and Athabasca were satisfied with the arrangements made for construction of a connecting rail-line to the proposed mill site.

To summarize so that it is in relatively easy language. This Infrastructure Agreement said that long-term financing, the long-term financing mustn't proceed until the Government and the Company were satisfied on three counts — firstly, the cutting rights of the Air Weapons Range had been arranged; secondly, Government and Athabasca satisfied with the amount and terms of the Federal incentive grant; and thirdly, that the Government and Athabasca are satisfied with respect to the arrangements for the construction of a connecting rail-line to the mill site.

That's the way the agreement was on March 15, 1971. Along comes this famous agreement of June 14th, a few days before the vote on June 23rd. This agreement that I called the General Amending Agreement, one aspect of which I have already told you about, Mr. Speaker, where the Government waived its right to object with respect to the terms and conditions. Along comes June 14th and lo and behold in addition to the paragraph I've told you about, 1.1 in the General Amending Agreement of June 14th, we now have a new paragraph, 1.2 of the General Amending Agreement stating that Athabasca and the Government of Saskatchewan "are deemed to have been satisfied" with respect to all of these requirements, the rail-line construction, the Air Weapons Range, the Federal capital incentive grant.

Now, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, and to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) to our knowledge on June 14th when that General Amending Agreement was signed by the Government opposite when it was the Government then, to our knowledge there was not on June 14th any agreement in effect with respect to the cutting rights of the Air Weapons Range. Yet the Government sees

August 9, 1971

fit to sign a provision that says they are now satisfied with respect to this. I've already told the House with respect to the Federal capital incentive grant. They sign away their right to get away from the obligations of the agreement on June 14th and then two days later decide to sit down to talk to the Government for the first time about the capital incentive grant.

Now I want to make the point with respect to the connecting rail-line which is the third condition according to that agreement, the Infrastructure Agreement of March 15th. Mr. Speaker, with respect to this connecting rail-line we must refer to the third relevant agreement, that one between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Athabasca Forest Industries that I told the House about this morning. The agreement is a very long agreement but there is this relevant section, Paragraph 2.1. Paragraph 2.1 of that agreement says as follows, and I'm quoting:

The Company (that is the CPR) shall seek such authorities and approvals as are required before construction of the branch line can be commenced. Should all such authorities or approvals not be secured on or before June 30, 1971, this agreement shall be void.

Further on in that agreement, Paragraph 10.3 of the agreement, stipulates that time shall be in all respects of the essence of the agreement. In other words, time is of the essence, June 30th is the operative date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the agreement between the CPR and Athabasca, the key authority which the Company had to obtain in order to proceed with the rail-line. Everybody surely must have known this, even the Hon. The then Treasurer, now Leader of the Opposition that the key authority was an act of Parliament from Ottawa and it was surely obvious to anyone, absolutely anyone, viewing the parliamentary schedule in Ottawa as at June 14th, the day that they signed this General Amending Agreement that I've told you about. It must have been evident to anyone that the possibility of such legislation for a rail-line being completed with royal assent by June 30th was extremely remote if not totally impossible. But yet the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), Ministers of the Crown, sit down and they sign an agreement on June 14th which says that they were satisfied that the condition had been fulfilled.

Now if there is any doubt in anyone's mind that the agreement between Athabasca and the CPR did in fact terminate on June 30th, let me call to your attention a copy of a letter which is in my possession, directed to two Saskatchewan construction firms, on CPR letterhead, dated June 30, 1971, seven days after the election. Let me quote just one paragraph of that letter to the construction firms:

This is to advise you that construction of the Dore Lake branch line must now be abandoned. Accordingly Canadian Pacific is unable to accept said proposal for contract or having accepted same hereby terminates the said contract forthwith.

This letter was directed from the Regional Engineer of Canadian Pacific to two firms which had entered into subcontracts with the Canadian Pacific in connection with the building of the Dore

Lake branch line. The date June 30, 1971. And the very question the Leader of the Opposition asks, I ask all people to note, June 30, 1971, the date of the photocopy of the letter that I have and I shall be pleased to table it if Hon. Members of this House so request. Now that's the situation that we have. I'll table it at the conclusion of my address.

So here's the situation. Reviewing all of the conditions of the Infrastructure Agreement which I have already cited, one condition being the Air Weapons Firing Range, a second condition being the Federal capital incentive grant, the third condition being the agreement to construct the connecting rail-line, I say, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this Province it seems perfectly clear to me the Government of the day acted with extreme haste, "deeming to have been satisfied" with respect to the conditions set out in the Infrastructure Agreement. It is also clear to me that had the June 14th agreement, the Amending Agreement, not been executed, the effect would have been to provide a method by which the new Government could terminate its obligations under the whole series of agreements without incurring obligation to pay compensation to the pulp mill developers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But that alternative is now not open to us as a result of the actions of the Government on June 14th just a few days before the vote on June 23rd. Everybody knew throughout Saskatchewan and throughout Canada and throughout the business community because we were straightforward in our approach what the position of the New Democratic Party was with respect to this deal, everyone knew it. The now Leader of the Opposition must have known that he was in a tough political fight. A few days before that, or around that time, he had just finishing telling the people in Saskatoon that they were going to lose if they didn't get out and work. He knew that the campaign, especially in Saskatchewan in this last election, was going to be close, that there was every prospect of an NDP victory as, in fact, it turned out. But having known that he gave up our rights and tied the hands of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan by that agreement of June 14th.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He did so without knowing anything about the rail-line; he did so without knowing anything constructive or concrete about the Federal incentive grant; he did that without knowing anything about the Air Weapons Range; he did all of those things so that he could get into the hustings and try to say what obviously was a losing effort on behalf of the Liberal Government of the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Once the Leader of the Opposition said he was in need of a good lawyer. It is too late now. I could have recommended him to have got a good lawyer. I'm sorry that he didn't have a good lawyer at the time.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, what is the end result of this series of actions? The end result is this, if, and I emphasize and use the word if, advisedly, if our Saskatchewan

August 9, 1971

people, our farmers and our laborers have to pay millions more in money as a result of this Government's unnecessary action respecting this contract and this deal, then the persons who are directly at fault in my opinion and responsible for those millions of dollars, are nobody else by the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Wilkie, the Member for Milestone, and all those who sat on the then Treasury benches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I said, Mr. Speaker, in opening this section of my remarks that every political party leaves a legacy for our future generations. Fortunately many of the legacies that the Liberal Administration from 1964 to 1971 tried to leave behind we've done away with in this Session. But it may very well be that one legacy the people of Saskatchewan will be penalized and suffering for a good many years from those who have occupied the Treasury benches and for that we can thank the free enterprise mentality of the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this was supposed to be a fighting Session. Liberals are coming out fighting. Frankly, I've been watching the Session now for several days and the contributions of the Members opposite, I think the only fight is in the minds of the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix who are trying to buoy up the spirits of a shattered and tattered Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I tell you it certainly isn't the Leader of the Opposition, I wouldn't be in the mood to fight either if I had the type of electoral results put on him as a result of his fiscal policies. I wouldn't be in the mood for a fight either if I was the former Minister of Welfare, the Member for Milestone, if I'd had a record of a tight-fisted, cruel, inhuman Welfare Department as he had, I wouldn't be very much in the mood for a fight, like the former Minister of Education, the Member for Wilkie, if I had been Minister of the Department of Education which created division and mistrust and fight among our trustees and teachers rather than union, rather than a good education program, I would not be in a mood for a fight so I can understand, Mr. Speaker, why they are not coming out . . .

Mr. C. MacDonald (Milestone): — What are you saying?

Mr. Romanow: — What am I saying? I'm saying that your fight in this Session has been the weakest in the last four years that I have been in the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Not only am I saying that it has been the weakest, not only am I saying that it is the weakest but I'm saying when the facts of what went on behind the Athabasca deal came out to the people of Saskatchewan, those who were in Government of that

day won't be back in the House come the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'm saying, Mr. former Minister, that you were a direct party to making those deals and all the other aspects that I have talked about in consent with your colleagues to the right and to the left of you.

Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That's what I'm saying. I don't think the Leader of the Opposition fully understands, as I said, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, when you were away this morning, as I said this morning, you people are awfully slow learners, you don't realize what the situation is electorally yet, it may take another election to clarify the situation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I must be getting a positive response in my speech from the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you for making the speech. Well, we are in the middle of a leadership race for the Liberal Party obviously.

Mr. Steuart: — Don't you tell us how to win!

Mr. Romanow: — I certainly won't. I agree readily there, I'm not an expert.

But I am going to say one or two things about the leadership race. I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that in the light of this type of dealing with respect to Athabasca, who over there can get the support of the rank and file Members of the Liberal Party? Can we expect to get support for the Leader of the Opposition who was Treasurer, who was instrumental in this deal that I've just talked about, can the rank and file of the Liberals be expected to support the Member from Wilkie, the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), can they be expected to support the former Minister of Welfare from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), can the average Liberal in the Province of Saskatchewan now support any of them with a clear conscience? If they do give their confidence to the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Milestone, or the Member for Wilkie, will they ever, ever be satisfied that these Members can truly negotiate the type of natural resources deal which is in the best interests of all the people of Saskatchewan? Will they ever give them another chance, any one of these three to negotiate a deal like they negotiated that I've told you about? Well, that's for the Liberal Party to decide. Who knows there might even be a Waffle party starting within the Liberals. Frankly, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition it would be a good thing if he did have the Waffle because I think you need a new deal with new faces and new ideas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Certainly you need a new approach with respect to the leadership.

Now, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, I want to tell this House what this vote on the Speech from the Throne will mean. If you vote against the Speech it will mean for the Liberals, as they undoubtedly will vote against it, it will mean a vote in support of their policy of unemployment; the highest in the history of this Province; it will mean a vote in support of your give-away resource deals; it will mean a vote against health legislation. But if you are not going to vote against the Speech from the Throne, if you vote for the rest of Saskatchewan, it will mean for them a vote for our farming people to give them a break in their family farm legislation, you'll vote for the family farmer, you won't vote for the financial institutions that virtually own lock, stock and barrel the Liberals in this Province; it will mean a vote for our laboring people; it will mean a vote for unity of all our people again; it will mean a vote for our health care programs. In short, Mr. Speaker, it will be a vote for a New Deal for the People of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I am proud to say that that's what I'll be doing when I vote for it, this Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 39

Messieurs

Blakeney	Pepper	Dyck
Brockelbank	Michayluk	Cowley
Byers	Meakes	Cody
Wood	Whelan	Gross
Smishek	Brown	Feduniak
Romanow	Carlson	Mostoway
Snyder	Engel	Comer
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Rolfes
Kowalchuk	Richards	Lange
Baker	Owens	Oliver
Thibault	Larson	Feschuk
Matsalla	Taylor	Kaeding
Robbins	Faris	Flasch

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

Steuart	MacDonald	MacLeod
Gardner	(Milestone)	McPherson
Grant	McIsaac	Lane
Boldt	Loken	MacDonald
	Weatherald	(Moose Jaw North)

NOTICE OF MOTION

Alcoholic Beverages In Saskatchewan

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I propose to move that we establish a Special Committee consisting of 12 Members, to be named at a later date, to conduct an inquiry into all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered by those few of us who were in the House last March and who are now still here that there was at that time a proposal by the then Premier (Mr. Thatcher) that we establish such a committee; it was a proposal which was concurred in by all Members of the House and was passed without dissent.

At that time the argument offered in favor of the resolution which found favor with all Members of the House was that there had been a growing number of comments on the inadequacy of the present liquor legislation. There had been a general review of liquor legislation some 13 years ago in the late 1950s and out of that general review had come the system of licensing which we now have in Saskatchewan with licensed premises — there are still one or two of those left, I believe — and beverage rooms and licensed dining rooms, licensed cocktail lounges and licensed clubs.

There have, however, in the last few years been a growing number of comments directed to the alleged inadequacy of this type of licensing, directed to the fact that there was either too little liquor or too much liquor advertising and directed to the need for more flexibility with respect to permits for special occasions. We have had a large number of those during Homecoming '71 year. Generally speaking, a number of comments directed to the Government, the previous Government, now being directed to the present Government, and I am sure directed to all Hon. Members are to the effect that there should be changes.

There is, however, I think no general consensus that there should be change, or if there is a general consensus that there should be change, there is no general consensus as to what the changes should be. I think that most Members feel that the basic structure of our liquor laws is adequate. Some members of the hotel industry feel otherwise, they are observing the experiment which is now in operation in Manitoba, where spirits are served in beverage rooms. They have noted changes in other provinces in Canada, for example, those permitting the serving of alcoholic beverages with meals on Sunday, or those which prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages at all, as in British Columbia.

I think that when there is an area such as the sale and advertising and distribution of liquor, a matter which does not concern our Party, as such, a matter where I don't think either the Party which is now in power or the Party which is now in Opposition, has any particular platform covering the area; a subject where differences are much more likely to be personal than they are to be political, we find a subject which is particularly well suited to consideration by a legislative committee.

The then Premier, on April 8, 1971, referred to a number of the matters at issue. He referred, in addition to the ones which

I have referred to, the question of the appointment of liquor vendors in smaller centres in Saskatchewan, should there be more liquor vendors; should the vendors only be in drug stores or should they be in hardware stores, or in the premises of general merchants, should liquor vendors be in hotels. There have been many arguments in favor of that proposition.

I think from what I have said it will be clear that there are a number of differences of view. I, in speaking in the House on April 8th, pointed out that there was one other area which I felt ought to be covered and that was whether or not licensees have sufficient protection from the arbitrary decisions of Liquor Licensing Commissions. I am not alleging that there have been arbitrary decisions in the past, I am saying that licensees have come to me and said that they have been the victims of what they termed arbitrary decisions. I was not able to refer them to anything in the Act which offered them much protection, if in fact the decisions were arbitrary.

In speaking in the House last April, I said that in general I felt that there wasn't very much wrong with the basic structure of our liquor licensing, that I was not convinced that we need any widespread or wholesale change, but that in view of the substantial number of areas of difference of view which had been arising, I felt the idea of a legislative committee was a good one. I have not changed my views. I believe that a committee consisting of 12 Members — and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there be eight Government Members and four Opposition Members — I would suggest that such a committee would do a thorough job of considering the various representations made by the several interested groups who will undoubtedly make representations and offer some recommendations to this House so that we might consider the next question of liquor licensing with the assistance of the report of the committee which will have had an opportunity to give detailed consideration to the representations addressed to it.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That a Special Committee consisting of 12 members, to be named at a later date, be appointed to conduct an enquiry into all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan;

And that such Committee will have power to sit during the inter-Sessional period and during any Legislative Session, except when the Assembly is sitting;

And that such Committee will have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public; and for this purpose to hold meetings away from the seat of Government in order that the fullest representations may be received without unduly inconveniencing those desiring to be heard;

And that this Special Committee be further instructed to submit its final report to the Assembly with all convenient speed.

I move this motion, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a word on behalf of the Opposition.

I want to say that the Opposition unanimously supports this motion. As you know, it was originally moved in the previous session by the Liberal Government and was one of the important motions of that session. I want to say that there is another reason that we support this motion and it is because it is the only proposal to solve the unemployment problem that has been put forth in this entire Session. By moving and increasing the members from seven to twelve, of course the tragedy is the only unemployment that they are looking after is for the Members of the Legislature and they are not looking after any of the unemployment problems that might exist among the students or other people that need work in the Province of Saskatchewan. However, aside from that, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that we do think that a committee of 12 is a little unwieldy, that's why we originally settled at seven because we felt that there was a certain amount of transportation required and moving around, in order to do an exhaustive and a complete review, the smaller the committee was the more effective it would be.

However, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is changing and changing very rapidly and, it has been 13 years, as the Premier has indicated, since the last review of the liquor laws of this Province occurred and since that time transportation facilities have changed, highways have improved, there has been a rural-urban shift, and we now find that many of the small operators, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, are in serious difficulty. And whether we realize it or not, if our laws prohibit a small operator from rural Saskatchewan from making a profit, and do not permit his establishment to be on an economic basis, then it is absolutely impossible for him to provide good service and quality service. This is one of the reasons why we felt that this was so important, that now many of the small rural hotel operators in rural Saskatchewan are experiencing economic difficulty in the last five or ten years, particularly with the expansion of the cocktail lounge and the expansion of the mixed beverage room and so forth, in some of the newer hotels which have provided very up-to-date facilities in their establishments, because of the liquor laws in existence the small rural operators are unable to provide. We are concerned that these small operators get an opportunity to review their position.

We think that the entire gamut of liquor laws in Saskatchewan do need review. We are thinking of Sunday drinking, we are thinking of the attitude of clubs on Sunday, we are thinking of liquor on Sunday with meals, we are thinking of the entire licensing procedure and the permit procedure. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we do support this motion unanimously. We do hope that it will be a complete and exhaustive review. We very firmly believe we cannot legislate the morals of the drinking public in the Province of Saskatchewan. What is required are reasonable laws that will encourage a rational consumption of alcoholic beverages for the protection of people on the highways, and to provide good quality service in all areas of the province, not only in the urban centres but in the rural centres as well. We certainly support this motion.

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief word or two in support of this motion. I don't wish to comment on the makeup of the

committee, nor the size, nor to interfere with any particular arrangements that have been made. This is, however, rather an important committee, and I should like to suggest that in future important committees be structured along a formula that, of course, gives the Government a majority, but a formula half plus one. I think some serious consideration should be given to this as being a reasonable formula. The group over here, now I understand the last committee was either seven, in which case the Government had four and the Opposition had three; or alternatively, I thought it was eight, in which case the Government had five and the Opposition had three. In any event, it would have followed the formula that the Government has half plus one. I think future important committees should be structured along this way.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Address To Be Presented To Lieutenant Governor

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that it would have been better had I moved it before the last motion, and this has reference to the Speech from the Throne:

Ordered, That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour) that Bill No. 7 — **An Act to amend The Labour Standards Act, 1969**, be now read a second time.

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister ranged rather widely in dealing with this Bill. I should like to content myself, however, with a look at the scene a little closer to home.

We speak of the industrial revolution as if it occurred over night but, of course, it did not. It was a gradual change from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy. Canada, about 100 years ago, was 75 per cent or more rural. The figures today have been reversed and, if anything, Canada is 75 per cent, closer to 80 per cent, urban.

I want to examine what happened to Saskatchewan during the period of this transition. In population terms, in 1944 Saskatchewan was the fourth largest province in Canada, behind Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. By 1948 it had dropped to fifth, behind the Province of Alberta, and by 1964 it had dropped to sixth. What happened during that period was that the people went to the jobs and jobs were where the industry was. So from 1948 to 1964 Saskatchewan had dropped sixth and was slipping in population.

The rural face of Saskatchewan had changed, the provinces with industry were those provinces that were growing. There was a man in Saskatchewan who saw this pretty clearly. He tried desperately to get industry. His name was Thomas Clement Douglas. I won't recount the reasons why he failed to attract industry, some of these reasons were his fault and some were not. Some of it was bad luck. Some of it, Mr. Speaker, was pure bad management. Mr. Douglas, then Premier Douglas, did see the need and personally I take my hat off to him. I don't know if he was ahead of his time or whether he was behind the time but unfortunately he was not right on time.

One thing he could control and did not control, Mr. Speaker, was the political climate of this Province. He made it sound bad for industry. In the post war years when the great rural-urban shift was on, Saskatchewan actually lost out. Saskatchewan failed to attract industry during that critical period of transition.

I should like to give two reasons only. I won't range through all the reasons why we lost out during that period but I think there are two that are worthy of note. The first reason is that this Province under the CCF was basically unwilling to make the appropriate concessions necessary to get badly needed industry. Some of you may well remember the rubber plant, which is the rubber industry now located in Medicine Hat, which looked first at Saskatchewan. It required water and it required power and our Government was unwilling to make the appropriate commitments. That industry is now located in Medicine Hat, it provides work and it provides jobs. It provides a ripple of benefit to the entire community of Medicine Hat.

Once you have lost an industry, you don't get it back again. It's gone for quite a long time.

The second reason for the failure of Saskatchewan during the years from 1944 to 1964, was that the Government did not understand the competitive nature of attracting industry. Instead of telling industry that labor and power and water were cheaper in Saskatchewan, our Government of the day told them everything was a little more expensive in Saskatchewan. The Government told the working man that everything was better in Saskatchewan. We told him that Saskatchewan was the leader in labor legislation; and the working man said, 'thank you' and promptly moved to British Columbia.

With provinces all across Canada trying to attract industries, Saskatchewan tried to go it alone. With every other province wining and dining and sweet-talking and romancing industry, Saskatchewan sounded very much like the wrong place to be, the wrong place to go, unless you want to be expropriated.

Well, now was it as bad as it sounded? Well, of course not, except that in other places it didn't sound bad at all, and it sounded better to go to British Columbia or Alberta or almost any other place. So Saskatchewan with enough natural disadvantages found itself with a considerable political disadvantage. And so Saskatchewan plummeted, Mr. Speaker, from fourth place to sixth place in terms of population in this nation.

Now today we find very little significant differences in the labor laws across Canada. Labor laws actually vary very little from province to province. Some provinces have some

August 9, 1971

benefits, others have other benefits, and by and large, every other province in Canada has everything we've got — and something else, they've got the people and they've got the industry and they've got the jobs — something that we don't have. So they can match us in labor legislation and they've got the labor to deal with that legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to make a sale to somebody, the best way is to have a little better service or a little better price or do a little better job of selling. If your neighbor is selling something at 69 cents a pound, maybe you should try to sell it at 68 cents a pound. If your neighboring province has a minimum wage of \$1.50, you're not going to attract industry if you offer a minimum wage of \$1.75.

Saskatchewan's natural birthrate should have been providing a doubling of our population in 50 years. The fact is that the number of people equivalent to Saskatchewan's natural increase has moved elsewhere. It's pretty shallow to talk about helping our workers when in fact our workers are now being helped by somebody else in some other province. I have not looked into the conditions in the Atlantic Provinces but dealing with Quebec and Ontario and the four Western Provinces, Saskatchewan alone during that period had a huge exodus of population. Every other province gained ground. The other provinces not only had enough industry to absorb their own natural increase, they had enough industry to absorb our surplus, the surplus that moved out of Saskatchewan to these other places.

The net result is that of the six largest provinces, Saskatchewan and Manitoba have, at the present time, the lowest average wage. In January of 1971 the Canadian average was \$130.82 a week. Saskatchewan was 10 per cent below that at \$116.27. Having destroyed the Athabasca pulp mill, having threatened the Choiceland iron mines, it's a mockery to pretend to bring in a Bill that pretends to improve the lot of the workers.

So when we hear the Minister say he'll restore Saskatchewan to its leading place in the labor field, you have to wince a little bit. Saskatchewan is going to get another punch in its economic belly. We may win the battle and lose the war.

A man listens to the Government talk about opportunities and jobs and pollution. He hears the promise to eliminate the Choiceland iron mine and the Athabasca pulp mill, because these are not good deals for the people, he then votes for the Government Party and promptly moves to British Columbia to the iron mines and to the pulp mills. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such salesmanship be regulated.

I am quite sure that the following is the kind of typical letter that might well be sent by a lot of people in Saskatchewan to the Minister. It could go like this:

Dear Minister:

I am very pleased with the tremendous improvement that you have made in my working conditions and in the hours of work. Now if you could only get me a job, I would feel very comforted indeed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I recently talked with two brothers who had left Saskatchewan to work in Burnaby, British Columbia.

Mr. Romanow: — Did they leave before June 23rd or after?

Mr. MacLeod: — Oh, a long time ago — four or five years ago. Both indicated they had previously supported the NDP but having observed the conditions in British Columbia and the opportunities that exist in British Columbia, they said they would never vote for our present Government again or that Party anywhere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — If every person who formerly resided in Saskatchewan was given a vote in the last Provincial Election, the Members of the Party opposite would have been lucky to save one single seat.

Mr. Romanow: — You talk about they left — because your philosophy . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — It was during 1944-64 that the destruction occurred.

I think we should strive for two objectives, Mr. Speaker,. Firstly, more employment; and secondly, a higher average pay. Our minimum wages and labor standards must not be so high that people will be driven out of our Province or that industry will be chased away. On the other hand, clearly industry is of little benefit unless the workers and society as a whole benefit from that industry. Government and unions as well as employers must make sure that the workmen get a fair shake.

But manipulation of our labor laws requires a delicate hand. In its control of the economy many factors must be weighed carefully and judged with a level eye. Bad judgments result from action founded on political bias or politico-religious fervour.

It is clear to me that the proposed amendments are of little benefit to the people, if any, whom they are intended to help. The Minister says, "It is difficult to quantify the effect of the change." What he means is that he doesn't know what's going to happen or what effect it is going to have.

He acknowledges that he will have to proceed very carefully. He desires to reconstitute the Minimum Wage Board and have it undertake a study. He says the amendments will not be proclaimed until the Minimum Wage Board has completed its review. He hasn't constituted the Board yet. We don't know when it will be starting. We don't know when it will commence its review or complete it. It is very possible that this review could not be completed and reported to the Minister, giving him enough time to study it, before the next sittings of the House in February. In the meantime, it'll be sitting on our Statutes as a deterrent to industry and you know what we think of deterrents.

Mr. Romanow: — Why would it be a deterrent to industry?

Mr. MacLeod: — You know why, Roy! It would be great to tell everybody

August 9, 1971

that we've got a 40-hour week in Saskatchewan. You can tell everybody else that we've got a 40-hour week. It's bound to chase people away and yet the people that it is intended to help won't have the 40-hour week.

The Minister said also that a more competitive position would result from this change. Does he mean that new equipment or more efficient ways would result? Does he mean that perhaps staffs would be reduced, people would be let go?

One of the speakers in support of this Bill, from the Government side, said that the shorter work time resulted in less absenteeism and fewer accidents. Now I fully agree and realize that this is true at the 60-hour a week level and at lower levels, but where does the curve level out? Can a man or woman make a living in an ordinary work week? Would you say that a man shouldn't be allowed to work 44-hour work week because of absenteeism or accidents, and yet say you don't mind if he works 44 hours if he works the extra time? Apparently the man doesn't get sick or hurt if he gets time and a half but he does get sick or hurt if he works at regular rates. That's the logic, I believe, presented us by a Saskatoon member.

The Minister hasn't proposed changes for the workers in towns and villages. What's to happen to them?

An Hon. Member: — Discrimination!

Mr. MacLeod: — Is this Act to be extended to all workers in Saskatchewan? If so, when? Have you consulted anybody? What will the effect of this legislation be? Will it increase prices? Will it put people out of jobs? If so, how many will be put out of jobs?

The Minister said that in service industries it was difficult to improve productivity. Well, are they to be exempt then?

I make this offer to the Minister — if you get your work done, Mr. Minister, and if you make your study and if you can tell us the effect of this legislation, that is, whom it will help, if any, whom it will hurt, if any, what it will cost — (give us the good and the bad, don't hold back) — give us the total picture and your overall judgment of the pros and cons, show us that this is good legislation — and I don't mean hazy generalities — show us the real benefit to the working man . . .

Mr. Steuart: — You'll need a lawyer, probably!

Mr. MacLeod: — Now, if you can show us that, you know what you're doing and why, we'll support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Until then it's premature. We suggest that you withdraw this Bill, complete your study, see us next February.

This may be very good legislation or it may be very bad. From what we've been told by the Government benches, it is totally impossible to tell. We, therefore, suggest that this

Bill be withdrawn, the study completed, and if you like it in February, bring it along then. Until then, it is premature and ought not to have been brought to this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak in this debate on the Act to amend The Labour Standards Act. I was quite interested in listening to the Member for Regina Albert Park's (Mr. MacLeod) condemnation of the past Government's record, the CCF Government record in Saskatchewan. I think he need only examine his own constituency to have some idea of the Liberal Government's record. It was supposed to be the fastest growing area in Saskatchewan. It was to double in size in one year. Unfortunately when the election was called and they had enumerated the constituency, most of the new people that were supposed to move in had not shown up.

Being a history teacher, I appreciated the history lesson although I can't exactly agree with the Member's facts or his interpretation of those facts as he presented them. He made a statement something to the effect that the previous CCF Government had been unwilling to make appropriate concessions to attract industry. Well if the Athabasca pulp mill was an example of the kind of appropriate concessions that he thinks a government should make, I think Saskatchewan can well do without them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — He also suggested something to the effect that Saskatchewan had done a bad job of selling our Province to industry and I really hope that he wasn't trying to suggest that we hire MacLaren's, because we've seen what kind of a job of selling they do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to spend a few minutes on the Bill. I don't propose to take very long. I think there are three parts to the Bill that to me are important. The first one is the reduction of the hours of work to 40. This is long overdue. It's something which throughout North America is almost totally accepted by the population and by industry. It is important that it be proclaimed as legislation so that all of the workers in Saskatchewan industries can be brought under this. I'm pleased that it will do away with the 48 and the 44-hour differential so that it is a single Act rather than a double standard such as we've had before.

I'm also very pleased that the Minister has seen fit to write into the legislation the permission for a 10-hour day. I think that in some cases this will be attractive not only to workers but also to industry and this is the kind of thing that we have to look at and I think it will please the Member from Regina Albert Park also, because it may assist in attracting some industries.

I also like the part of the legislation which deals with the maintenance of earning because the last thing that we, in this Government, and I'm sure those in the Opposition, want to

do, is to reduce the earnings of someone who is on a minimum wage by reducing the hours of work, and so that this piece of legislation was necessary. It was necessary to write in the maintenance of earnings clause.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the past weekend in my constituency talking with people working in the towns, talking with farmers, and talking with small businessmen. And nowhere did I come across any opposition to this Bill. Indeed, in the case of farmers and businessmen, in most cases I had to bring it up before any one commented on it and in no case did I get any adverse reaction to it. I think that this simply proves that the old ploy of the previous Government of playing one group against another, and of saying that this Bill is bad legislation because it's going to affect the farmers adversely or it's going to affect small businessmen adversely; that now, with the new climate in Saskatchewan, people are looking towards a co-operative effort to build a better Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation is a step in that direction and I am sure that the people in my constituency will fully support my intention, and my vote, which will be in favor of this Bill.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) introduced this legislation the other day and he prefaced it with a few remarks which painted a very glowing picture of the goodness of trade unions in this Province. He intimated, Mr. Speaker, that there would not be a dispute involving unions in essential services in this Province, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the people of this Province know that this glowing picture does not exist.

I personally have worked with unions in this Province where the members spend the first hour of every day walking back and forth in the roundhouse, doing absolutely nothing but walking back and forth, and they are paid to do this.

I've worked with a union in this Province that has gone on strike for wages knowing full well that the employees would get no increase after a strike. We struck for three weeks, we ended up settling for an extra quarter of a cent over what management had offered in the first place, and the union knew full well in that situation that the management had a great surplus of the product that was being manufactured.

Mr. Romanow: — Did you have a say in determining whether there would be a strike or not?

Mr. Lane: — Yes.

Mr. Romanow: — Right! The majority disagreed with you?

Mr. Lane: — No, what happened was that the union bosses controlled

that, and we did not — we were told to shut up and we tried to get our word across and nothing happened because of it.

And there are unions in this Province, Mr. Attorney General, who couldn't care less about their members. And don't forget that!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would accept a question?

Mr. Lane: — I thought that I had the floor, Mr. Speaker. No, I won't entertain a question, Mr. Attorney General. I'm making a speech at this time and I should like to finish it if I possibly can.

Mr. Romanow: — Will you at the end of the speech — a question?

Mr. Lane: — Well, we'll see!

We've all seen the effects, Mr. Speaker, of the Montreal police strike, and we've all seen the effects of the Ontario and Quebec hydro strikes, but this legislation before this House and all the labor legislation presented by this Government ignores these facts, and I include in that the statement saying that the legislation repealing the Essential Services Emergency legislation ignores many of these facts. The labor legislation proposed in this House, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the Government opposite intends to shirk its responsibilities to the general public and the people of this Province and especially to the workers of this Province. It tends to ignore its responsibilities to the people of this Province by repealing Bill 2 and it will ignore its responsibilities to the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Member is speaking more on Bill 6 than he is on Bill 7. We are debating Bill 7.

Mr. Lane: — Yes, I'm going right into that, Mr. Speaker.

The legislation before this House is another example of this Government's window dressing and I'm referring to the hours of work legislation, The Labour Standards Act. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) made reference in some phrases in his speech on the Throne Speech Debate, such phrases as, "not mere tinkering" in referring to legislation, such phrases as, "be relevant" referring to the actions of the Members of this House. Well, Mr. Hon. Member for Saskatoon University, you are off to a very poor start in this House in that regard and I submit that this legislation is merely a . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would just remind the Member . . . I realize that some new Members wouldn't know this, but you cannot refer in the debate here to statements that have been made in another debate in this Session. The Throne Speech Debate, Budget Debates take precedence but on debating a bill you can't refer to statements made by Members in the Throne Speech Debate.

Mr. Lane: — I refer to an article in the Leader-Post of July 9, 1971, Mr. Speaker, which quotes from a research monograph by Dr. N.H. Lethwick of Carlton University and in it he states:

Raising minimum wages and creating more jobs would do little to help the majority of the poor people in Canada's major urban areas.

The research paper says that higher minimum wages would also be of relatively little help since few paid workers are classed as poor. Unemployables make up the largest part of the poor. Again these facts are ignored by this legislation. The legislation does nothing to solve the basic problems, I submit, Mr. Speaker. The unemployable is not helped by this legislation. He sees a new wage figure which he knows is unattainable by himself and this is no new deal for the unemployable. The Government has failed to relieve the basic labor problems; it has done nothing to enable the worker to attain pride in his work; it has done nothing to ensure that the unions become democratic, it has done nothing to enable the worker to function as a human being in his environment. The Government by its inaction and its failure to deal with the basic problem is continuing to treat the laborers of this Province as mere wage slaves. The Government has perpetrated the biggest hoax on the laborers of this Province that this Province has ever seen. We don't expect the Government to have answers to these basic problems in five weeks, but if you don't have the answers, don't add to the problem by bringing legislation like this before the House. I'm surprised that the Member for Saskatoon University puts up with this legislation. The legislation merely adds to the problem which was ignored by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) and again this is typical of the window-dressing legislation of this Government. The only criterion for the working man's success under the Government opposite will continue to be how much money he makes, or how big a car he drives and not how happy or satisfied he is in his work. This legislation solves no problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour in introducing this legislation stated what a great principle this legislation was. Then he went on and said, "We will continue the present exemptions, we will keep the power to exempt persons in industries, we will not implement the legislation until the Minimum Wage Board brings in its recommendations." I ask the Minister, what if the Board says that this legislation is not feasible? Proposing legislation in this form is a waste of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to take part in this debate until the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) rose and spoke. I was rather glad that I had made the decision to rise when I listened to my hon. friend from Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I'm also glad to support this Bill. I believe that it should encourage more employment. I think of many industries and many businesses which have been on the 44-hour week and incidentally as far as I know in my community there aren't very many of them on the 48-hour week. Most urban centres in my constituency are already on the 44-hour week or less even though they may have been allowed to have the 48-hour week. And I think the time is

coming and not too far off when we shall not be looking at a 44-hour week but at a 32-hour week.

This new great technological era that we are in, if we are going to give people jobs and meaningful jobs, the hours of work are going to have to be cut down. Twenty years ago Walter Reuther, the great labor leader of the United States, talked of the 32-hour week and he was laughed at. Certainly this is coming. I'm sorry my hon. friend from Regina Albert Park has left. He went on and he talked about the population loss of Saskatchewan under the CCF Government. Well, actually if my hon. friend, the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) will look at the records he will find that the population of Saskatchewan grew and I'll admit not fast, there was a loss through decrease in births but it did grow from 1947 to 1964 and if you look at the figures of the census you will find this is right. There was a growth. But also from 1967 to 1971 the population of this Province dropped. It not only lost all its birthrate growth, but it also lost more than that. So I suggest that really his arguments were very facetious.

The other point I wish to deal with, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down are the remarks from the Member for Lumsden — I'm sorry he is not here — I object to Members getting up and saying that the rank and file of labor union persons or any person is lazy, and this is really what he was saying. As I understood him to say, he said that many union people didn't work the first hour of work and if that isn't laziness I should like to know what it is. I just don't believe that this is true of any group of people. There may be the odd one but I certainly object to him saying that any group of people are deliberately wasting time. Then he went on and he asked a lot of questions of the Minister of Labour, he asked questions about labor problems. The strange thing was that there was a Liberal Government in this Province for seven years and they not only didn't look into any of the problems that he raised but they never even tried to look into them, they didn't try to solve them at all. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, again that I am proud to support this, what I call a very progressive piece of legislation that I know will be acceptable to the rural constituency in which I represent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain amount of pleasure that I have this opportunity to support this Bill.

Not since 1947 has there been any significant attempt to change the law related to hours of work, Mr. Speaker. Nobody on this side of the House is under any illusions that this particular piece of legislation is the be-all and the end-all of a labor policy, is the be-all and the end-all of the problems of unemployment, problems of poverty that we have in our Province. However, Mr. Speaker, it is in the tradition of regulating hours of work, of regulating the worst problems which our society has faced since the Industrial Revolution and that therefore it is a good piece of legislation. It is time that we finally catch up and realize that the norm of 40 hours is going to have to apply to our people and that people do not want to labor on beyond that.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the question of this Bill being in the tradition of the 40-hour week, there are a great many economic

questions which must be considered; their obvious benefits to the workers involved in terms of reduced hours of employment or increased wages or a combination of both; that this piece of legislation is also in a certain sense a match for the previous Bill 6 which referred to the repeal of The Essential Services Emergency Act, inasmuch as that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, referred to problems faced by organized labor. This piece of legislation is a small attempt to get at and realize the problems of the largely unorganized working poor, because it is these people who will largely be affected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of arguments which could be raised in opposition to this Bill, and I should like to consider them as rationally and as fairly as possible. Now one very obvious and simple argument is that this piece of legislation will bring hardships upon the employers who have employees who will be affected. Mr. Speaker, obviously we must agree. This does impose this kind of hardship. In particular one should emphasize that it will affect largely small firms and primarily rural firms. Mr. Speaker, having stated that, let us realize the counter to that argument, that much as we want to preserve rural society — and we are going to be introducing many pieces of legislation to that effect during this administration — we cannot save rural society by forcing it to subsist with poverty level wages for all kinds of small town employees. The gas pump operator, the rural telephone operator, the store clerk, all of these people who may be working more than 40 hours a week on very low wages, will not appreciate our sentiments about preserving rural society if it means that they have to do the jobs themselves if they have to subsist on really substandard wages. Then it comes back to the small firms themselves, the small firms themselves cannot survive if realizing the substandard wages which exist in these establishments, the people pack up and leave. We cannot save rural Saskatchewan by forcing on it poverty.

A second argument, Mr. Speaker, that might be raised against this piece of legislation at this time is that we are in a depression. We are in a depression, but, Mr. Speaker, it is never the right time. This is a piece of legislation that has been advocated by the New Democratic Party, by the union movement, for many, many years. Thank goodness that we are now fulfilling the promise that we have made repeatedly to our people, and this legislation is coming forward. If the argument could be raised during a boom period, one could defend this piece of legislation on the grounds of sharing out the prosperity, then one can make the reverse argument during the depression that this piece of legislation could be defended on the basis of sharing out the poverty. This is the kind of legislation which affects people such as those working in restaurants, hotels, taverns, etc. One should realize, Mr. Speaker, the average wage of these people in January of 1971 as reported by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for Saskatchewan was \$1.62, that their weekly wage declined from 1970 to 1971. Also we have in front of us the impressive precedent that in the last session the minimum wage was increased by the Members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a third argument which could be raised is the question of what will be the net effect on employment on introducing this piece of legislation. On the one hand it could be said that due to the increased wage costs, certain firms will be laying off people. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, because of the increased wage payments which will be in the community

and the increased spending power that therefore arises, there could be increased purchases from these firms which might help save these small firms from bankruptcy. To repeat the first argument that if your small town people are leaving, packing up and going away from rural Saskatchewan, the firms are going to go bankrupt anyway.

There are a great number of technical arguments, some of these arguments we do not have all the satisfactory answers for. Some of the Members opposite have said they would like to see a great deal more research in the labor department. Well they, Mr. Speaker, were on this side of the House for the previous seven years and they emasculated the Labour Department and they did nothing to do that kind of research which was needed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — It now falls upon us, now that we are the Government to quickly pick up the pieces and start doing the kind of research that is necessary in order to have a creative and constructive Department of Labour. And this piece of legislation which is the tradition of liberalism and reform, how, Mr. Speaker, can they possibly oppose it?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter this debate, I intend to only take a very, very brief length of time. I should like to compliment the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) who just took his place, on a very forthright presentation of some of the problems involved in the changes of the hours of work and the changes in our labor laws. I think he did a very excellent job of presenting the case for both sides.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, though that on one particular point I wish to present an alternative because I think that the Member who just took his seat has opted for what is very much the complaint of rural people in Saskatchewan, and indeed rural parts of Canada, that most economists are telling them that if you can't make a similar standard of living in your small town, then you should move to the city. That is basically what many economists have been telling rural people throughout the rural areas of Saskatchewan and all over Canada. They have been telling them you can't generate income here in your small town that would say, be comparable to what you should make. For example, if you want to use the sum of say \$5,000 a year, it is frequently put forward by economists that the person is only generating \$3,000 a year income in his small community, but that the poverty level says he should be making \$5,000 and therefore he should no longer reside in that small community but should move.

Mr. Speaker, the Member has suggested that, by raising the wage that it is undoubtedly that we shall have a number of people in rural areas cut off the payroll. I don't think there is any question about that whatsoever. There is only so much blood to come out of the employer. If you go through the small towns of Saskatchewan you go into the cafes, you go into the garages, implement dealerships, through all of the small businesses that make up rural Saskatchewan, frequently you will find the owner will tell you, he'll come to you and say, "if the wage level goes much higher, I'd be better off if my employees own the business rather than myself and I would be better off if I was

working for them!" Mr. Speaker, in no way is the employer being harsh on his employees in this case. It is simply a fact that he simply can't pay any more because he doesn't have it.

I know from personal experience, I know every Member here in this Assembly has eaten in many small cafes throughout our country and they are finding it very expensive, not because the cafe owner is making a lot of money, he isn't making a lot of money at all. He is barely making an existence on probably 14 or 15 hours a day of work, he's not paying big wages. If you go into many of . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — Hot dog taxes!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . No, I don't think so. I think the fact is that they can't generate enough income. I was talking to a cafe owner in my constituency just a few days ago and he said, "if we continue in this direction, the only type of small business that will survive is a very high volume business that has a tremendously high volume because they can cover the overhead." Many of our small businesses in Saskatchewan don't have this type of volume and aren't going to have that type of volume. This particular man lives on No. 1 Highway, he can generate that type of volume to cover the overhead. But many of our other cafes unless they are going to put the price of coffee up to 25 cents a cup, or price themselves totally out of business, simply can't absorb this cost. The alternative is for the family to work longer hours to cut some of the employees off.

If we follow through the analysis that the people working in these areas should have a higher income, then many of them are going to become unemployed. They simply can't do anything but become unemployed because the price level can't be raised that much more in many instances.

Now, if they become unemployed they gravitate to the city. But I want to put forward the thesis, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure is held by many people, and that is that it isn't necessary to have what we often think of as an income of \$5,000 in the city, to have a decent living in rural Saskatchewan. There are many other attributes about living in our smaller towns that accept a lower standard of living in a monetary sense. In a sense of say \$3,000 a year versus \$5,000 a year in a monetary sense but that person can have as good a standard of living despite the fact that he may not have the same number of dollars to spend. It may take \$5,000 to reach a certain standard and quality of life in Regina but it may well take only \$3,000 in Wawota where I live to reach the standard of life for an obvious number of reasons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point is simply this, that if we are going to have a blanket policy that is going to insist that everyone is going to receive the same remuneration, then in many cases we are asking for a mass exodus and disappearance of many of our smaller businesses. Because the difficulty financially of these businesses must be shared not only by the owner but by the employees as well. If the employer is making \$2,500 a year, he simply is not going to be able to pay the employee \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, these are not big employers, they are not employers who are out to gouge the public or to unfairly treat their employees, these are little garage men who have three or four mechanics working

for them, fixing tractors. They can't pass the price of a substantial wage increase on to the farmer who is already paying a large cost for machinery. In the cafes they can't pass on the price in the increase of the cost of food or else they'll not have any business. The people who are selling gasoline, they can't pass that price on to the customer unless they are working much more towards the age of more bulk tanks on the farm.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very good case to be made that for employees and employers in our rural communities, it's important we keep these small businesses going. They give a very, very excellent service, they add to the community. The difficulties associated with those businesses must be felt and appreciated by both employers and employees. Mr. Speaker, the alternative is simply that the employer shuts down the business and disappears. We'll have only a few high volume businesses left in Saskatchewan if we continue our rapid movement from the small towns into the city.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we would all agree that the quality of life in rural communities will severely deteriorate as these small businesses continue to close. I hope that the Government opposite recognizes this. I realize, as has been said, they are partisan to labor but I don't think that they will find that most of the small employers in the Province of Saskatchewan are unfair to their employees. Sure there is the odd one maybe making a good living and maybe he isn't paying quite enough, but there are a great many of them not making very much money either, Mr. Speaker, and they are trying to give their employees the best deal they can and under very difficult conditions. I think the alternative is to push for a continued rural exodus to the cities simply on a monetary basis.

As I said originally, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely convinced, having lived in rural Saskatchewan all my life, that many of us in rural Saskatchewan would like to remain there. We don't necessarily have to make as much money as we could in the city to have a good life. I think that, unfortunately, this is not recognized by enough people. I hope that more people will recognize the fact that you don't really have to make \$10,000 a year living in Wawota, Saskatchewan or Kennedy, Saskatchewan, in order to have a good quality of life. Maybe you do have to make that if you live in Montreal, I don't know. But I think there is a real case to be made here. I hope the Government opposite isn't too tough because I am very concerned for the outlook of a number of very small businessmen in Saskatchewan who aren't trying to give their employees a bad deal. Maybe the odd one is but a lot of them aren't, they simply don't have it to pay. I hope the Government opposite will give those people a little consideration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Firstly, may I make a few observations, Mr. Speaker, in regard to what the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) had to say. I agree and sympathize with him as to the problems our rural communities are facing in the Province of Saskatchewan. May I also suggest to him that the establishment of the shorter work week in this Province is not going to create more business closures, as he seemed to indicate. I don't think that one can suggest that a shorter work week is going to be putting people

out of business any more than one can suggest that reducing the hours of work will put people off the pay roll. I would suggest to him that from the standpoint of employment, the reverse is going to be true, there are going to be added jobs created and I am going to deal with that in some detail later on, Mr. Speaker.

When the Hon. Member talks about the crisis our rural Saskatchewan is facing, I should hope that he would look back just a matter of a few months or a few years and look at the lack of action on the part of the Liberal Government to do anything about strengthening our rural communities and how passive they were during the last few years when the Federal Government was doing everything to worsen the problem for our rural communities, for example, the closure of rural post offices. I know that the NDP Members of Parliament made all kinds of representations, made all kinds of speeches in the House of Commons to have the Federal Government reverse this trend. We did not hear the Liberal Government in the Province of Saskatchewan make any protests to the Government of Canada because of the closing of post offices in our rural Saskatchewan, or the closure of our railway stations. One railway station after the other went down the drain but the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan remained passive.

These were the problems that added to the confusion that today exist in rural Saskatchewan and why rural Saskatchewan is at the cross roads. We have the proposals from the Federal Task Force on Agriculture advocating that in the months and years ahead two-thirds of our farmers will have to disappear. The people who wrote this report were not farmers but it was a group of economists who wrote the report. This may be a way to get larger production out of agriculture but it certainly isn't going to be any kind of a solution to our farmers or to the solving of our problems of our rural communities, our towns and villages.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to talk piously now but I suggest that in the seven years of Liberal administration the small business was the least of the worries of the Liberal Party and, in particular, the small business people of rural Saskatchewan. When it came down to financial assistance, loans and grants and other assistance and encouragement, the Liberal Government provided funds at lower interest rates and made funds available for big business, but when it came down to providing funds at lower interest rates and making grants, helping with other problems and providing technical services for our rural people and our rural communities, I am afraid that the Liberal record is dismal and sadly lacking. So I don't think they can talk about this problem today with real conviction because their record is one, as I said, that is sadly lacking. We, in this Government, do propose to look at the problems of rural Saskatchewan, particularly what our towns and villages are facing. For the merchants, the small business people, we do have a specific program in this regard and in the matter of weeks and months ahead our programs will be announced toward the helping and aiding of small business people in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation establishing a 40-hour work week throughout Saskatchewan, I suggest, is long overdue. Labor legislation governing the hours of work has remained virtually unchanged in the Province of Saskatchewan for a period of 24 years. So the introduction of the 40-hour work week is certainly long overdue. We are not breaking any new ground in this Legislature, the vast majority of workers have been successful in

reducing their hours of work through collective bargaining down to 40 and, in some cases, down to 36 hours a week in this Province. In many cases employers have granted their employees a 40-hour work week in order to keep up with the changing times. This is also true in rural Saskatchewan as well. One cannot assume or suggest that the hours of work in small communities are 48 hours a week universally. Many of our rural communities do have 40-hour work weeks and less, including the small towns and villages.

Liberal Members opposite must candidly admit that Saskatchewan fell behind in the field of labor standards during their seven years of office. The Federal Government, for example, several years ago established a 40-hour work week for all employees under its jurisdiction. Other provinces have taken the lead from Saskatchewan in terms of hours of work legislation and minimum wage increases, so today we are merely beginning on the work that must be done to catch up with other parts of the country in labor standards and to once again take the lead in labor legislation standards as Saskatchewan did once lead all of the Dominion.

Given the fact that Saskatchewan has lagged behind other provinces, perhaps this is a good occasion to look back at the record of labor legislation of the Province of Saskatchewan. All of us know that labor laws prior to 1944 were incredibly poor. Labor legislation in this Province before the CCF Government was elected was medieval to say the least. But after 1944 and during the 20 years the CCF Government held power in this Province, our labor legislation was undoubtedly the most advanced and the most enlightened in the Dominion of Canada. The hours of work were shortened, time and one-half overtime provisions were established after eight hours a day of work. To start with, the CCF Government established two weeks annual vacation with pay after one year of service, being the pioneer in this regard, and later three weeks after five years of service. The Government also legislated eight statutory holidays with pay after breaking new ground in this respect where we were ahead for many years. In fact, Saskatchewan is still somewhat of a leader in this respect. Some of the provinces have not caught up.

But in the last seven years we have seen Saskatchewan fall behind in the matter of labor standards, such as hours of work and minimum wages. The Federal Government and many other provinces brought in legislation which is by far more advanced than in the Province of Saskatchewan. The labor movement in Saskatchewan has strongly advocated changes, not only in labor standards legislation but urged the Liberal Government to bring in many new laws. After the election of the Liberal Government the Women's Bureau was abolished. Labor asked for its re-establishment, asked for the provisions of maternity leave, and effective action to deal with the problems of automation. All of these efforts on the part of labor were unsuccessful. The Liberal Government had a deaf ear when it came down to labor representations and the improvement of labor standards, similarly in the area of industrial relations legislation.

While Saskatchewan was losing ground in the field of labor legislation, many thousands of highly skilled tradesmen were leaving the province to take advantage of improvements made elsewhere. This is a tragic loss and one that Saskatchewan could ill afford. Last year alone this Province lost some 32,000 people. This is a staggering loss when we consider the investment made

in the training and education of these people. But the loss is enormous when considered in terms of the loss of productivity potential of so many thousands of skilled workers who left the Province of Saskatchewan. Despite the tragic loss of so many skilled workers, statistics show that the net value of non-agricultural commodity production per man per member of the non-agricultural working force in Saskatchewan has more than doubled since 1947, even after allowances are made for price increases that have taken place since that time. This fact is just one more valid argument for the reduction in the hours of work.

There are many more valid reasons why legal hours of work should be reduced at this time, let me just list a few. Studies have proven that shorter hours of work often lead to an increase in productivity. Shorter hours of work reduce absenteeism and relieve the pressure on the family of the worker. Shorter hours reduce fatigue and relieve nervous tension. Shorter hours provide a more satisfactory combination of production and leisure and contributions to cultural progress. Shorter hours of work tend to minimize the effect of labor displacement and thus stabilize employment and increase employee productivity. Shorter hours make it possible for the older worker to compete more effectively with the younger worker. Shorter hours make it possible for the husband to share domestic duties, particularly in families where both husband and wife are working. And certainly shorter hours of work will lead to the creation of many needed new jobs. Many additional points can be made and many have been made. Perhaps one of the most important of these is to make time for the re-education and retraining of working people as we move so rapidly into the highly technological age that lies ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, I have personally spoken out in favor of the 40-hour work week as a Member of the Legislature and as a trade union representative for many years. I have, on several occasions, brought bills into this Legislature seeking the establishment of the 40-hour work week. After The Labour Standards Act was amended which prohibited a private Member from moving a private bill, I introduced resolutions urging the former Liberal Government to establish a 40-hour work week and to raise minimum wages. Mr. Speaker, the merits of the 40-hour work week have been debated both inside and outside this House since the introduction of the 44-hour work week back in 1947. It seems to me that this is no longer a matter of debate. It is, in fact, an occasion I should hope, to ponder the reasons of our failure for so many years to have failed to take action in this regard. There have, on occasion, been arguments presented against the introduction of improvement of labor standards and we just heard part of that argument a few minutes ago. There have been those who have argued that better labor standards would hurt the farmer and the business people. Mr. Speaker, nothing would hurt the farmer and the business people more than to restrict the purchasing power of the wage earners living in our towns, villages and cities of this Province. I believe the farmers in Saskatchewan reject the notion of economic prosperity at the expense of the urban workers. The introduction of the 40-hour work week will have many immediate and positive effects on the economy of Saskatchewan.

First of all, the 40-hour work week may create as many as 5,000 new jobs. Mr. Speaker, a 40-hour work week, however, is really no earth-shaking legislation. Introduction of the 40-hour work week in Saskatchewan hospitals, for example, will

have no effect. Since taking office I have asked the Department of Health officials to check and find out how many hospitals may be affected in the Province of Saskatchewan by the introduction of the 40-hour work week, and I find to my surprise — and perhaps I shouldn't be, I should have checked this before — but every Saskatchewan hospital is now on the 40-hour work week. In other words the 134 hospitals that we have in the Province of Saskatchewan are now working on a 40-hour work week.

This particular legislation will, therefore, not place any additional cost on the hospitals and will not have any effect on the staffing. So while we have brought in this long overdue legislation, Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to much more than merely updating that legislation that was allowed to become obsolescent. In this age of rapidly changing technology and automation, it is tremendously important to our people to take advantage of this new technology. We must make plans for using their leisure time at this age of automation and to make their lives much more pleasant and perhaps more productive in other respects.

But let us never forget that those of us who sit in this Legislature do not give working people anything that they do not earn. When we pass this law we should remind ourselves of the long struggle over so many years for this legislation. Let's remind ourselves that in this case, and in every case, our workers and our farmers have had to struggle for every single gain they have made, whether economic, social or legislative. The workers of Saskatchewan have won their liberation from the Liberal oppressive years and they can now look forward to negotiating and working with the New Democratic Government which will listen attentively to their needs and will act accordingly for their interests.

We are here with a mandate from the people. We are here to help the people of Saskatchewan to plan and undertake new and more equitable forms of economic and social development. We are here to assist the people to develop a humane and just society.

Mr. Speaker, a legal 40-hour work week is a move in this direction and I am proud to support the Bill introduced by the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to say a few brief words in closing the debate today on a Bill which in the near future will have the effect of, I believe, improving the working conditions for a fairly substantial number of Saskatchewan's working men and women.

I want to take just a moment or two to comment on what I believe had to be a predictable position that was brought forward by the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and I think it would have to be agreed that he had some difficulty in justifying the position which he took today. I thought it was rather incredible, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Regina Albert Park showed the courage to mention the population exodus in the Province of Saskatchewan in light of the very dismal record of performance of the previous Liberal Administration which sat on these benches only a matter of a few months ago.

I think he should be reminded that some 30,000 fled the province in 1970 as visible evidence of the failure of the Liberal Government of that day to provide industry, to provide a stimulus to economic expansion or to provide what appeared to be a beneficial situation with respect to working men and women.

I'd like to examine just very briefly one or two of the points made by the Member for Regina Albert Park when he suggested that in order to promote industrial expansion that if others were selling a product for 69 cents, then we must sell it for 68 or I believe words to that effect. He suggested that if the minimum wage is \$1.35 in a neighboring province or a neighboring jurisdiction that we cannot allow ours to rise above those which prevail elsewhere. I think what he was really saying was that low wages and long hours of work are somehow a blessing and a stimulus to industry and in fact the very opposite is the case. If you want to examine depressed areas, you'll find that depressed areas, low wages, miserable working conditions, go hand in hand.

I think the time is appropriate for us just to remind ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that in order to make any strides at all, to make any advances, to make any improvements in working conditions for Saskatchewan's men and women, it will be necessary for this Province, I think, to provide the leadership in the way that we did during the 20 years between 1944 and 1964 when the CCF was the Government of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I thought the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane), Mr. Speaker, displayed a typical anti-labor bias that we in this House have become somewhat accustomed to over the years. I think it came as a disappointment because of his youth to see a Member opposite displaying the kind of anti-labor bias which has been evident among those sitting opposite to us in this House for some years.

He said, and the Member for Regina Albert Park also intimated, that when the question of the minimum wage was to be considered in conjunction with hours of work, that he wondered whether we should take seriously the findings of the Minimum Wage Board.

Well, just let me tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that we shall be listening to the advice of the Minimum Wage Board and we shall treat them — that is to say, the members of the Minimum Wage Board — with a degree of courtesy in a way in which the previous Administration did not.

The former Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) was sitting behind the brass rail when one of the Members made this remark questioning the care with which we would judge the findings of the Minimum Wage Board and I thought I saw him shudder rather visibly when this matter was brought before the House. I think the former Minister of Labour will recall pretty distinctly the situation which arose in April of 1971 when he, as Minister of Labour, called the Minimum Wage Board together and asked them to rubber stamp a decision which had already been made by the Executive Council. They had recommendations of their own which were ignored completely, Mr. Speaker, but they were called upon to endorse the judgment of the Premier and the Executive Council,

which caused them, Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1971, to move a unanimous resolution and forward it to the Minister of Labour. And this is the resolution that the Minimum Wage Board made and passed on to the Minister of Labour on April 27, 1971 last:

In view of the decision made by the Cabinet and the subsequent announcement made by the Premier as reported in the press, it would appear that the Minimum Wage Board is redundant and therefore perhaps consideration should be given to doing away with the Board, because as the Board is a duly constituted body and because we are fully in accord with the proposed increase, we therefore ratify the increase of the Minimum Wage Board.

Well, just let me tell Members opposite that when we call the Minimum Wage Board together, it won't be done for the purpose of establishing a minimum wage in advance by Premier and Cabinet and calling them in solely for the purpose of rubber stamping the judgment that has been made in Executive Council.

I just want to say another few words, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the points that were made to emphasize the rationale for the shorter work week, and I think they by and large fall into three categories: the equity argument — if you like — the social advantages and the economic benefits that accrue as a result of the shortening of the legal work week in Saskatchewan.

I think the essence of the first thesis is that workers are entitled to shorter hours as a matter of simple justice, Mr. Speaker. When over 70 per cent of Saskatchewan's employees now normally work 40 hours a week or less, then the question is a reasonable one when we ask ourselves why should a minority have to be on duty for a longer period than that 70 per cent majority. I think we need to ask ourselves if these people are any less capable or any less productive or any less deserving than the 70 per cent that work 40 hours a week or less. And we say the answer is, of course that they are not, Mr. Speaker. And it may be said with some justification that the existing hours of work legislation in its present form in fact encourages a form of employment discrimination with respect to the length of time that some employees are required to be on the job. I think it should be remembered too, Mr. Speaker, that a great many members of the labor force on the 40-hour standard are filling positions which required up to 60 hours a matter of only 25 years ago. The transition to the 5-day week in these cases was accomplished without any undue difficulty and it may be added without any loss in pay at that particular time. There is no reason to expect that the situation will be otherwise when Bill No. 7 goes into effect, in spite of some of the dire predictions that arise from Opposition benches.

It must also be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the real output per worker in Saskatchewan today is more than double that of 25 years ago, and most authorities agree that all employees should gain from an increase in overall production in our Province. The legislation hasn't been altered, as has been mentioned in this House, Mr. Speaker, since 1947 — almost a quarter of a century ago. It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the government of a modern, democratic, industrial state has the obligation to identify changing employment trends and apply their benefits to those wage earners who cannot rely upon the action of unions or large establishments to obtain them.

The second line of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, relates to the social advantages of legislation of the kind which is proposed today and has been discussed in some detail. I don't believe that at this time there is any need to restate the points that have been put forward except to say that they revolve around the necessity and the desirability of increased leisure time in this hectic age of technology.

Thirdly, and finally, Mr. Speaker, despite any protest to the contrary, the shortening of the work week makes good economic sense. It's our hope that it will lead to the creation of some additional employment, both directly and indirectly. It can stimulate a real demand and an increase in purchasing power. It may well result in a further expansion of productivity. It will probably reduce the rate of sickness and accidents and ultimately these consequences will be of material advantage to all of us, including the employers of the province.

I want to stress again, Mr. Speaker, that the Government intends to implement the provisions of Bill No. 7 in an objective and a rational manner. As I indicated previously, these provisions will not be proclaimed until the Minimum Wage Board has met to consider the relationship of the minimum wage and the hours of work. We do not wish to impose undue hardship on employers. Therefore, there will be sufficient administrative flexibility to permit exemptions and alternative means of observing the spirit of the law in special cases.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Government does not intend that this amendment be merely window dressing. Those who may criticize it must realize that employees working longer hours have the right to expect their fair share of the rewards of improved working conditions and living standards. Wage earners represent something more than impersonal labor costs, they are subject to the same needs, the same influences and desires which can characterize all other human beings.

That successful employers (and there are many thousands of these in Saskatchewan) take pains to ensure this fact is reflected in their employment policies. They in turn have the advantage of services of a loyal, contented and hard-working staff who are generally interested in the welfare of the business in which they are engaged.

The employers affected by Bill 7 can probably do a good deal also to adjust the impact of the changing of hours through better work methods. I'm certain that their employees will be only too willing to assist them in every way possible to improve the efficiency of that enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. It will no doubt be duplicated before very long in other provincial legislatures and it is particularly fitting that it has been introduced shortly before Labour Day, inasmuch as this holiday and Bill 7 have a common purpose to recognize the contribution of working people to the progress and prosperity of our Province.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Minister will permit a question?

Mr. Snyder: — Yes, by all means.

Mr. MacLeod: — Is it the intention of the Hon. Minister to implement this Act before Labour Day? Was that the implication of his last remarks?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I think the Member is being facetious. I told you that it was going to be a matter of calling the Minimum Wage Board together, have them recommend on the appropriate level of minimum wages. I expect it will be later in the year before the Minimum Wage Board has had an opportunity to advise with respect to the appropriate level of minimum wages. Additionally, it's a matter of — as you well know — assessing the impact of this Bill on the various industries and businesses across the province and they will be reviewing all of the Orders-in-Council that provide the present exemptions by Order-in-Council, so certainly there is no intention, there is no possibility of it being implemented before Labour Day.

Mr. MacLeod: — A further question. I wonder if the Minister has decided on whether this Act will have universal application, that is, the 40-hour week will apply to all workers throughout Saskatchewan?

Mr. Snyder: — Well, I thought, Mr. Speaker, I'd made my point sufficiently clear on that. I should like to see that the 40-hour work week be made to apply in the largest number of cases possible without exerting any hardship on specific individuals or groups; certainly it will not apply in cases such as those workers who are under Federal jurisdiction — over whom we have no control — certainly these are exempt. There are a number of others, as you know, under many other classifications and I'm thinking of highway construction industry and a number of others where neither employer nor employee are married to the thought of working a 40-hour work week. So as a result, all of these classifications will be re-examined in the weeks directly ahead.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) that Bill No. 9 — **An Act respecting the Protection of Farm Property** be now read a second time.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, what I concluded my remarks the other day, I was speaking in regard to the Bill before us.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it can be safely said, never has it become more apparent in such a short time the bias which is shared by the Government opposite towards business, whether it be business of a large nature or of a small nature. I think it is unfortunate that the bias which is so widely felt by the Members opposite against any individual enterprise or private enterprise should become so obvious so quickly in legislation put forward to this Assembly.

We have at times, Mr. Speaker, put forward some of the views that we have upon this Bill, and unfortunately the Treasury benches have not indicated to us, in the last four or five days, any reason to think that our observations have been listened to, or to believe, Mr. Speaker, that any substantial changes in this Bill before us are going to be undertaken.

The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) put a very positive alternative to the Assembly when speaking in this debate the other day. He suggested that the Government of Saskatchewan had completely failed to plan any financial backing behind the purposes of this Bill and the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we think this is very unfortunate, by a Government that campaigned so long, so hard, during the election campaign on salvation of the family farm and on the premise that they would do a great deal for the family farm in our Province. We think that a government that was sincere in their efforts and in that election campaign would have been able to find, at least, a substantial amount of money to be able to assume the obligations that are going to be expected to be undertaken by so many people that can ill-afford to assume these financial risks.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Milestone eloquently placed before this Assembly the suggestion that the Law Amendments Committee should be constituted and that the various groups, that have been indicated, would have the opportunity to present their case.

I think this suggestion has great merit and should still be considered by the Government opposite. I will, at the conclusion of my remarks, give the Treasury bench an ample opportunity to put before the Members of this Assembly any changes in attitude that they have had in the last four or five days.

Mr. Speaker, this Assembly has listened for a number of days to proposed legislation put forward to assist labor in this Province. This, in itself, is fine, Mr. Speaker, but we think it very unfortunate that the Government opposite has asked every small businessman, and every independent enterpriser in the Province of Saskatchewan, to undertake tremendous financial responsibility if this Act is proclaimed.

I want to pass on, Mr. Speaker, some of the problems that will be confronted by the small businessmen in the Province of Saskatchewan. First, Mr. Speaker, the implement dealer. I presented at least two or three causes for great fear on their part and I think there has been nothing done by the Members opposite to allay that fear. I am convinced in studying the Act and in talking to the many dealers in my own particular area, Mr. Speaker, that if I were a dealer myself I should certainly have the great apprehension that many of them feel at this time. For example, one particular provision in the Bill suggests that when the Act is proclaimed that an implement which has been repossessed by a dealer, that this implement may be taken back by the person whom it has been taken away from. I outlined at that time, the other afternoon, that this could certainly result, in many particular instances, where dealers have repossessed machinery the dealer may have had it on his lot for the last six or seven months, he has undertaken substantial changes and invested money of his own in that particular machine to the extent of several hundreds of dollars and now if this Act is proclaimed, the farmer who had originally lost the machine can go to the dealer and take it back. Precisely how the dealer hopes to reclaim the lost investment that he has put into this machine, I certainly would not know under this particular Act. I think that many dealers have machines sitting on their lots that have been repossessed. I know that no dealer whom I have ever encountered has ever made any amount of money out of repossession, in fact, I think it could safely be said that 99 per

cent of the time that if a machine is repossessed, the dealer actually takes a loss.

I have also talked to many credit unions which find themselves in a similar position. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case of repossession by credit unions, I have been assured in all of these cases that the credit union, if they thought the farmer was a bonafide operator, a person who was sincere in his efforts to get on to better financial ground, that they had extended credit wherever possible and that only in the most severe cases had they undertaken repossession.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, an advertisement that has just recently been published by the Wolseley newspaper, July 28th that I should like to read into the record in the next few minutes. It is an advertisement put out by the Montmartre Credit Union, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure that the shareholders of the Montmartre Credit Union, many of whom are farmers, all local people, that they have not undertaken repossession except in the most extreme circumstances.

For example, a ten-foot grain cultivator is advertised for sale in the July 28th issue of the Wolseley paper, for \$50. A 50-foot Minneapolis disc, \$150. A ten-foot heavy duty discer, \$125; Minneapolis diesel tractor, \$500. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, it can readily be seen that if the repossession could not take place on any of this machinery for over one year, these machines would practically be worthless after they have been used for another year if no payment was made.

I am certain that no ulterior motive could be ascribed to the shareholders of the Credit Union of the Montmartre district. Most of the shareholders would be farmers or people who are working people in the town. And I think it would be very irresponsible of the Members to suggest that this is big business trying to perpetrate hardship on the local people. I think that would be complete nonsense, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . to say that they are large mortgage lenders, banks or some other accusation, would simply be a misconstruction of the facts.

I think it is very obvious that many of the small people of Saskatchewan — and I hold no brief for the mortgage companies or the banks, Mr. Speaker — certainly can look after their own interests, and after this Act, and I am certain they will continue business as they have in the past. But I am certain that many of the smaller businessmen in Saskatchewan will find themselves in a much more difficult position when this Act is proclaimed and comes into operation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if I were an implement dealer I should be also very concerned because of other provisions of this law. I think a very, very dangerous provision of this law is simply that no matter how well off the farmer is he can walk into the place of business and say, 'I am unable to pay.' And as has been amply put forward by the Dealers' Association themselves, this is a very, very dangerous aspect of the Act. It is very, very dangerous, Mr. Speaker, because it makes normally good payers into bad ones. The result of this simply is that a

person who wishes not to pay this particular year, can walk in and say, 'I'm sorry. I am unable to pay my debt.' The obligation then lies on the creditors' shoulders to go to court and prove, Mr. Speaker, that that individual is able to pay.

Well you can just imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the dealer, for example, or a small businessman had even seven or eight farmers who may be of a marginal nature. Possibly they are marginal in the sense that they maybe could qualify under the Act. Possibly they are marginal in the sense that they can't afford to pay, but they walk in and say, 'I am not able to pay, now you take me to court and you produce the evidence that I am able to pay.'

The implications of this for the small businessman is tremendous. The possibility of creating many more bad debts, as far as they are concerned, the possibility of creating a substantial number of people who will take advantage of this, as unfortunate as it may be, as much as I may dislike to say so, Mr. Speaker, I think that we must all recognize and be realistic that we do have a number of people who simply will take advantage of the Act, who could pay their debts but will simply take advantage of it because they hope to postpone that debt for another year. I think that this, if I were a small businessman, this aspect would make me very, very sceptical about its worthiness.

I want also to say a few words about another aspect of the Act which I think is of great concern to many people, and that is the credit to the individual farmer. Already many of our lending institutions are saying, and have said privately, that they are carefully scrutinizing any credit which is given out to all farmers at present, simply until they are able to determine what the intentions of the Government are as far as this particular Act is concerned. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that as a farmer that the one thing that many, many farmers take great pride in is their ability to pay their debts; their ability to meet credit obligations . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . and I think it goes down very badly when they appear at their bank or credit union or whatever financial institution it is, and they are given an answer, 'We regret we are unable to discuss any financial loan to you simply because the Government of Saskatchewan is contemplating passing a law which may make it very difficult for us to take any type of security.' I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this law is passed that many, many farmers now who should be able to receive loans, in good faith, will find it very difficult to obtain loans. They will find it extremely difficult to obtain loans, simply because the lending agency has very little security on which to lend this money.

Mr. Speaker, I should think that from the point of view of every farmer in Saskatchewan he would be extremely concerned about the nature of this Act, particularly because of his own reliance upon credit. There are very few farmers who operate in Saskatchewan who do not have to rely on credit at some particular time of the year. The outcome of this Act will mean that except for the very best of the farmers, the very, very best farmers who are able to obtain loans under any arrangement, because of their assets and standing, that practically all other groups, except for probably 10 or 15 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan, who have extremely high credit ratings, I should

think that a large percentage of the farmers of Saskatchewan will find that loans will be much harder to obtain.

In this regard, I think that most farmers of Saskatchewan would view with great alarm the intentions of this law. Mr. Speaker, in essence, I have suggested at the opening of my remarks that it is most unfortunate that the Government opposite has decided on this attitude towards most of our individual enterprisers in the Province of Saskatchewan. I fully realize that being a Socialist Government they probably have very little sympathy for most of the small business people in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I realize that being a Socialist Government the only time, to my knowledge, that the small business people of Saskatchewan have ever received any suggestion that they would be supported by the Party opposite was a few days before the election.

I must confess after having listened to speeches from that side when they were on this side of the House that it was not surprising to me. It is a little surprising that they were so fast to introduce and so reluctant, after studying this Bill, to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

I could even forgive the Government, Mr. Speaker, if, for example, after it had been brought to their attention that the Bill was ill-conceived, that the Bill had been brought in, in haste and was bad legislation, I could even forgive the Government, Mr. Speaker, if they had stood in their place and said, 'Well, we are a new Government. We regret that we have acted in haste, that we have presented a Bill which has been poorly thought through. We didn't understand its implications.'

Mr. Speaker, that was last Wednesday. Thursday went by, Friday went by, Saturday, Sunday and today it is Monday. Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite can scarcely say now that they don't understand what the effect of this Bill is. This is sad, Mr. Speaker, because it only means that they have determined that this Bill must go through and will be passed at all costs. I think that they could well be forgiven if they stood in their places, when they get the opportunity, to say that they have made a mistake, that they would withdraw the Bill or bring in substantial changes. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that even though substantial changes in this Bill, if they are made — and I have no indication that they will be made — that it is very difficult to see how this Bill could be patched up to the extent that many innocent people would not suffer from any transaction which may take place in the coming year. It is so encompassing that it is hard to envisage just exactly who will be affected.

For example, I discussed with one of my colleagues just this afternoon an aspect which I had not thought of and which I believe had not occurred to most of the Members on this side. For example, a small fuel dealer in a town in Saskatchewan where the dealer has sold \$300 or \$400 worth of fuel to a farmer and frequently, if payment is not forthcoming, the local dealer has paid for the fuel. He has been forced to pay to the company he represents for the fuel and therefore he has accounts receivable of about \$300 or \$400. Now if the time of six or seven months goes by and he received no payment, he frequently goes

to the farmer and says, 'I must have payment or I will have to proceed in a court action against you' which in most cases if the farmer is able to pay, he makes some settlement. I should think that under this Bill, if it comes into operation, that fuel dealers will find this extremely difficult to do. Many of his accounts receivable, which are out now, he would be unable to collect in the next year.

I think that these are only a very few of the difficulties which this Act will bring about. I mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, that it is like an iceberg with a little bit showing above the water. I think that it is hard to visualize by any of us precisely the difficulties that it could create, because it is all so encompassing and could have so many ramifications for so many people.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the amendment which has been moved by my colleague from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and I want to support it on the basis, first, Mr. Speaker, because of serious effect that this Act will have on the many credit unions throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. It is quite obvious the credit union, which is in a depressed area, could have many clients who may suggest that they are unable to pay the bill and it could have a very serious effect on the credit union shareholders and the credit union assets in that particular area. I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it should go to the Law Amendments Committee because of the serious effects it may have, and will have, on small machinery dealers and automobile dealers.

This Act as it is presently constituted will jeopardize the credit position of every farmer in this Province and make every farmer in Saskatchewan become suspect as to whether he can legitimately have credit or not.

Mr. Speaker, fourthly, the dangerous provision of this Act, that anyone refusing to pay must be taken to court to prove that he can pay, I suggested the other day that this provision should result in practically no unemployed lawyers in our Province.

Fifth, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has suggested that the money released from debt payment can go to other living expenses. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish that I had that confidence in human nature that the Minister has. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that all of us know too well of many times visiting in small business places when the businessman looks out the window and he says 'so and so owes me a substantial amount of money. He just bought a new car or a new snowmobile.'

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very obvious that the money which is released from the principal payments or the interest may not necessarily go to the small business person in the community. It may well go to some other particular item that that individual wants.

Six, Mr. Speaker, most of the farmers under this Act will receive no benefits simply because their debts become due in one year and the net income that they will have remains totally unchanged. It does absolutely nothing to improve the net income of some farmers and, in fact, only postpones the net obligations which he has for one particular year.

Mr. Speaker, in essence this legislation will have such far-reaching effects that I think it is impossible for any of

us to comprehend the ramifications it may have for many people. Many groups and organizations have indicated their willingness to appear before the Law Amendments Committee and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House hope that the Government opposite will accept our suggestion and go to the Committee and hearings be held so that determination of the good this Act can do will be weighed against the difficulties it will create.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and this Government which took immediate action to introduce new legislation which will no doubt bring relief to many farmers, legislation the farmers will welcome in their present plight. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that during the Liberal term of office when the Saskatchewan Liberals and their bed partners in Ottawa failed to provide agricultural policies they encouraged farmers to diversify. Farmers were encouraged to assume unrealistic debt loads to extend their farming operations, to buy larger equipment, to build \$40,000 and \$50,000 hog barns, to buy and raise more cattle, to buy more land for a viable farm operation, all in the name of efficiency. Some of the other people who were guilty of encouraging the farmer to assume unrealistic debts were the machinery companies, the banks, the financial institutions, and public lending agencies as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feschuk: — These are the people who exploited the farmers with highly inflated prices and excessively high interest rates. These are the people who have betrayed the farmers of Saskatchewan who have to exist from day to day in poverty and insecurity. These are people who by their policies are driving the farmers of Saskatchewan into bankruptcy. Farmers are being threatened with repossession action on farm machinery and farm land. The situation appears critical. Different tactics have been used by creditors to force farmers into debt, to force farmers into debt into giving up their lands and equipment or else forcing farmers into signing new debt agreements at a high interest rate. Various banking institutions, Mr. Speaker, have renewed farm improvement loans from five per cent interest to eight and one-half per cent interest, almost double the interest rate, when farmers could least afford it. Farm Credit Corporation loans in arrears in the Province of Saskatchewan in 1969 were 6.6 per cent, in 1970 they were 12.2 per cent and as of June, 1971 Farm Credit loans in Saskatchewan were in arrears of 21 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, along with the Farm Security Act there is a need for further legislation to protect farmers' rights. There is an urgent need to re-establish the Agriculture Machinery Act, to provide protection to the farmer. There is need for legislation to do away with planned obsolescence in equipment. Mr. Speaker, presently the onus is still on the farmer to take legal action and in many cases farmers lose their land and equipment by default because of legal technicalities. That is a sin in these difficult times and many repossessions are taking place because farmers have no protection, while others do not understand their rights. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 and 1969 cash advance

payments were given throughout though outstanding cash advances had not been paid back. In 1970-71 crop year they were not and a producer must pay back one-half of all prior or outstanding cash advances. Although the delivery quota for the 1970-71 crop year has been set on an eight bushel quota for the LIFT acres, the eight bushel quota was only an illusion. The eight bushel quota on the old specified acres is only a four bushel quota and many farmers realize only one-half of that four bushel quota because of repayments of prior or outstanding cash advances. But most important, Mr. Speaker, is the implication imbedded in the new regulations that the farmer has been trying to get away with something. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in bringing forward Bill 9, an Act respecting the Protection of Farm Property, will have done much to help farmers temporarily.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feschuk: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion, I believe we must recognize our present economic agricultural situation. Many of our agricultural problems are such that only a Federal Government can solve and may, I submit, that if the Government of Canada insists on a cheap food policy, then the time has come to bring a subsidized two-price system or a guaranteed annual income for our farming people.

I am pleased to support this legislation and I feel that it will be welcomed by Saskatchewan farmers. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that much more can be done if we had a New Democratic Government in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feschuk: — Wheat sales and farm protection are urgently needed but the lowering of farm production costs and increases in farm income is really the only step towards the solution to the farmer's situation. And these, Mr. Speaker, are in the hands of the Federal Government and it appears likely that with a New Democratic Government there after the next Federal election, that this will greatly assist this Government in providing a better deal for our total farming population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Macleod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to address to this Bill which is called The Family Farm Protection Act, 1971. Now to begin with, I should like to express my agreement with the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) when he says that the prime industry is farming, is agriculture. When the farming economy is good, everything is good. When the farm economy is bad, everything is bad. And in this Province we are all farmers. I want to mention this because I like to be agreeable whenever possible and I have looked at this Bill and it is probably the only thing we can agree upon. Although I do agree, if the implication of the remarks of the last Member can be taken at face value, that he has now concluded that they elected an NDP Government in the wrong place. I am prepared to agree that it isn't in the right place.

Now to begin with, Mr. Speaker, I looked at paragraph 1 of the Act and it is cited as I mentioned, The Family Farm Protection Act, 1971. I have looked for the definition of family farm in the Act but none appears. This is intended to be a farm protection Act and the addition of the 'family' just doesn't add anything to it. Unless they have decided in Saskatchewan everybody is now a family farmer instead of just a farmer. The Government then has fulfilled a promise by changing a name so I find that today that a farmer isn't a farmer anymore, he woke up this morning and found that he is now a family farmer. So he says, what did I do, more children? No. Have you done anything? No. What were you yesterday? Well, I was a farmer yesterday. What am I today? Today I am a family farmer. It's like changing the name of Trans Canada to Air Canada. It's wonderful but it doesn't change anything. All I know is, it's like the girl up in our country called Mabel Auganschlotz. She didn't like her name so she changed it to Olga Auganschlotz.

The farmers in this Province have had a promise kept to them by the change of a name. A promise in words and a completion in words. But having studied the Act, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the name be altered to read Farmers' Credit Destruction Act. There are so many faults with this statute, so many defects and inconsistencies that it is difficult to know where to start, so I think I'll list them as they come to mind just as I went through the statute.

Now, the question of land I think, gives us an excellent example of what I am talking about. Our laws presently have tremendous provision for the protection of the farmer. Under Agreements for Sale and Mortgages the law is stacked heavily in favor of the owner and very much against the man who owns the Mortgage or the Agreement for Sale. I want to give you an example. Let's suppose you do have a farmer who has not paid for his land and is in default. Before the mortgagee, that is the fellow who gets the money, can commence action he must follow the procedure which is presently set out in The Land Contracts Actions Act.

I want to outline briefly what this involves. To begin with the mortgagee, as I mentioned the fellow that has the money coming to him gives a notice to the Provincial Mediation Board. He can do nothing for 30 days, he has to give the Mediation Board an opportunity to intervene and use its office to bring about the settlement. At the end of 30 days the mortgagee can then start his preparation of documents. He goes to a judge and asks permission to commence action. Then he gives notice of this to the farmer and he has to wait another 15 days minimum. Then the judge hears the matter and the mortgagee asks permission to start action. Now the judge can adjourn this application up to eight months, he can dismiss the action, he can make interim orders, and do all sort of things along the line. So let's suppose the judge eventually agrees that it is fair to let the mortgagee continue with his action.

Well, he gives an order permitting the mortgagee to start the action. And what I wish to emphasize to this House is that after all these procedures that he has gone through, taking anywhere up to eight months after he has actually got before a judge, he still hasn't begun any action to foreclose. He has no permission yet, at this point to start it. When he gets permission he then can start action. I want to read what it says in dealing with this in The Land Contracts Actions Act, Mr. Speaker, I am reading from Chapter 104, Section 4, first part:

In any action, whether heretofor or hereafter commenced, the court or judge may require the parties to furnish information respecting the value of the land, the state of cultivation of the land, the state of the mortgagor or purchaser's account with the mortgagee or vendor the income and assets of the parties . . .

(Not just one but both parties)

. . . prevailing conditions of a local or temporary nature, and all other matters that may appear relevant. He may make such inquiries with regard to any of the said matters as he deems necessary. He may grant or refuse to grant an order, stay the action, postpone payment of any monies due, prescribe the terms and conditions to which an order shall be subject, vary or extend an order from time to time, give directions as to cost . . .

And so on. Those are the matters that a judge must look upon and consider when he is thinking about giving permission in the first place in allowing this man to start his action. Just let me look for a moment, Mr. Speaker, as to what is said in this particular statute:

When an application is made by a creditor under subsection 1, the court shall require the parties to furnish information respecting the value and state of cultivation, value of the security, the state of accounts between the parties, the earning capacity, income and assets of the farmer, the general or local economic and climatic conditions, including hail, drought, frost or agricultural pests, any other conditions or circumstances beyond the control of the farmer, and all other conditions and circumstances that appear relevant.

Mr. Speaker, the difference in wording is totally immaterial between the two statutes. What they have done precisely is take the wording out of The Land Contracts Actions Act, put it into this statute and pretend that they have done something new. Great delays have occurred under The Land Contracts Actions Act as any lawyer knows. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the similarities in the two statutes are so identical that obviously Section 22 is put in for the purpose of avoiding ridiculous duplication of effort. In fact, Section 22 says this:

If a man proceeds under this particular Act, then he does not have to proceed under the Land Contracts Actions Act.

But obviously he is doing the same thing under one as he would under the other and, therefore, the new Act is a waste of time. It is a pretense at something new that isn't new at all.

Well, let's suppose that under one statute or the other the mortgage owner, now considerably in arrears under the mortgage, does eventually get permission to start an action. The judge gives him permission and says, all right, you can go ahead. Well, he starts out by preparing a writ of summons and statement of claim, setting out in full detail all of these particulars again. That's what the mortgagee does. The farmer gets a copy of this and the mortgagee has to stop, he has to bide his time for awhile until the farmer can enter his defence. If the farmer does enter a defence the usual trial procedures apply and this

can last anywhere up to a year or two, depending on how rapidly the parties press the case.

Now let's suppose the farmer doesn't do anything at all. Let's suppose he has abandoned the farm, he has taken off for some other location. Even in this case the mortgagee must proceed right through the case. He must make the usual applications for default, he must eventually wind up by getting an order nisi which does the following. The order nisi says, well, we've calculated the account and this is how much is owing. This is how much is in arrears, and the arrears is the only part he has to pay to bring it back in good standing. It's an interim order that, in addition, gives a period of time in which to pay all these arrears, three months, six months, who knows, the judges usually give a fairly liberal length of time in which to repay the balance. A copy of this order has to be served on the farmer. If the farmer pays anything in the meantime, the mortgagee has to go back and do it all over again. Make a new application, get a new calculation of accounts, get a new redemption period and a further extension of time is granted. The new order nisi is again served on the farmer. And even when all of this is done, he has now gone through the entire Land Contracts Actions Act, he has gone through the entire procedure of a lawsuit, he's got his order nisi, he has waited all these periods that can go anywhere into years, not months, years. Even then he has got to go back and apply to a judge for a final order. And that final order can be appealed or you have got to wait 30 days before it's final. Yet we look at paragraph 4 of The Family Farm Protection Act, which says that these orders nisi will again be set over for one further year. Here we have a mortgagee that may have waited anywhere up to three or four years and he finds that he has got to wait another year. The entire procedures, as I have described, for foreclosures and mortgages apply exactly and identically in the cases of the cancellation of Agreements for Sale. In the case of mortgages, after the appeal period has expired, you can still go back and redeem the property by payment of the arrears. Even if the farm is abandoned, the mortgage owner has to go through this entire procedure and the unfortunate part is that having gone through it once, he may well be required, having gone through to the order nisi stage, to go back and do some of it again.

The Act before us cannot possibly help anyone. Whom will it hurt? Well, I assure the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that the mortgage companies won't be hurt and Traders Finance will not be hurt. The Farm Credit Corporation can't be hurt very badly. It will still be in business, it is the Government of Canada. The trust companies have long feared this kind of legislation in Saskatchewan and they have long since stopped lending money to farmers with this security. They have virtually no outstanding loans to farmers. If they have any, they are residual ones from many years ago.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . wonderful legislation!

Mr. MacLeod: — Great! I agree with you when you say that is wonderful legislation.

Now I will tell you who will be hurt — a lot of credit unions will be hurt. And maybe they won't lend to farmers any more. The persons who suffer the most from this legislation, of course, are the farmers. Is it possible that the failure to get credit

August 9, 1971

to buy or sell will result in a reduction of farm prices? A reduction in people who can actually borrow money to buy land? I wonder if this will benefit the Government when it establishes its Land Bank? I wonder if this will help the Government to get land at cheaper prices by driving out the lending institutions? Is this, the offer to acquire land, freely offered at competitive prices? Certainly it is wonderful. Nobody else can borrow a dime to buy that section of land so the only person with any money will be the Government of Saskatchewan.

There are already so many protections for the farmer in the case of land that if anything else is needed to destroy the farmer's credit, this statute is it.

Mr. Speaker, what we have today is an example of protective overkill. If any farmer has any difficulty in borrowing money he should blame no one but the Provincial Government.

Section 13 is obviously too vague to be workable. In effect it says that the operator of the land can take as much of the land as is necessary to pay for all his expenses, including a living allowance, before he actually pays his crop share to the owner. So if a man sells his farm to someone else and is to receive a third of the crop share as part of the purchase price, the new owner can keep the entire proceeds until he receives this amount to pay all legitimate costs of harvesting and a necessary living allowance for the support of himself and his family.

What happens if a farmer has all sorts of other land? What happens if he has just purchased one more piece of land from one more owner? How in the world are we going to determine what is a fair living allowance? How long is it to last? Is it one year, one month, six months? If a farmer has this section of land in his own name and buys some more, I gather that the living allowance is to be charged first to the land he bought. That is what it says in the Act. How do you determine these amounts? I wonder, has the Government proposed that the seller of land has the right to look into another man's income tax? If so, I strongly reject this, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Section 13 is pure nonsense. Just window dressing.

So now we come to farm implements and that includes farm trucks. To answer the comment of the Attorney General earlier, the Attorney General mentioned that The Land Contracts Actions Act and The Limitations of Civil Rights Act were outstanding legislation. Well, I agree with that. These amendments were brought in last year under the last Administration by Mr. Heald when he was the Attorney General, and we accept the compliment on behalf of the last Administration.

Under the present law, the Saskatchewan farmer is more protected than his counterpart in any part of North America and probably protected more at the present time than any other farm in any other place in the world. Now, many sales in Saskatchewan are made by what is called a 'Condition Sale'. Now under a Conditional Sale a farmer buys the machine, takes it home and uses it and he agrees to pay for it. And if he pays for it, of course, it belongs to him. It becomes his property, but if he doesn't pay for it, he can never be sued. And that is the essential of this type of contract. The dealer can take the machine back but he can never by law sue the farmer. So it doesn't matter how much is owing. It doesn't matter how long

the farmer has used the machine or how much it has depreciated. It doesn't matter if the machine is worth only a fraction of what the farmer agreed to pay. Under the present law the dealer can take the machine back, and that is all that he can do. I think that is excellent legislation and it is more than ample protection for the farmer. It is the right amount of protection that a farmer is adequately and properly protected. But what you are suggesting is that the dealer can't take that machine back for another year.

Let's see what happens then. Let's suppose that the dealer now looks into it and says the farmer agreed to pay \$4,000 for that machine. He has used it for two or three years and he hasn't paid for it. I should like to take it back. What can he do before he seizes it? Well, to begin with, if you follow Section 19 and the following sections in The Limitations of Civil Rights Act, he must give 30 days' notice that he intends to seize the equipment. Then he does nothing. Then the farmer can go to a judge and tell the judge the reasons why he can't make payment. And while that procedure is going on, the dealer is not permitted to seize the equipment. In fact, he can no longer seize the equipment after that occurs until a judge gives him permission. Now that is the law, the way it is. The judge may allow the farmer to keep this without making any payments whatsoever or he may decide that the farmer should pay some payments and he can alter the arrangement.

But let's suppose that the creditor eventually gets permission. He takes possession of the article and he gives another 30 days' notice that he has the article. This is the second set of notices. And if the farmer didn't make application in the first place, he can make application to the judge now. And, again, they go through this entire court procedure. These cases can drag on for months and even years. And it is only after a judge has been totally convinced that it is proper, fair and reasonable that the creditor be allowed to seize the equipment, that the dealer is actually permitted to proceed.

And all the while remembering that at no time can the farmer ever be sued for the purchase price. He can give the machine back or it can be taken back, but he can't be forced to pay for it. This Act, this Farm Credit Destruction Act, is like carrying coals to Newcastle. It gives protection where no further protection is needed. There comes a time when more protection isn't protection at all. Well, then it's window dressing. If there is nothing new in the Act, then it is pure and simple window dressing and let's not go out to the people and say that you have done anything.

Now a similar principle to that which I have discussed is set forth in Section 12. To show the protection presently given the farmer, let's deal with the situation as it relates to the tax enforcement proceedings. In Section 12 of this Bill they suggest that no final applications for title shall be taken by any rural municipality. It doesn't matter what it says in The Mediation Board Act or The Tax Enforcement Act, everything stops for a year. Well, let's suppose this is true, that this stuff does get through. What have they done? Well, let's look at the present Act and the present law. I want to show you the protection that is now given to the farmer. So let's assume that he doesn't pay his taxes in 1971. Nothing can be done by the municipality until June 30, 1972, then The Tax Enforcement Act applies. Then the municipality sends in a notice to the

August 9, 1971

Provincial Gazette and that says if they aren't paid within 60 days, the municipality will file a lien.

Well, let's suppose that the 1971 taxes aren't paid, so sometime in the last half of 1972 the tax lien will be applied to the title. The municipality must wait two years before it proceeds to acquire the title. We may well now be into the fall of 1974 depending on how quickly people operate and then this is the procedure that they have to follow to get title. The municipality must make application to the Land Titles Office and then a notice is served on the farmer telling him his taxes are in arrears. If he doesn't know already that the 1971 taxes are in arrears, we are not out in the middle, or past the middle, we are half past 1974. Nothing further can be done until after the expiration of another six months.

Another six months goes by and if the taxes aren't paid after this additional six months, the municipality can now proceed. And before it can do anything at all it must now apply to the Provincial Mediation Board and the farmer gets another 30 days. Before making final application for title, the owner gets notice of this final application, so they have to make two separate applications in the Land Titles Office, one other application to the Provincial Mediation Board. If the Provincial Mediation Board will not proceed, then you can't proceed. And it would be very simple for this Government to have said to the Provincial Mediation Board, which is now their servant, take it easy on these applications for final title. Make very sure that anybody, that any municipality that applies for final title, absolutely should do so, before letting them go ahead. It can easily be stopped at that level because there is no municipality in this Province which can get final title without the consent of the Provincial Mediation Board.

Here we may well be in the midst of 1975. Now, from the things that I have said, you might get the idea, you may well get the idea, that it takes anywhere from three to five years to acquire title by tax proceedings. And if you have that idea, you have the right idea. The taking of land by a municipality for taxes is a long and tedious process. Now, of course, you can shorten it up if you move instantly the very moment you are entitled to take the next step. I have never yet seen a municipality move the very first second that it is entitled to do so.

I have only dealt with a part of this Bill. Livestock presents a special problem, particularly the buying and selling so frequently of these cattle. All I wanted to do was attempt to show to this House the total futility of this Bill. This Bill is absolutely unnecessary. Now it would help if the Government was willing to spend some of its own money, of course. In the end the farmer is hurt very much by this Bill. Will the machine companies be hurt? Well, not likely. The machine companies cannot sue the dealer while the Act is in force but at the end of that term the bill still must be paid. This means that the dealer will be obliged to pay the machine company and he may lose money because in many cases the machine will have been kept another year and it will be worth a lot less than when they would have liked to have seized it.

So as a result, the farmer has had continued use of the machine and the machine dealer loses. As I mentioned, under the Conditional Sale Agreement, the farmer cannot be sued for the value of this machine. So at the end of this year, if the

machine is worth what is owing on it, the farmer pays for it but if it is worth a lot less, the farmer says, the heck with it. He doesn't do anything. The dealer takes the loss.

So we face the prospect of these machine dealers through the province, not the machine companies or the manufacturers, we face the prospect of machine dealers throughout Saskatchewan going broke or suffering serious financial difficulties because of this legislation. It won't hurt the banks, and it won't hurt the trust companies. The Co-op Trust Company, however, may well be hurt because it does make some loans to farmers.

Trust companies have the odd residual one and that is all. Banks, frequently are covered by Federal guarantees, but credit unions are in the class of lending institutions which lend the most — on a percentage basis — across the board, across the board groups referred to in this legislation. That is, they lend on land, they lend on farm implements and they lend on livestock. No other lending institution is more broadly under the shadow of this legislation than our credit unions.

I spoke to a manager of a credit union this morning. He tells me that at least 30 to 40 per cent of his loans will be affected, or could be affected, by this legislation. I have a letter dated August 6, 1971 delivered to me this morning. It is from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited, 2625 Victoria Avenue, Regina, Saskatchewan, and it is addressed to me, re: Family Farm Protection Act, 1971, and it says this:

Saskatchewan Credit Unions, like the Members of the Legislature are concerned about the debt problems of farmers. While The Family Farm Protection Act, 1971 seeks to alleviate these problems, it may create secondary effects which would interfere with the ability of Saskatchewan credit unions to meet their commitments to a large number of their members, who deposit money with and borrow from credit unions. We, therefore, request that this legislation be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers so that credit union members may be heard on this vital matter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — A higher percentage of their accounts, of credit unions, will come under this Act than any other lending institution, and as a result they suffer the most. No institution has as high a percentage as the credit unions of Saskatchewan. Now these weren't dealt with by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) in his remarks. His only comment was that the Liberal Party would return to its traditional role of defending the big Eastern lenders. Now that is the kind of argument you use when you don't have an argument. That's the very argument that you use when you don't want to discuss the Bill on its merits. You go back to this old hate program, all those big Eastern lenders and jazz like that.

So the Provincial Government wants to get the political mileage but it wants someone else to pay for the gas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — We gather from the remarks of the Members that they do not desire this Bill be discussed in detail on its merit. We recommend that it be sent to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers, which I refer to as the Law Amendments Committee. I suggest that all interested parties be permitted to present their case and give their views as to this legislation. Now, if you cannot present this Bill and subject it to the cold light of careful scrutiny, then I have reason to doubt that it has any merit. We also have reason to doubt that the Government itself has any confidence in this enactment.

Now, the Attorney General frankly admitted that the Bill was an experiment. If it is an experiment as he says, it is only fair that those affected must have the right to express their views. We don't know whom they have consulted. They certainly have not contacted the 17 organizations that we contacted, at least not prior to the time that we contacted them.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more remarks to address to this Bill, and I call it 5:30.

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

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, it may be worth noting for the record that there is, at very best, a corporal's guard on the other side, and I wonder if we chased them all way. I don't think we have a quorum here. Not even a private's guard, let alone a corporal's guard.

Mr. Speaker, before the call for 5:30, I reviewed for the House the various measures presently enforced for the protection of farmers, dealing in some detail with the protection of farmers having mortgages, protection from seizure of implements under The Limitations of Civil Rights Act and the protection given to farmers who have failed to pay taxes, this latter under The Tax Enforcement Lien Act and The Provincial Mediation Board Act.

I acknowledge to the House that if a diligent rural municipality desired to take every step the very second the time became available, it would, of course, shorten the procedure somewhat. It would materially shorten up the procedure and the same remarks would apply with equal force to the other two proceedings that I described.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, my statement and my submission to this House is that the proposed legislation is ill-advised, badly drafted, badly conceived. It has no place at the present time in our farm economy, it does harm, it can't possibly help anybody. One of the speakers across the way, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk) was speaking to this Bill and said that many repossessions are taking place at this time. But he didn't tell us how many repossessions were taking place. I wonder if his imagination is running away with him in this regard, the same as it was in connection with the threatened foreclosure of land.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the Act there is a section that makes this Statute apply to the Farm Credit Corporation and all the rest of the lending institutions. Now, Farm Credit Corporation has told us that the last foreclosure that it did was in 1957, 14 years ago. I don't propose to suggest that there is a

great deal of significance about the fact that the then CCF were in power at that time. The point I wish to emphasize is that it was 14 years ago that the Farm Credit Corporation last took a foreclosure proceeding in the foreclosing of property. The only one under way now, at this time, by the Farm Credit Corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan is a foreclosure that has been necessary because the husband and wife have separated. It is a family problem and neither one of them are prepared to make the payments on the mortgage and if nobody is prepared to make payment on the mortgage for fear of helping the other party, then the mortgage company has no choice but to proceed to foreclose. Probably the Farm Credit Corporation will be doing one or other of the parties a favor by carrying out these foreclosure proceedings and perhaps forcing one or the other of the parties, or both of them, to do something about the farm land. But the point that I make is that the only foreclosure under way at the present time, and the last one for 14 years, is one dealing with a family separation where the parties absolutely refuse to pay the mortgage. I don't know what you can do in good times or in bad times, that if people refuse to pay the mortgage, you have no choice but to let the mortgage company foreclose. In this case, because it is a family break-up that is the initiating cause of the foreclosure, I conclude that in this case the Act becomes a non-family Farm Protection Act. It certainly isn't protecting a family farm or certainly not a family.

This is the sort of imagination that has gone into the creation of this particular statute. It would be very nice if in listening to the speeches of the Members of the Government we could be given specific facts on the number of foreclosures, the specific facts on the number of seizures, and the specific facts on the number of lands being taken for tax under tax enforcement proceedings. How many final ones have gone through and how many extensions are actually being granted?

Mr. Speaker, that isn't the only problem. The Hon. Attorney General said in his remarks in support of the Bill that he hoped that the Bill wouldn't be needed after July 31, 1972. Now, that implied threat or that implied future extension of the Bill, is one that is a concern of many people. The Bill could be extended in two ways. First of all, it could be extended as to time. It goes at the present time to July 31, 1972, but there is absolutely nothing to say that it couldn't be extended for a year or two beyond that, and it could be extended to cover other items. It could be extended to cover repairs, gas, oil and, for that matter, it could extend to cover practically anything that the farmer might purchase. The result of all of this is that the farmers will probably be put on the cash basis. I doubt if anyone would dare to sell to the farmer except by cash if there is the threat that the bill which the creditor puts on his books cannot be collected by an extension of this Act one way or the other. As a result, the family farm or any other farm will find itself having to pay cash or be deprived of the items that it wants.

Now the Attorney General said that 99 per cent of the Saskatchewan farmers are honest. Well, that is absolutely true and that is exactly the 99 per cent that are being hurt by this legislation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we suggest that the Government do one or other of the following: First of all, we think it should go to the Law Amendments Committee. We urge that it go to the Law Amendments Committee. We hope the Government will not deprive such people as the credit unions, and I

refer specifically to the letter which I read earlier. If this statute has any merit at all, the Government should have absolutely no fear of placing the cold light of day upon it.

Secondly, we ask that the Act be amended. There is no reason why this cannot be greatly improved. We are not happy with it, and we do not intend to specify the type of amendment that should be put into this Act, obviously, however, it could use a lot of amendment. The very best solution, of course, is to withdraw the Act entirely. I realize that there is a problem of saving face . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — . . . there is a face-saving problem and to get over that — if I may be so bold — I should like to recommend to the Government that it pass the legislation and never proclaim it. I think they should treat this legislation the way they propose to treat the amendments to The Labour Standards Act. They propose to pass it but who knows when, if ever, it will be proclaimed, and that would be a nice face-saving gesture. We should be out of this House and they could run around saying what good guys they are and yet nobody would be scared off by the ridiculous Statute that we are discussing.

I realize that withdrawing the Act involves a tremendous sacrifice of face and one which this Government, so newly installed in the office, may not wish to suffer. I am fearful that this will not come about, however, because I just read in tonight's paper of the determination of the Government. The heading on page one of the Leader-Post, "Bill to be enforced at once."

The Government intends to bring in at once The Family Farm Protection Act as soon as the Bill is passed through the Legislature, Agriculture Minister Jack Messer said Monday, despite protests from implement dealers and finance companies.

Maybe the Leader-Post should well have said, "despite protests from implement dealers and credit unions." I suppose credit unions may well be included in the group called finance companies.

My recommendation to the Government is that the Act be withdrawn and quietly buried as quickly as possible. The next recommendation is that if they can't withdraw the Act, that they guarantee the debts of farmers, that would be the most positive step that this Government could take.

Mr. Steuart: — Follow our example!

Mr. MacLeod: — Follow the example of the last Government which actually guaranteed the debts of farmers. Don't ask somebody else to take a risk that you are not prepared to take. How about putting up some money yourself? This is another recommendation. How about actually putting up some dollars if this is such an urgent need? The Federal Government proposes to put out \$100 million, if it isn't continuously stymied by the Opposition parties in Ottawa. How about something from this Government? Under the circumstances, I have no choice but to support the proposal that this Bill be transferred to the Law Amendments Committee, failing that, we do ask for substantial amendments,

failing that, we ask that it be withdrawn, failing that, we ask that they put up some money and failing that, I shall oppose the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I really can't agree with the Hon. Member from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) that there is no need for some form of legislation that provides protection for the farmer, because I have had a conversation with a sheriff, just not too long ago before the election and he said, that he has never been so busy in all the years that he has worked for the department. There must be a need for it, he wouldn't be busy if he wasn't going around doing something about some of the debts.

I recall another example where last year in my constituency a farmer who had a substantial amount of land had to give up one quarter of land so that he could save the rest, because he couldn't make payments on all of it. He had made a \$2,000 payment on that land but he gave up the quarter and lost the \$2,000. So there definitely is a need.

Mr. Speaker, in this second reading of this Bill to protect farm property, this House is looking at the most important industry in Saskatchewan. We can talk about our potash mines and our pulp mill, or any other industry, we can combine all of them and still the primary industry of this Province is agriculture. There have been times when some forgot the importance of farming in Saskatchewan, but in recent years — which have been crisis years for our farmers — the dependence of our towns and yes, even our cities, on agriculture, on the farmer, has been made very clear.

During recent years, Mr. Speaker, the degradation of Saskatchewan agriculture has been accelerated. There have been many reasons for this, one has been the serious drop in markets for our wheat and a drop in Canada's share in the world market for grain. Another reason is the fact that while the cost of production has been rapidly increasing, the price for the farm produce has remained the same, or in some cases declined. A third reason, and maybe the major reason for this degradation of Saskatchewan agriculture and the related decline of our rural communities, is the inaction and neglect of the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, for some time now pressure has been put on the Federal Government by community, business, professional and farm organizations for a massive cash injection into the Western farm economy.

As a matter of fact, the New Democratic Party has time and time again urged the Federal Government to do this. At the 1970 Session of the Legislature, the NDP Members presented a resolution which urged:

That this Legislature urge the Government of Saskatchewan to consider and the Federal Government of Canada to provide an immediate cash injection to farmers of Saskatchewan in order to stabilize agriculture and its related services.

Being in Opposition at that time, the NDP asked for no less than \$200 million.

Mr. Speaker, the reply of the Liberal Government in 1970 was such that a resolution was substituted which essentially said that they were satisfied with what the Federal Government was doing. As a result of this economic crisis, Mr. Speaker, and as a result of Government neglect, many farmers have been forced to sell out. Many farmers who still hang on have been forced to go into debt to such an extent that their whole operation is geared from one mortgage payment to the next. Our rural areas are being very rapidly depopulated. Anyone who did any travelling during the recent election campaign couldn't help but notice that the auction sale posters, almost outnumbered the election signs.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, many of them didn't, that's why they are not here.

This kind of situation is very desperate, it is a serious crisis, and there is need for some fast action. Many farmers, if they do not get some relief, will not last the winter. Some farmers, if they do not get some protection of their property from seizures, will not be able to pay any other debts.

Farmers need some time to catch their breath. They are unable to sell enough grain to pay their debts. This Bill will free farmers who are seriously short of cash from the enslavement to large mortgage payments for one year.

I can see the possibility of farmers using the money saved from the payments on mortgages on land, machinery and livestock, to pay small debts in their local communities. This, Mr. Speaker, is important because our small businesses in our rural communities are finding themselves in a desperate situation along with the farmer.

In the last year sales in this Province have dropped by a large percentage from 1964 by something like 40 per cent or 50 per cent. If farmers use the money they would ordinarily use to pay mortgages to pay local debts, this will help the rural community businessman get back on his feet.

Mr. Speaker, in every sector of our economy different industries are protected and continuously get concessions. When the publishing industry gets into difficulty, the Canadian Government is right there with money, is right there with a loan.

When Parsons and Whittemore want to build a pulp mill in Saskatchewan, the people of this Province pay for subsidies that are provided. Saskatchewan people, including the farmers, are expected to risk millions while Parsons and Whittemore are guaranteed 70 per cent of the profits if the mill is successful. The mill gets natural gas at cut prices, the mill gets pulp provided by a Crown corporation which lost money, which was subsidized by taxpayers, many of whom are farmers.

But, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is left unprotected and with no guarantees. No government of Canada has been prepared to guarantee the farmer anything worthwhile. In Britain the wheat support prices are set at \$2 a bushel; in Mexico \$2.13 a bushel — poverty-stricken Mexico; in the European economic community \$3.10 a bushel. These are a long way from the wheat price guarantee in Canada which is \$1.50 a bushel, the lowest in the world.

The debts that many farmers find themselves in today are due to a large extent to the lack of protection or guarantee in a world where almost all concerns that farmers deal with are protected.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I do not believe that this Bill will in any way solve the real problems in agriculture, the problems such as the rising costs and declining prices and declining sales and bad advice from too many politicians who think more of their political ambitions than they do of the people whom they represent.

These problems will not be solved by this Bill, but it will give farmers just a little more time until the remainder of the New Democratic Party's New Deal for People is implemented.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — When the Land Bank Commission is established, it will provide cash relief. This protection of farm property from seizure may give many farmers a little more time while the Federal Government decides when it is going to let the \$100 million be sent out to the farmers as it should have been done months ago. It is going to give Mr. Lang just a little more time to get the message from the people that he is now hearing as he travels across this Province, that they are not going to be blackmailed, that they want that \$100 million, but they are not going to be blackmailed and go for the passing of the Stabilization Act which should get some pretty close study before it is ever passed.

It should be clearly understood that it would be of no advantage to any farmer who is able to make his payments to withhold them, that payments and interest are stayed for one year, but they are not forgiven forever.

The fears expressed by the Members opposite about the damage to farmers' credit rating are somewhat exaggerated. This Bill will protect farm property from seizure which has been mortgaged prior to the implementation of this Bill. Any purchases made after this are not subject to this Act. Credit will still be available.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this Bill will give farmers short of cash a one-year period in which to find themselves financially. It may prevent many from leaving the farm and further depopulating our rural areas. This in turn will be important in preserving our rural towns and villages. Farmers who find themselves in this crisis need some protection. This Bill will provide a short period of protection and therefore I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to enter the debate and rise to speak in support of The Family Farm Protection Act.

It has been rather interesting to watch the Opposition wiggle and squirm and try to find someone whom they could find in the Saskatchewan populace to defend. I can understand why they didn't want to come out and speak in favor of the multi-national farming companies or the large mortgage companies, so they have now become the self-appointed protectors of the credit

unions. After seven years of ignoring the credit unions and allowing the Co-operative Department to fall into a state of disrepair, they now emerge as the knights in shining armour, defending Saskatchewan's credit unions. I am sure we all welcome them into the fold.

Mr. Speaker, they have also come out in favor of supporting and bringing forward ideas to help the small implement dealer. For seven years they watched a number of these implement dealers decrease rapidly in Saskatchewan as one by one they were forced into bankruptcy. Now, sitting in the Opposition, they all of a sudden realize that this segment of the economy, is in difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that there are problems facing agriculture in Saskatchewan. The major problem is one of rising costs of production and declining prices for the products farmers have to sell. We have not put this legislation forward as a solution. We have put it forward as a stop-gap measure to attempt to stabilize the agricultural situation while further legislation is prepared to meet the crisis that we find Saskatchewan agriculture in. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition have spent most of their time picking holes in this Bill, they have never once spoken to the principle, the idea of a debt moratorium, they've simply picked a hole here and a hole there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — I should be interested in their comments as to whether or not, if they could design what they would consider a perfect Bill for debt moratorium, whether or not they are in favor of the principle or whether they are just picking holes in it so they don't have to take a stand one way or the other. Mr. Speaker, we have not chosen to tie up this legislation, as the Federal Government did with the \$100 million payment, by sticking it on to a piece of other legislation so that it would be held up in the House and the payment couldn't be made or the assistance given to the farmers.

This weekend I spoke to many people about this Bill. Nowhere did I meet any outright opposition to it. Many people put forward questions and in most cases I was able to answer them. I know the Opposition will find this hard to understand. It is something that has been absent in Saskatchewan for the past seven years, but people of this Province have faith in this Government. The people I talked to are convinced that if this Government finds that this Bill works hardship on a particular group, the Government will take action to remedy it and on this basis they are ready and willing to support this legislation at this time in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, on that basis I am pleased to indicate that I will support second reading of this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in regard to this Bill that is before us now. It is interesting to note that this Bill is to protect the farmers and yet the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) deems it necessary to be out of the House practically every minute since this Bill came up this afternoon. I saw him here a minute ago and he was reading something in the Leader-Post. That's the contribution that he makes to this debate.

Then the Hon. Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) mentioned that there were more 'for sale' signs of farmers than there were NDP signs. Well, when I looked at the NDP signs where they were at the farms, you know, in my constituency I don't want to say that all the people who voted NDP were poor farmers, but when you look at the New Deal signs, they were always placed at the dilapidated junk yards, that my sign just couldn't come up there at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — All you are doing is you are supporting the two-bit farmer, maybe one per cent of the farmers that you are applying this Bill to. Nobody would want to give them credit but here you think that you have a real Bill for the majority of the farmers in Saskatchewan. The Humboldt Member also said that we have been subsidizing the pulp mill, Landegger, etc., with gas and pulp, well, you know, you are in the driver's seat now, you are the Government, why don't you subsidize the farmer? You don't give him anything. No, sir. The farm machinery implement dealers that were here today and who have met with you since morning and this afternoon, have told you the facts of life. They want you, and we have their brief, and in point 2 they say:

Financial assistance or guarantees on loans presently held by farmers.

No, you are going to the implement dealers, you are going to the merchants in Saskatchewan, you are going to the Family Credit Corporations and saying, now look, the Saskatchewan farmer is hard up and we want you to help share and ease their burden. When I listened the other day to the Attorney General's (Mr. Romanow) remarks on the second reading of this Bill, never to my knowledge have I heard a Minister of the Crown present such an unconvincing argument, such a lame excuse, for the reasons given how and why this legislation is intended to assist the farmer. Although I realize that he is a labor lawyer, he doesn't know a farmer from a load of hay. I know he tried to make a good case but I couldn't get the point at all. I believe the editorial in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of last Saturday sums it up very well when it says that the Government feels it necessary to introduce such a Bill at this time. It states that the farm debt legislation seems to have been conceived in some ways . . . Oh, welcome here, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) . . . The Star-Phoenix editorial says that the farm debt legislation seems to have been conceived in some haste as a sop to the farmer voters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Many dealers and farmers have expressed shock and dismay at the Government's attitude to the farmer. The dealer, the implement companies and those involved in helping to finance agricultural industry are shocked. I am surprised that there are a good number of dealers who supported the NDP and as I said, on election night that people voted for Socialism and Socialism they'll get. Yes, sir! They are shocked by the fact that the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General were considered right-wing Socialists at their leadership convention. They are considered to be right-wing Socialists, they did not support the left-wing, the Wafflers, my friend there from Saskatoon University

(Mr. Richards), they didn't support him. And this cost the Attorney General the leadership. The Attorney General didn't get the leadership because he was considered to be too right wing. Neither did Mr. Messer.

Mr. Steuart: — They weren't sure which wing he was on. He was wing ding, I think.

Mr. Boldt: — The farmers and the dealers had stated to me personally that if these right wingers introduce such extreme left-wing legislation, what is one to expect from the Premier and the left-wing elements.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — He had to promise all kinds of support in order to get this leadership. Dealers have told me that with this legislation, no farmer except those personally known to them, and this is important, no dealer unless these people are known by the dealer who have good security and financial backing, will be given as much as \$1 worth of credit. It would be interesting to know, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) how many farmers will be able to buy this chemical to spray their rape fields. Will the banks give them credit?

Mr. Messer: — This Bill will pay for it!

Mr. Boldt: — No, sir, no, sir! They say if the Government tells the farmer not to pay the bill to the dealer, credit union or machine company, they are better off to keep their repairs in the stockroom. This is what the dealers are going to do.

A little better than a year ago a Saskatchewan lawyer, Otto Lang, introduced to the farmer the Operation LIFT Program. What it in fact did was to tell the farmer in no uncertain terms that if you want to sell a bushel of wheat you have to have at least of one acre of summerfallow. I had never before witnessed such dictatorial, in fact Communistic attitude, by a Member of a senior Government directed toward a Prairie farmer. Never had I realized that there would be another two lawyers, plus the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, who would want to display the same type of arrogance, perhaps illegal dictatorship, as witnessed in Bill 9.

The Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture said in this debate because of the great many legal technicalities involved it was felt that the Attorney General should pilot the Bill through the House. Well, you know, it is really too bad that they have a Minister of Agriculture who can't even pilot the Bill, he doesn't even know what the farmers want.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — A Bill that cannot be understood and explained by the Minister of Agriculture is poor legislation in itself. I want to tell you why Operation LIFT and this Stabilization Program by Otto Lang had so much trouble being explained to the people, because nobody believes in it and he can't explain it anyway.

If the Bill is so technical that even the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) found it difficult to explain in the House — as a matter of fact he didn't explain it — then I suggest that if it is passed, the Saskatchewan lawyers are going to have a real field day with it. Rather than call it the farm debt legislation, it should be entitled the Saskatchewan lawyers' field-day bill. Every lawyer in this Province and outside are certainly going to have their feet in the trough.

When one reads the Farm Credit report and the statement by Mr. J.M. Day, Branch Manager of Saskatchewan, in which he reports and I quote:

A quick check of his files showed that the last time he Corporation foreclosed on a farm for money owing was back in 1957.

There is currently one case before the courts but it involves a family matter, as the Hon. Member (Mr. MacLeod) from this side who spoke has mentioned. I don't think there is any need for the farmers to be worried about losing their land. The Farm Credit Corporation does not want to seize land. The Federal Government doesn't want to own land. It wants to assist the farmer to own his land. That's what the Farm Credit Corporation is there for.

Mr. Messer: — . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, will you keep that young Minister of Agriculture, who doesn't know what he's talking about, quiet until I finish speaking.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I don't doubt whether he knows that Bill 9 is being debated now. I really doubt if he knows that Bill 9 is being debated.

The Farm Credit Corporation doesn't want to seize land, it wants to assist the farmer to own his own land. And they will do everything possible to help the farmer in making the necessary arrangements to make it possible for him to pay off his loan. I am confident that it has been aptly proven that as far as the farmer is concerned, he should have no fear or concern that he will lose his land by foreclosure. There is absolutely no need for Bill 9 to protect him in this area.

The implement dealers have come out strongly opposing the Bill and saying that it is a bad piece of legislation and we don't want it to go past second reading.

Many of the officials of lending institutions intimated that the Act would make it more difficult to get loans this year. I am sure that this will be the case. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that many farmers today will find it extremely difficult to borrow money to spray their rape fields with this Bill hanging over the lending institutions' heads.

Instead of wasting his time on this left-wing legislation, the Minister of Agriculture should have been busy checking out where and what kind of chemicals could be made available for the

control of the army worm which is now destroying a multi-million dollar crop in Saskatchewan. Then of all the things, you hear from the Minister the other day the way they have ridiculed foreign investment, we don't want United States' capital in here, he had to stand up and say that the chemical is going to come from Texas. Hundreds of acres of rape are already totally destroyed. Had this happened when we were the Government, one would have been severely criticized by the farm leaders. Why is Roy Atkinson so silent about this matter? You are so embarrassed that you didn't have any of these chemicals here, you people knew. Surely, so many farmers are almost completely dependent on the proceeds of their rape crop to see it destroyed in only a matter of a few days. Norman Bourassa, Collection Supervisor with the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society, is reported in the Leader-Post as saying that farm machine manufacturers are becoming leery of dealing in Saskatchewan. And here you want to bring industry and jobs into Saskatchewan.

This is a Government that only a few weeks ago told the voters of Saskatchewan, elect an NDP Government and we will get industry in Saskatchewan and jobs for our young people. Already the Choiceland iron mine development and the pulp mill at Meadow Lake have been told they are not welcome in Saskatchewan. Now the farm implement dealers and the machine companies are getting their dose of Socialism, and their eyes are popping, and they are already thinking of closing their doors.

Wells Construction of Saskatoon — for the city Members of Saskatoon — who have been in this Province for 60 years, a few weeks after the election of June 23rd announced that they were pulling out of Saskatchewan. Socialism does not want industry and many more industries and dealers will be moving out in the next four years. The Attorney General said the other day that all the Government is asking the lending institutions, the machine companies and the implement dealers to do is to leave the farmers alone for one year. And he said, quote:

You have made good money in years gone by, please be good boys for one year and help carry the farmers through the crisis.

That's the farm legislation that we are talking about. This is hard to understand when more grain has moved through our ports in the last crop year than ever before. More rape, flax, and barley have been sold in the last crop year than ever before. Wheat deliveries are up only a shade but almost 80 million bushels more have been sold than a year ago. Why this legislation now when things are going up? When things are beginning to look better for the farmer, the implement dealer and the lending institutions, the NDP Government is prepared to put the damper on the economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Well, I cannot agree that the implement dealer has made good money in the past on the farmer and that he now has an obligation as a good citizen to carry them on for one year. Many manufacturers have had hard times in the last four years and they, too, cannot agree with the Attorney General that they are loaded with past profits. Now be good boys and help the farmers by carrying his interest and debt charges. The NDP Government is not prepared to put up one plugged nickel to save

the family farm. The Premier said, during the election campaign, elect an NDP Government and we will save the family farm. Whom does he ask to save the family farm now — the implement dealer, the lending institutions. The past Liberal Government made millions of dollars available to the farmers of Saskatchewan. This was done through the credit unions, the Wheat Pool and the banks, and other lending agencies. The past Government guaranteed loans and in some cases subsidized the interest rate. This Government has no intention of financially assisting the farmer. The facts will be proven in a matter of months that the NDP is not the friend of the farmer. The farmer is his enemy. The NDP is a Socialist labor Government. It is no supporter of Free Enterprise especially when he is a farmer. How long will it take this Government to introduce legislation asking Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation not to collect from the owner payments if the landlord is unemployed through lay-off or through strike action? Why do it only for the farmer? The Attorney General has admitted that Bill 9 could be challenged in the courts as being illegal. This is a strange attitude, a real strange attitude from the labor lawyer who is now the Attorney General and a serious one to take by the Attorney General, although not a surprise to me when I examine the left-wing elements within his Party. Unless the Government is prepared to put up its guarantee to the implement dealers, I just cannot see how I can support this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the delegations who are meeting with the Government and with the Members of the Opposition, we want to meet with the credit unions, the implement dealers again, with the automobile dealers, with the livestock dealers, and real estate organizations, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Motion for adjournment negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 11

Messieurs

Gardner	McIsaac	Lane
Grant	Loken	MacDonald
Boldt	Weatherald	(Moose Jaw North)
MacDonald	MacLeod	
(Milestone)	McPherson	

NAYS — 42

Messieurs

Blakeney	Robbins	Dyck
Brockelbank	Pepper	Cowley
Byers	Michayluk	Cody
Wood	Meakes	Gross
Smishek	Whelan	Feduniak
Romanow	Brown	Mostoway
Messer	Kwasnica	Comer
Snyder	Carlson	Rolfes
Bowerman	Engel	Lange
MacMurchy	Tchorzewski	Hanson
Kowalchuk	Richards	Oliver
Baker	Owens	Feschuk
Thibault	Taylor	Kaeding
Matsalla	Faris	Flasch

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very sorry that the Government has felt that they do not want to see these delegations. They have intimated to us and I'm sure to them that they will want to come in tomorrow and they certainly would have an opportunity to weigh their opinion as to whether it is good for Saskatchewan, for the implement dealer, for the farmer. I regret very much that this huge majority doesn't listen to the majority of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House at this time will do more harm than good in its present form. It will destroy the farmer's ability to obtain credit. Members opposite use as a defence the position that the legislation does not apply to future debts. I submit this argument is false and wrong, Mr. Speaker, because this legislation postpones debts and does not cancel them. At the end of the stated period of one year, the farmer will have two debts, two payments to make. Who will loan money to anyone who has a substantial debt load? Who, I ask, Mr. Speaker, will loan money without any collateral? Small loans may be available on credit but the collateral necessary for large purchases will be tied up by this legislation. This legislation removes collateral from past debts but it makes the farmer a poorer credit risk by requiring the delayed payment to come due next year, in effect requiring two payments on August 1, 1972.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) says the legislation will protect the local implement dealer. Let's see what the Act does to him. Section 14 removes the right of action against the vendor of a farm implement as long as the vendor's action is stayed. Where does that leave him? He will be required to pay interest to his manufacturer and if he does attempt to repossess he will repossess an implement that has an extra year's depreciation. It is the implement dealer who will be required to take this loss which could be worth thousands and thousands of dollars on large implements. Now the implement dealer is required to take a loss. What about the farmer who has sold some land and is using this money to live on? He will have absolutely no action if the purchaser does not intend to pay.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will help, and I repeat 'help', the American who has purchased farm land from our citizens under an Agreement for Sale. Here's what the absentee purchasers can do under this legislation. They can get by for several months without paying under the protection of this Act. It gives them the opportunity to invest their monies at interest rates that are usually high on a short term while the local Saskatchewan vendor get nothing in the meantime. It is our Saskatchewan vendor who is living in the city, in the cities of this Province, who will now have to pay and probably have to go on welfare because he will have no income coming in. The absentee landlord will not be available to give evidence and is not required to give evidence. The onus will be on the local vendor of that land to try and prove that an absentee vendor-purchaser is able to pay under this Act.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will help and not hinder the American absentee purchasers of Saskatchewan land. I submit again that this is some new deal! This legislation can harm and will harm and not help both the implement dealers and the farm vendors.

Now what about the lending institutions. Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about banks, mortgage and insurance companies. We are talking about local community credit unions. Members opposite seem to have forgotten about their former co-operative friends. There is no Minister in charge of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. The local credit union will have no right to recover money owed to them for a year. There will be little money coming in and no credit will thus be available to the farmer. I ask the Members to think back to the debt adjustment legislation of 20 some years ago, and you've used the argument that the farmers are basically honest and we quite agree with that — but they are not dishonest by using this legislation and the debt adjustment legislation showed that the farmers would take advantage of the legislation passed and if the farmers take advantage of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is the small credit union and no one else which will suffer because there will be no monies coming in. The farmer is not being dishonest by taking advantage of this legislation. There will be little money coming in and again no credit will be available. This legislation is going to devastate the local small credit unions and no monies will be available for the farmer.

Mr. Romanow: — A year from now when you read the word "devastation" you'll be sorry you said it.

Mr. Lane: — I'll never be sorry I said this unless you are changing the legislation, Mr. Attorney General.

So far this Bill hits the farmer, the farm-vendor, the implement dealer and the credit unions. What does the Government do about it? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) very proudly stated that in this House that the Government doesn't have to put up any money at all. A lot of faith you have in the Saskatchewan farmer and I ask what kind of a Government that won't back the Saskatchewan farmer in this crisis that has been pounded into the people by the Government opposite.

Now for argument's sake, and I repeat for argument's sake only, let's accept the Government's position and see what the Bill does not do. The definition of debt in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, does not include debt consolidation loans and there are probably millions of dollars loaned out for debt consolidation which may have no security or charge and may merely be evidenced by a promissory note given by the farmer. Now most of these loans are held by finance companies and the NDP is in the very unenviable position by this legislation of protecting such companies as the Attorney General has said, Traders Finance, Pacific Finance. You are the defenders of the finance companies with this legislation. The Bill makes no provisions for those farmers who made an honest effort to straighten out their affairs in the past under the provisions of The Orderly Payment of Debts provision of the Bankruptcy Act of Canada. The Minister of Agriculture has stated that there is no concern about legislative jurisdiction but I don't think the Attorney General of

this Province will argue that government can interfere in any way with the bankruptcy legislation by means of this Provincial legislation.

Returning to the Bill as it now stands, the Premier made some very, very pious statements in this House in dealing with Medicare Bill about Government by Order-in-Council, when trying to justify the calling of this Session to deal with the medicare deterrent fees. Now again we have the Attorney General of this Province proudly saying that there will be all sort of exemptions, and all sorts of powers of legislation by Order-in-Council. I ask the Government opposite where is your consistency and where do you stand, Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Premier, on the principle of governing? Make up your mind or at least quit being hypocritical about your position.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does nothing in its present form to solve the farm problem. It is another example of window dressing legislation. It is legislation which will protect the American purchaser of Saskatchewan farm land. It is legislation that will make the Saskatchewan vendor of farm land suffer. It is legislation which will harm the local implement dealer and make it difficult for the farmer to obtain credit for repairs and equipment in the time of equipment breakdown.

I cannot support this legislation in its present form, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion for adjournment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 11

Messieurs

Gardner
Grant
Boldt
MacDonald
(Milestone)

McIsaac
Loken
Weatherald
MacLeod
McPherson

Lane
MacDonald
(Moose Jaw North)

NAYS — 42

Messieurs

Blakeney
Brockelbank
Byers
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Bowerman
MacMurchy
Kowalchuk
Baker
Thibault
Matsalla

Robbins
Pepper
Michayluk
Meakes
Whelan
Brown
Kwasnica
Carlson
Engel
Tchorzewski
Richards
Owens
Taylor
Faris

Dyck
Cowley
Cody
Gross
Feduniak
Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Lange
Hanson
Oliver
Feschuk
Kaeding
Flasch

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Lane: — Sorry, Mr. Speaker, again I have asked the Government

to be very, very careful with this legislation. In the past the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has stated that I was critical of the previous Government's legislation and I was trying to give the Minister of Agriculture some constructive criticism by telling him that the legislation that is already on the books, which is more advanced than in any other province in this country, has gone far enough. He made mention the other day that I told my constituents this. Yes, I told my constituents this whenever they mentioned the fact that they were having difficulty getting parts or equipment. I advised them that it was this legislation which was a pretty big factor in many of these people leaving the province. I explained to them — and I make no apologies for this — that the legislation was put in at their request and for their protection. They agreed with this. And I also explained to them that it was this legislation that served to drive many of these people out of business and the farmers have suffered because of it. The farmers admitted that they wanted this legislation at that time.

I am saying, simply, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, that the legislation we have now goes far enough, and the farmer will be hurt and will suffer by the legislation that you have proposed in its present form. If you have major changes, we should certainly like to hear about them. We have seen nothing. I cannot support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak in support of The Family Farm Protection Act. Regardless of what the Members opposite have had to say, as far as how much sense the farmers have if they can understand this Bill or not, in my constituency I give the farmers credit for knowing that this Bill is designed to help them.

There are many people in my constituency. I've visited with them at two or three Homecoming functions in the last week and they are really concerned that this kind of protection be given to our families who need help. We need a program where steps are taken to salvage the farm units that are doomed by the threats of repossession and seizures and we need this help now. Hard-working, good-managing people have found themselves in difficulty. They need this extra time that this Bill will give them. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they have earned a chance at one more year of operation. Surely they have earned a chance to keep and maintain their way of life that they have chosen. The Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) doesn't seem to have a clue what this way of life is all about. Ever since settling in this Province, farming is a way of life. This Bill was designed to protect this way of life.

There are several reasons why some farmers find themselves in a position where they are unable to meet their present commitments. During the growth process in this Province we accept it as a norm that we had to expand. We thought we had to get bigger to stay in the game. The farmer found himself in a vicious circle where he needed more and more credit to develop an economic unit. Going into this new crop year, he is now faced with a shortage of cash, the prices of his commodities are lower than they ever were, the prices of his parts and repairs for his equipment are higher than it has ever been. The farmer finds himself in a situation where it is easier to buy a new

August 9, 1971

piece of equipment than to dig up the cash to repair his old machine. There are those farmers who didn't get on that merry-go-round and expand and buy larger equipment.

A good old friend of mine was at my place just two weeks ago. He is living by himself; he is 65 years old; he took over three-quarters of a section of land from his father; he farms with a John Deere Model D tractor; he has his same 10-foot cultivator and a Model 26 combine. He is not a big spender, Mr. Speaker. But he told me that this is the first year that he had to borrow money to operate since he had his farm. Under Liberal Administration in Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan during seven years of operation, the point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the farmer who expanded is in trouble, the farmer who stayed the same size is in trouble too.

Much of my constituency is suffering this year because of lack of rain. Many of the farmers were telling me that they went into a LIFT Program last year to get sufficient quotas to meet their commitments. This year they put that extra summerfallow back into a crop hoping to make up some of the grain they lost last year, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we found out the hard way. We don't need man-made crop failures down in the southern part of Saskatchewan. Operation LIFT was a program where the Federal Liberals lifted cash out of the farmer's hand. As an example, I should like to quote a farmer who put 250 acres into LIFT last year. If you take into account the crop we had last year, which was a very good crop, and what we expect for this year and the Federal Liberals lifted 5,000 bushels of grain off of this farmer without paying him for it. He got \$1,500 in cash but this was more than used up by the extra summerfallow he had to work.

I have tried to outline some of the reasons why we as farmers find ourselves in so much trouble at this time. Now I should like to point to some of the reasons why we should tide a farmer over on a short-term basis. First, we are all aware of the past performances of the old line parties in Ottawa. They'll throw out a few tidbits every four years or when there will likely be an election so we can expect some extra goodies within the next year. This is one thing the Members opposite have confidence in. They are looking at this Bill as though it is a means in itself. We look at it as though it is a stopgap measure where we're going to hang on for one year longer.

The second little bit of help in the wind is that the famous \$100 million — and I brought along a statement I got in the mail just this past week and I'd like to read it for you in case some of these farmers didn't get theirs. The figures on this insert represent the amount you should receive as a transitional payment under the Prairie Grains Stabilization Act when the legislation has been passed. The Bill has reached the report stage in the House of Commons and will be dealt with after the House of Commons reconvenes. The House is adjourned until September.

The amount is calculated on a basis of \$1.45 per eligible acre with a maximum of 640 acres that are eligible, and my name is on there and the amount I expect to get. Now, this is promised to us and I'm quite confident that Mr. Lang, even if he is an attorney, that he'll come across with this payment within a year, and so I'm saying we need a program that will help us hang on for one more year.

The third reason the farmer needs this Family Farm Protection Act on a short-term basis is that we have to help him hold the fort until the really big guns arrive. There is one program that would put him on his feet without having this big axe hanging over his head. The program I'm speaking about is this Land Bank Commission. It will take some time to set up this program but this time is worth buying, Mr. Speaker.

I feel I have outlined sufficient reasons why the rest of the community will have to bend a little to give the family farm the protection it needs.

I'm happy to say that I'll support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I. Carlson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter this debate to speak to this legislation that is so drastically needed at this time.

First of all, I want to emphasize some of the reasons that this legislation is needed so urgently right now and some of the reasons why the farm population finds itself in such financial straits at this time. It is well known that throughout Saskatchewan as a result of low prices, low quotas, increasing production costs, and in many cases reduced production due to Operation LIFT, many deserving citizens are in receipt of insufficient income to meet their certain fixed financial obligations. One might divide these obligations into two distinct classes. First of all, there are obligations or debts arising under rigid contracts made in harsh terms under conditions entirely different from those at the present time. These are contractual obligations, in some cases secured by mortgages and in other cases unsecured.

On the other hand, there is a certain type of obligation imposed under our system on married people with families arising under an entirely different form of contract, under a contract which has received the blessing of the church, The Marriage Contract, to provide food, clothing and shelter for one's family. Must the first priority be the debts or the contractual obligations? In many instances in Saskatchewan homes today this is the case. Families are doing without in order to meet payments on land, machinery or livestock.

This legislation is designed to allow our people to meet their obligations to their family and postpone their contractual obligations for one year.

At this point I just want to say that in order to secure respect for contracts, they must be fair, humane and possible of performance. I want to make it clear that this legislation does not allow for avoidance of contracts. We must have respect for contracts whether written or even the spoken word if we're going to avoid chaos in our society. Although at times, it appears that certain types of contracts are rigid and harsh, and are not worthy of respect because there is no possibility of performance. Unfortunately our lending institutions have ignored a fundamental fact with respect to the agriculture sector of the economy. This has resulted in widespread breakdown and avoidance of these contracts. These contracts have been drawn up in terms of fixed and definite secured money payments which must be met out of unsecured and uncertain incomes,

August 9, 1971

therefore, impossible to fulfil unless the conditions are favorable throughout the whole term of the agreement.

What I am saying is that our farmers need an extension which this legislation provides because the original contracts do not account for unforeseen things like crop failures or even more seriously now, the low quotas that the farmers are faced with, the government policies of non-production or low production.

These contracts do not give credit for a farmer whose bins are full of grain. The farmer has become a victim of circumstances. His income has declined, not because of laziness or inefficiency but because of poor prices and low quotas but there is nothing in the agreement to forestall or ease the incidence of the default position.

Mr. Speaker, only a couple of weeks ago one of my constituents phoned me about his particular case. In 1968 he borrowed some \$12,000 to purchase a new tractor and a new truck. He's now found himself in the default position although he has bins full of grain. On July 7th the bank seized his machinery and gave him one month to fulfil or to pay his note in full. This kind of action, in my opinion, reduces the credibility of our financial institutions. If a farmer cannot meet an annual payment, how is he going to meet the full obligation? This type of arbitrary dictation compounds the problem rather than helps it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to say I know of a farmer who went into a bank last Saturday to borrow money to purchase some cattle. He wasn't turned down. The young farmer, with a limited amount of assets, managed to borrow \$6,000 to purchase cattle. I think really the Opposition is trying to build false fears in their arguments against this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — The kind of protection that this legislation gives the farmer will allow him time to finish off his crop this fall and again put in his crop next spring. Also it will allow him time to arrange for refinancing if necessary during the next 12 months. It will also give the Government some time to draft more permanent legislation, legislation that will help the farmers in the long term.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that knowing the farmers of this Province as well as I do, they do not need to have their debts waived. The farmers of Saskatchewan are responsible people, but they do deserve economic justice. This Bill is the first step towards the economic justice that the people of Saskatchewan deserve. I, indeed, am pleased to support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown): — This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is one that any Socialist government, anywhere, is liable to pass. It reflects Socialist thinking or a lack of thinking from Section 1 to Section 29.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will do more harm to far more people than it will help. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, typifies Socialist non-help. The Government, in this Bill, has done absolutely nothing to help anyone, in fact by bringing in this legislation, it jeopardizes the very existence of thousands of small businesses in this Province. This legislation is dangerous and could be ruinous to some of our credit unions as well.

The ruination of our small implement dealer and the harm that it can do to the small credit unions, can, Mr. Speaker, have harmful and serious effects on farming and on farmers in general.

Mr. Speaker, I have been engaged in the implement business in rural Saskatchewan for 39 years and have had thousands of dealings with thousands of farmers, through prosperous times and through hard times. The same experience Mr. Speaker, is shared by many other dealers in this Province. The relationship between farmers and dealers, Mr. Speaker, was and is not one forced by law but one that was built up over many years of mutual trust and close friendship.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — The farmer and the dealer, Mr. Speaker, because of the basis of their relationship, were able to work at their business arrangements that were mutually satisfactory and beneficial to both. The same holds true, Mr. Speaker, between the bank manager, the credit union, your grocery storekeeper, the hardware dealer, the bulk fuel dealer and the farmer. These people, Mr. Speaker, and the farmers, were able by working together to build their schools, hospitals, recreation facilities, our churches, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, our communities.

This Bill attempts to split these people into good guys and the bad guys. It divides the community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — The farmers here, Mr. Speaker, have successfully worked out credit arrangements in tough times with the business community. They have been able to do so because they were working with sympathetic, understanding friends. The implement agent, for example, Mr. Speaker, is essential to the process of farming. He understands the difference between good years and bad ones. Once this Bill passes, if it does in its present form, the farmer loses every additional source of credit that he has ever had. Without this credit many farmers will not be able to carry on. The businessman who depends on agriculture for his livelihood has gone through tough times. Also, Mr. Speaker, now he is being forced into an even tougher position.

This Socialist Government, Mr. Speaker, is toughening these times for him. They will drive some of them right out of business, thus causing the farmer even more difficulty by lack of competitive buying, by the lack of service and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government really wanted to help the people in rural Saskatchewan, they would, as a Government, guarantee the debts so that no one would be hurt.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — This, Mr. Speaker, is probably too much to ask a Government that is made up of people who are Socialists. Socialists have been in power in this Province before, Mr. Speaker, and in the 20 years they were in office, the disregard and contempt for small enterprisers engaged in business in this Province is well known.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — The New Deal for rural people, Mr. Speaker, is one that is as old as Marxist Revolution in Russia with the same authors. It was their desire to control people, land, or property, and all ways of distributing goods and services. This, Mr. Speaker, is a Bill no one in Saskatchewan has asked for or will support.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I oppose the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill under discussion here today is certainly causing grave concern and consternation throughout rural Saskatchewan.

The suggestion of a one-year moratorium of debts is the kind of idea that appeals to most people initially. It sounds good. But it is also the type of idea which appeals to you less as you consider it further. This Bill could have disastrous results for the entire farming community in Saskatchewan. It could have disastrous results for small merchants and rural communities.

Rural Saskatchewan was developed as a result of co-operation between the farmers and the merchants who supplied them with credit whenever credit was desirable and necessary.

This Bill suggests, Mr. Speaker, that its purpose is to protect the assets of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, talk to a farmer and he will tell you that one of his most valuable assets is his ability to borrow money. When a farmer needs cash to buy farm machinery, land or cattle, in the past generally he has been able to borrow that money. When a farmer needs fuel or groceries or twine, he has usually been able to get credit if it is necessary or go to the bank or credit union and get money to buy these essentials.

A good credit reputation is one of the most prized possessions of our farm people, and farmers, generally, have a good credit reputation. If this Act is passed in its present form, it could be one of the greatest tragedies ever suffered by the rural people of our Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Some speakers opposite, Mr. Speaker, have said that it only applies to debts incurred before July 31, 1971, and therefore it will not affect the farmers' ability to borrow. Surely they don't believe this to be true, Mr. Speaker. Credit available to farmers is already drying up and the Bill has not even been passed yet. Credit unions, merchants, banks, individuals and other lenders are not going to extend credit to farmers

when the attitude of the NDP Government indicates that at any time these debts could be rendered uncollectible.

Last weekend, Mr. Speaker, I talked to farmers and dealers in my constituency about this Bill and they were uniformly genuinely concerned. One dealer told me last Friday that he sold a truck which a farmer badly needed for harvest and because of this Bill the farmer was unable to raise the money and the deal could not be made. The farmer was denied a truck which he badly needed with his crop coming off. The dealer was denied the sale of a truck. The Government, of course, lost the sales tax which it would have had if the sale had been made. I talked to an older farmer in my constituency, he does mixed farming — he has about 30 cows — and he wanted to buy a bale elevator. He said he had always stacked the bales by hand and his wife had helped him. They are small farmers and not prosperous, but they had decided this year to buy a bale elevator to make the job a bit easier.

Because of this legislation they are afraid they will not be able to get credit to buy the bale elevator. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) have any feeling for these people. I wonder if they would go out on these last few hot days and help these old people stack their bales. If I thought they would, I would certainly supply them with the names. I don't think there is too much chance.

Mr. Speaker, Western Canada was founded on credit and this Bill will destroy that foundation. Surely the NDP know that a young man cannot start farming today unless credit is available to him. If this Bill is passed, it will destroy the hopes of thousands of young people who would like to have a future in farming. There is no way that a young person can start farming today without financial assistance. This Bill will deny him financial help for many years to come. It could well become known as the Bill respecting the Destruction of the Family Farm.

If this Bill, Mr. Speaker, would help a substantial number of farmers, it might merit some support. It purports to protect the land, the cattle and the machinery of a farmer from seizure for one year. I think everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that the Farm Credit Corporation is by far the largest lender of funds in this Province for the purchase of land. No one will deny that they have not been reasonable with their clients. Some one has mentioned here already today that there has only been one foreclosure in 14 years. Farm Credit Corporation doesn't want the farmers' land. They want them to continue on the land and they have done everything possible to see that the farmer can make satisfactory arrangements.

The previous Provincial Government guaranteed loans for the farmer so he could buy breeding stock and increase his livestock herd. And these loans, Mr. Speaker, amount to a large amount of money owing on cattle today in the province. Over \$25 million for this purpose, and I certainly don't expect any foreclosures under this program even under the NDP Government. The Liberal Government gave the farmers something besides sympathy. They gave them financial support when the farmer wanted to buy cattle. It would appear that cases of seizure of land or cattle have been very few. Mr. Speaker, I should have thought that the Minister of Agriculture would give us some more precise figures in this regard, to support his argument that this Bill is

August 9, 1971

necessary. I haven't heard him say how many foreclosures there have been. Surely he has people in his Department who have some idea of the seriousness of this problem, but so far he hasn't seen fit to give us this information. It would appear that the only area where a problem may occur is with farm machinery.

Farmers, generally, are well protected in this regard with the legislation that we have at present. If, Mr. Speaker, there are cases of individual hardship and there may well be, I believe that the Government could have set up a board to make separate investigations in cases where hardships did exist and the Provincial Government could have backed the farmer the same way that the previous Liberal Government backed the farmer when he wished to buy livestock.

A policy such as this would have enhanced the credit rating of the farmers collectively. Contrast this to the NDP legislation which we are now considering, which will destroy the credit rating of 99 per cent of the farmers, in order to give questionable help to perhaps less than one per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the immediate results of Bill 9, if it is not amended and goes through in its present form, are obvious to all and could bring disaster to our rural areas. The long-term results could be even more destructive to our family farms.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the NDP, particularly the Waffle group, must be given credit for long-term planning. I propose to show how this Bill ties in with still another NDP program. I should like to refer you to several statements made recently by Members of the New Democratic Party.

One quotation is headlined, "Public ownership proposed" and I shall quote:

Members of the Saskatoon University Provincial NDP constituency organization called Tuesday for public ownership of all Saskatchewan's natural resources, including farm land. The resolution was passed with only one dissenting vote at a constituency meeting.

Everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, that a recent convention of young New Democrats in Moose Jaw, called also for nationalization of farm land. More frightening, Mr. Speaker, is the recent attitude of the Wafflers in this regard. You will recall, about one year ago, a disagreement arose within the NDP about some of the demands of the Wafflers. It seemed that the Wafflers wanted a policy of immediately getting control of the farmers' land and as cheaply as possible. As an election appeared imminent, some NDP politicians became concerned about adverse publicity. Mr. R.A. Walker, former MLA and law partner of the present Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, circulated a letter which has become well publicized, and I should like to quote from the Leader-Post, June 1, 1970:

Literature under the Caucus and Party name was sent out which described itself to be a draft statement of purpose and called for legislation empowering the Crown to purchase retiring land at assessed value. Evidently retiring land means the land of retiring or deceased farmers, and as every farmer knows, assessed value means approximately one-fifth of market value.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that some NDP constituency organizations quoted above, young NDP and the Wafflers, want the Government to take over the farmers' land. And the Wafflers want it, as you will note, Mr. Speaker, at one-fifth of market value. This was contained in literature sent out by them.

Mr. Speaker, the Wafflers have apparently not changed their policy and I quote from the Leader-Post of August 2, 1971 — just a few days ago. The heading is, "Waffle group outlines policy", and again I quote:

Among the demands that the Waffle will be making are that the Party take a pro-labor stand to bring about changes proposed in the 1970 convention with respect to agriculture and resource development and that it return to a firm Socialistic program.

Wafflers apparently are still sticking with the acquiring of the farmers' land at one-fifth the value. The Wafflers know what they want and they are still after the land.

Mr. Speaker, how would any government take over the farmers' land at such a cheap price as one-fifth of the actual value? Any government wanting to do this would take the first obvious step of passing a Bill which would prevent the farmer from getting a good price from other buyers, and we are considering, Mr. Speaker, such a Bill here today, Bill No. 9. If money is not available from the Farm Credit Corporation, if it is not available from banks, credit unions or individual lenders, the NDP Government can step in, get the farmers' land at bargain prices. No doubt we shall see a Bill before long where they are trying to acquire some of this land.

When farmers, Mr. Speaker, become fully aware of the dangers of this Bill, they will oppose it vigorously. This Bill could well be the start of a policy which will finish the NDP in rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — It is very unusual, Mr. Speaker, for a political party to commit political hari-kiri so soon after being elected. As the Opposition we have the duty to bring these matters to the attention of the people and the people certainly, at this time, haven't had an opportunity to bring their wishes before the Government. Many organizations would like to express their views. Many of these organizations have only heard of this Bill in the last few days.

I should like to make further comments on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion for adjournment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 10

Messieurs

Gardner
Grant
MacDonald
(Milestone)

McIsaac
Loken
Weatherald

McPherson
Lane
MacDonald
(Moose Jaw North)

NAYS — 43
Messieurs

Blakeney	Pepper	Dyck
Brockelbank	Michayluk	Cowley
Byers	Meakes	Cody
Wood	Whelan	Gross
Smishek	Brown	Feduniak
Romanow	Kwasnica	Mostoway
Messer	Carlson	Comer
Snyder	Engel	Rolfes
Bowerman	Tchorzewski	Lange
MacMurchy	Richards	Hanson
Kowalchuk	Owens	Oliver
Baker	Larson	Feschuk
Thibault	Taylor	Kaeding
Matsalla	Faris	Flasch
Robbins		

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Gardner: — We know by now that the Government realizes that they have a real hot potato on their hands with this Bill. They are trying to rush it through before the implications that I have mentioned become well known and this is the reason for trying to continue the debate tonight. They want to push it through before the general public have a chance to find out the true implications of the Bill. We are disappointed that the Government has, once again tonight, used its huge majority to prevent the common people of the province from being heard on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Government has not seen fit to indicate that they will send this legislation to the Law Amendments Committee, because it seems to me that the Bill before us, in its present form, serves only one useful purpose, Mr. Speaker, and that is to demonstrate, I think, more clearly than we have seen yet in this House the hypocritical attitude of my friends opposite for the farmer in the province.

Here is a Bill called The Family Farm Protection Act. Now the name in itself is a pure hoax, Mr. Speaker, because if the Bill goes through and is passed in its present form, it will surely become known as The Family Farm Destruction Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I think one thing that we have learned this evening as we listened to some of the Members opposite participate in this debate, is some of the reasoning for bringing this hasty, ill-conceived legislation into the House, it is merely to give them time to develop a Land Bank and develop other programs and other policies. We are prepared to give them time, Mr. Speaker, to bring in some sensible policies to help the farmer in this Province, but they don't need to bring in this piece of legislation that does nothing for anybody, to have that time to bring about some of their election promises.

I can certainly tell the House, the Members opposite and the Government, that this Liberal Opposition group is anxious to support and safeguard the family farm in this Province, just as anxious as they are, or more so. And to this end, Mr. Speaker, we only need to look at the record of seven years of Liberal Administration and what we did for family farms in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Let's look at some of those things, Mr. Speaker. We first permitted farmers the use of purple gas in farm trucks. Good legislation, meaningful legislation. Millions of dollars of savings to farmers every year since in reduced operating costs. Millions of dollars saved by the farmers of this Province.

We brought in a rural road program with a half a dozen or more new programs in the Municipal Road Authority, like grid road maintenance, feeder road programs — I could name a dozen others. We increased dollars in the equalization grants to keep the farm property taxes municipally at as low a level as possible. I think, Mr. Speaker, if there is any man that deserves credit for urging diversification in this Province, it is the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Ross Thatcher.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He went up and down this Province for years warning farmers of the dangers of depending entirely on wheat or the straight grain economy. And we backed that up with policies to help farmers diversify into other crops, into livestock and so on. Yes, community pastures for cattle operations, sheep operations. Hogs, and yes, I will agree that we are not happy with the current hog market situation, not any more than you are. As a matter of fact, we implemented a \$2 premium policy which you people were good enough to extend and cover more farmers for a longer period of time. It couldn't have been that bad or you wouldn't have extended it. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think we need not take a back seat to anybody for the effort of the former Premier, and when we were the Government, in trying to encourage and assist and stabilize the family farm in this Province.

We brought in The Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act that some Members here have referred to, and we guaranteed it and it has been supported with dollars. And that is the reason that the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) was able to report tonight that he had a constituent go to the bank and get his \$6,000. Why? Because it is Government guaranteed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — And in that Act we guaranteed the farmers credit. We did not jeopardize it or destroy it as this Act is bound to do if it is carried through in its present form.

I think that one piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, The Livestock Guarantee Act demonstrates pretty conclusively the difference in approach between the two parties in this House in solving farm problems. We acted to help the farmer with good

sensible policies, with good hard cash and dollars. And what are they acting with? Nothing whatsoever.

This Act before us, Mr. Speaker, unless it is very drastically amended, does nothing whatever for the Saskatchewan farmer. There are no government funds; there is no direct assistance to the farmer; there is no real assistance to anyone in Saskatchewan. Now, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) in introducing it the other day tried to imply, at least, that this legislation will make the big lender — Traders Finance, the big corporate lenders, and so on — make these people carry the farmer for one more year. Now this is utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker, because there is nothing in this Bill to hurt the big money lender, now or next year on August 1, 1972. They merely wait another year with their money and their loans, accruing interest and at that time the farmer is going to be faced with a double shot and double payment.

There are hundreds of small lending institutions, like the credit unions of this Province, which will definitely be hurt by the implementation of this NDP effort to help the family farm. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will not help any class of farmer. We certainly realize, on this side of the House, just as well as they do over there, that farmers are or have been in serious financial difficulties. This isn't going to help the small farmer; it isn't going to help the large farmer, or the grain farmer, or the mixed farmer, or the livestock farmer, in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this Bill that particularly disturbs me because one of the real bright spots in Saskatchewan agriculture is the cattle industry, particularly in the past few years. And that the cattle industry is in such good shape today, is due largely to the kind of people who have built the industry, not due to the governments in particular. I think of the Purebred Dealers' of this Province, the commercial men themselves, the Stockgrowers' Association, and many other groups of people associated directly with the livestock business. Due to these men and their own initiative, and assisted by former policies of the previous Government of years ago, and certainly by the climate created and developed by the Liberals when they were in power, provincially, have created and promoted a livestock industry in this Province second to none anywhere that you will find. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, in its present form, is a threat to that livestock industry in Saskatchewan, a real threat because that industry certainly depends on credit. And if there are any of the Members opposite — and I am sure there are some — who know anything about the cattle business, they know that credit is essential in the feeder cattle operation and in almost any other phase of the cattle industry.

I think the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, made one other rather telling admission when he was introducing this Bill. He said, "I frankly admit," he said, "it is experimental." Well, what an admission, I think, Mr. Speaker! Surely the last thing that Saskatchewan farmers need at this stage of the game is NDP experimentation with their credit. Not only are they experimenting with the farmer and his credit, but the implement dealer, the credit unions, automobile dealers, livestock commission firms, the bulk fuel distributors, every class or category of small business in those very same rural areas that our friends opposite expressed so much concern, are being jeopardized by this particular legislation.

I urge the Government, Mr. Speaker, as other Members on this side of the House have done, to withdraw this hasty legislation, this ill-conceived piece of legislation. I believe that their overall intentions must be good but certainly it isn't demonstrated in this Bill 9 that is before us here tonight. I urge them to withdraw it and take time to seek the opinions of the farm groups and other groups in the province who are going to be very directly affected by this legislation. Surely they don't want to jeopardize further the position of the family farm and the farm economy and the small town and the rural economy generally by pushing onward with a piece of legislation that hasn't been properly studied, the full implications haven't been considered and the people concerned with it haven't had a chance to really sit and give the Government their side of it. What chance do groups have trying to meet the Government opposite during the noon hour, after supper and such other times, Mr. Speaker. There is no need for this kind of consultation whatsoever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I can tell the Members opposite and the Government that we on this side of the House will come back any time to look at legislation that is meaningful and that will do something worthwhile to help the hard-pressed grain farmer in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — We'll only be too glad to support any useful legislation that they put forth and this certainly isn't such a Bill. I can't support a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that says to the implement dealers and the credit unions — in effect it says this to them — in the rural areas you've been fleecing the farmer, you are going to have to carry him for another year, you've made lots off him through the years, so carry him for one more year. I can't support a Bill that says again to farmers, in effect, you are poor payers and we really know you need this legislation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that's a slap in the face to the farmers who have been making every effort and always have to pay their bills; and pay them as they go and that want to pay their way. Again, what a slap in the face to the dealers as outlined so well by the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) here who has been in the business himself for longer than most of us would like to think about, but people who have helped farmers in difficult times, there have been difficult times here before, from one part of the province to another, going back to the '50s we had the same kind of grain situation. If this Government is concerned about people, why aren't they guaranteeing the farmer?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Why aren't they guaranteeing some of these farm implement dealers who certainly will pay the price for this legislation? It may be a year or so away when they pay the direct losses of this particular Bill, if it is forced through in its present form. Because of the far-reaching effects of this Bill and as they are only now becoming aware of them across this Province, I would again ask the House to adjourn debate at this time to hear more representations from other people who are directly concerned in this Bill.

August 9, 1971

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member asked to raise a point of order. I must entertain a point of order, the motion isn't lost yet.

Mr. Carlson: — I just want to point out to the Liberal Member from Wilkie, he made a comment about a statement I made regarding a young farmer who got a loan at the bank . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is not a point of order. It is a debating point.

Mr. Carlson: — I just want to clarify that this was not a Government guaranteed loan . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Well, it is not a point of order. It is a debating point.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — On a point of order. In regard to this, I do believe that you, Sir, wish to give the Opposition all the opportunity they have to express themselves in this House. I am sure that we on this side have no desire to endeavor to restrict them in any way. It is my understanding in the rules that no motion to adjourn the debate may follow a motion to adjourn the debate, unless there is some piece of business which is worthy of being put into the Votes and Proceedings intervenes. We have had tonight — I think this is the fourth motion in regard to adjourning the debate — and I don't think there has been any business of the House that is worthy of putting into the Votes and Proceedings in any case. I think you will recall that Mr. Beauchesne is quite definite on this matter.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on the rules of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for seven years and never once have I ever seen a debate refused to be adjourned or at least refused to have the motion put. Mr. Speaker, when they were the Opposition, they moved the adjournment of many debates and standing votes were called. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, we consider to be of vital importance and if the Opposition is only permitted one opportunity to adjourn the debate, this would be the biggest closure that would ever be written into the rule books of this House. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that every speaker individually should have the opportunity to reply to an address or to a point made by the Government Members when new information is provided. New approaches may be needed, new research required and every individual Member should be permitted to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Swift Current raised a point of order. It is plain in the rules that an adjournment is always in order, but no second such motion shall be made unless some intermediate line of business has taken place. There must be some business of the House which has been transacted in the meantime before it can be moved again.

I think I should have to say that as long as the debate continues and as long as we have other speakers in between time, that it is in order, but I shall check out more fully for later rulings in case this problem is raised again. But I do believe that we have had now one, two, three, four speakers, in between, we have had two adjournment motions and three speakers and this is the second adjournment by the last two Members who spoke. I should ask the Members to refrain from moving too many motions in this manner, but I think on this occasion I will allow the motion to stand.

I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Steuart: — Call in the Members, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I want to get this point clear. No Member may ask to "call in the Members". What the Members do have the right for is to rise and ask for a recorded vote and it is the Speaker who calls for the Members to come in. One stood and sat down, and then another one stood, but no request for a recorded vote was made.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, with deference, it has been customary in the House to rise. I realize that the request is to record the vote. Three of us rose. We might not have risen simultaneously but I am asking for a recorded vote. And very often in the House, we have had the Opposition Members say "call in the Members".

Motion for adjournment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 12

Messieurs

Steuart	McDonald	McLeod
Gardner	(Milestone)	McPherson
Grant	McIsaac	Lane
Boldt	Loken	MacDonald
	Weatherald	(Moose Jaw North)

NAYS — 43

Messieurs

Blakeney	Pepper	Dyck
Brockelbank	Michayluk	Cowley
Byers	Meakes	Cody
Wood	Whelan	Gross
Smishek	Brown	Feduniak
Romanow	Kwasnica	Mostoway
Messer	Carlson	Comer
Snyder	Engel	Rolfes

Bowerman
MacMurchy
Kowalchuk
Baker
Thibault
Matsalla
Robbins

Tchorzewski
Richards
Owens
Larson
Taylor
Faris

Lange
Hanson
Oliver
Feschuk
Kaeding
Flasch

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Government again has seen fit not to allow the House to adjourn on this Bill for the very reasons that I outlined earlier, and for the reasons that other Members on this side of the House have put forth in the course of this debate.

We do not believe that this legislation will do what it is intended by the Government to do, to do anything at all for the family farmers, Mr. Speaker. We believe, and we are well aware that there are many farm groups in the province who have very serious concern about the far-reaching effects of this legislation, not only farm groups but implement dealers, farm truck dealers, bulk fuel distributors and other sectors of the small business, particularly the small business in the rural community.

Why only today we had representation from the Farm Implement Dealers' Association, and I think, in their brief to the Government they themselves made some excellent points for deferring debate on this legislation until the Bill goes to the Law Amendments Committee for further consideration and amending of some of the many clauses that are in this Act.

I am going to quote some of the pertinent paragraphs from this submission of the Implement Dealers' Association to my friends opposite. Some of them may not have had time to catch the hasty caucuses that were called today, to consider this brief. They say here, Mr. Speaker, they begin by wishing to make it clear that their remarks are confined to the family farm and not the large scale farmers who have problems also, but have enough backing to work out credit arrangements satisfactorily. In other words, they make it clear that the implement dealers themselves are concerned, not about the corporate farmers, but about the same family farm that concerns the Members on both sides of this House. They go on to say, generally, the farm economy has come through a period of high productivity, with low sales, and in most cases, low prices.

However, the brief points out, there are indications that the farm economy today is in a much better state than it was a year or two back. We have just come through a year of record grain sales and relatively high prices for cattle. I am sure that the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) when he got his letter notifying him of this \$900 or whatever amount he is getting, also got another little notice, another little piece of information from the Wheat Board pointing out the record sales last year of wheat abroad and the prospects for quotas for the next year.

Now they go on to say:

For the immediate future, the farmer looks forward to

payments under the Federal Stabilization Program, and immediate grain sales under the already announced quotas.

In addition to these quotas, Mr. Speaker, special quotas exist for rapeseed, but it also appears that a net increase in cash advances is available this coming fall.

From the above observations we can see considerable improvement in the cash position of the farmers of Saskatchewan, enough improvement so that the farmer with the accommodation that he has already received from creditors, will be able to meet his obligations.

This, Mr. Speaker, without special legislation. The brief continues:

Our concern lies mainly for the two groups that this legislation proposes to protect, namely, the family farm and the implement dealers. We respectfully submit that this legislation will harm these two groups. 1. We see this legislation as seriously limiting credit to the farmers.

Again, we are particularly concerned about the family farmer who makes one major purchase at a time. They go on to say, Mr. Speaker:

We know that the banks and other financial institutions will not and already are not extending credit as they have in the past. While the Government may proclaim, as they have done in the course of this debate, that this is a one-shot deal, these lending institutions are not convinced particularly when the Government has indicated that it is uncertain as to what additional measures will be required come the 31st of July, 1972, when this present proposed legislation is due to expire, if, indeed, adopted. Also these institutions cannot be sure that further legislation of this sort will not be forthcoming August 1, 1972, in the light of the rather gloomy predictions made recently by the Canadian Wheat Board for marketing.

Legislation that is selective amongst creditors may make poor payers out of good payers. Again, this would upset the normal business relationship in a community . . .

I think, once again, so aptly discussed and pointed out in this debate by the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken). The brief goes on:

. . . while we heartily recommend to farmers to take advantage of farm improvement loans, because of its low interest rate and its accommodating features. Many farmers have established credit with other financial institutions, and those institutions are going to be leaving the farm equipment field. One has already left after the Limitations of Civil Rights Act which was passed by the Liberal Government a year or two ago. This will limit credit choices to the farmer and in turn will curtail dealers' sales.

The Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) in his remarks this evening illustrated that point very, very well.

The brief continues, Mr. Attorney General:

We know, as dealers, that farmers are already being accommodated on past due payments and will be in the future, with or without this legislation. As long as the farmer puts forth a just case and a reasonable method of repayment, he has been and will continue to be accommodated.

Let's be perfectly frank about this matter of repossession, as long as the farmer has equity in the equipment, and by equity we mean the difference in market value of the equipment and what he owes on it, no financial institution wants to repossess. While we don't want this to happen, the farmer who has negative equity and equipment is really better off to have it repossessed and go out in the market and buy equivalent equipment for less money than he owed on his present equipment.

The brief goes on to state:

It is at this point that most repossessions are made, The Limitations of Civil Rights Act prohibits the dealer from recovery of losses in cases of wilful damage or abuses.

I think the operation of The Limitations of Civil Rights Act was again very capably outlined by the Member on this side of the House, the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) here earlier in the course of this debate this afternoon.

The brief goes on, Mr. Speaker, and one observation, and I think it is worth reading into the records at this time:

We wish to make one observation about this legislation that most media have implied by not specified. Agricultural equipment depreciates while land and cattle usually appreciate, especially during buoyant farm conditions. To compound the situation, used equipment depreciation accelerates when times are good, because more farmers are then in a position to buy new. It is this fact about used equipment that concerns us most.

So say the Farm Machinery Dealers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

It is well known that all dealers are on full recourse on the finance paper they write with their machine companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — If a farmer is going to be repossessed, all this legislation will do is postpone it for a year and the dealer will take that much bigger loss at that time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — There is no provision in this legislation to compensate the dealer for additional losses. No provision to compensate the farmer, Mr. Speaker, nothing to compensate the dealer indeed as I said earlier in the course of my remarks, nothing for anybody in this legislation.

I believe too, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should seriously consider the request made at the conclusion of this brief as an alternative to the present legislation that they have before us. Their alternative is very well worth repeating and recording in the records of this House.

As an alternate to the legislation proposed, we respectfully propose the following:

1. Immediate setting up of a mediation board to hear cases and advise.

I am sure the Attorney General will welcome that suggestion. When we were on the Government side, we heard him many times seek to set up boards — mediation boards, civil rights boards, you name it. I am sure he would be receptive to this particular suggestion.

2. Financial assistance or guarantees of loans presently handled by farmers.

I don't know why the Government opposite refuses to entertain this very worthwhile suggestion, a suggestion that they have had precedent for in much of our legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, a suggestion of the implement dealers . . .

3. An educational program advising farmers on programs that exist, such as the Farm Improvement Loans, that are tailor made for his benefit.

They conclude their brief:

We finally submit that the answer to the farmers' problem is not a moratorium on repayments of loans or a restriction of credit but a solution to the problem that the farmer does not receive adequate returns for his labor.

With this, I am sure, we can all agree and concur.

Mr. Speaker, for these and for other reasons I have outlined, I certainly cannot support the Bill and will be supporting the amendment of my seatmate, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert West): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I think one thing that shines through crystal clear is that this is a phony Bill, put forward in a phony fashion, for the purpose of them standing in their place and saying, "We're going to help the farmer." The great friend of the farmer, the Socialist, the NDP.

An Hon. Member: — I can't hear . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Who's that deaf vociferous person in the back that can't hear? Well, just calm down and I'll make it loud and clear and you'll be able to hear everything.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I shall ask the Member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't referring to any of them, but if the shoe fits, I'm sorry. If any of you feel that way, I withdraw.

They haven't done anything for the farmer. What have they really done? They have put the load on the little man. They put the load on the little businessman, they put the load on the little implement dealer, they put the load on the credit union. They said, Oh, look at the death-bed repentance of the Liberals supporting the credit union. You look back on the history of this Province and you will find that all decent legislation, setting up co-ops and credit unions was put on the books of this Province by a Liberal Government. All you people did was to infiltrate the co-op movement with your Socialism and turned it into almost a political movement that hurt the co-op movement in this Province and hurt it badly. Whom have you asked to carry the load? The little people. Oh, they say the Liberals are the big friends of the banks. Don't you kid yourselves that the big banks or that the big finance companies are going to be hurt by this. They can't be hurt by this. If you knew anything, if you knew anything about business, if you knew anything about enterprise, you would know that every time a big bank or a big finance company or one of the finance companies of the big implement dealers signed to pay for the advance of any credit, he gets the signature of the little dealer on it. The man you are going to hook, the man you are going to hook for this deal today and one year from now and 18 months from now, is the little man, the implement dealer, the small purveyor of credit. If you don't know that then God help the Province of Saskatchewan in the next four years.

Let's talk about another group of people you're going to hurt. You read the Bill, I don't think you have read the Bill, Mr. Minister from Moose Jaw, I'm sure you haven't read it or you wouldn't sit there with that smug look and all the Members over there giggling and laughing and saying what they are going to do for the farmer. You go back and you just talk to some of the retired farmers in your little towns. Some of those people that you just took the utilization fees off, so you did them a favor. Now go back and find out what kind of a favor you really did them. Because in this Act if a retired farmer has sold his land and he's depending on one-third crop share, that one-third crop share will be denied him and there are all kinds of retired farmers on Old Age Pensions; the kind of people that you bled for.

An Hon. Member: — Jack didn't know that!

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, Jack didn't know that! Happy, jolly Jack, the family farmer! He is the super family farmer. He already owns ten family farms. He didn't know what was in the Bill. I've never seen a Minister in the time I've been in this House who had to have someone else bring a Bill before this House on his behalf. Then he asks the farmers of this Province to please understand it, when he doesn't understand it himself. Mr. Minister (Mr. Messer) you read the Bill and you ask the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) to go and ask the people who helped him misdraft this Bill to find out what happens to retired farmers when they want their one-third share of the crop that they depend on for a livelihood. You'll find out if you don't change this Act that they have to stand back until that farmer takes out his living

expenses for this year and next year. And he's the judge of that. Who's the judge of how much his expenses will be if he isn't? It's not in this Act. I don't know if you're going to bring some legislation in to cover it. Who is going to be the judge of what is fair and reasonable for that farmer to take out of his crop that he sells before he has to give that man who sold him the farm his one-third share, or what's left of it? Just check into that. We'd like an answer to that. I'll tell you there are thousands of retired farmers, not rich farmers, not big banks, not just finance people, just ordinary little "joes" who live in our small towns and our cities who have retired off the farm after years and years of labor who depend on that one-third. And you, by this ill-conceived ridiculous Bill are denying it to them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — There is another question that I think the people of this Province are interested in. In your first Session, after your great big, spanking new, wonderful victory, you come in here all shined up, polished and happy and smiling. You hadn't even met half your own Members and already what have you done? You've taken that great big victory and you've punched a hole in it, because you've shown to the people of this Province in five or six short weeks that you intend to use that great majority that the people of this Province gave you to steamroller things through this Legislature. Why? When the Premier and the Attorney General could take two days, three days in fact, because you could have sat Saturday, could take three days off and go out to Victoria and adjourn this House, then why all the rush to put this Bill through? Why are you making us stall, and we are, you won't get through tonight. Make no mistake — you won't get through tonight. Why? Because up in the gallery are implement dealers, back out in Saskatchewan there are little car dealers, there are still hundreds of people, maybe even thousands of people who want to be heard on this Bill. You don't want to give them a chance, you're afraid to give them a chance. Why won't you take this Bill into Committee, Mr. Attorney General, why won't you give those people a chance to be heard? Why?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I'll answer that!

Mr. Steuart: — Well answer it now. You haven't got an answer that's worthwhile.

Mr. Romanow: — I'll answer . . .

Mr. Steuart: — You haven't got an answer. You know what you'll do, I'll tell you what you said you were going to do, unless you've changed your mind, and I hope you do and show some flexibility. You said we'll put this Bill in and then this summer we'll set up a committee to see how it works. You're going to hang the man and then two months later you're going to say, how do you like that for justice? It's a little late, Mr. Attorney General. When you pass this Bill, you have cast a shadow on the credit of every farmer in this Province. You have cast doubt on the credit of every farmer in this Province. You are so ignorant in this

field that you don't even know what you're doing. I honestly think you are trying to help the farmer. I think you are, but you won't stop and listen. Listen to those implement dealers. For God sake listen to some people and don't get the idea that all the sanctity, all the piety, and all the good wishes and all the good hopes and all the sincere thoughts are on that side of the House — that the implement dealers are out to rob the people, that the credit unions you should laugh at their problems, that if the Opposition stands up and says take a second thought, that all we want to do is break you down — you ignore them all. Why haven't you got some confidence in the people to sit for two days or even a day and say, okay we'll listen to them, we'll listen to these people and if they make some good, valid points, we'll be prepared to change the legislation. On top of everything else, why haven't you got the courage to put your money where your mouth is and put the credit of the Government behind the farmer.

You should understand what you're going to do with this Bill. You are going to put into jeopardy the credit of every farmer in this Province. You're going to do that. It's a serious thing, a far more serious thing than you realize. If you were going to enhance the credit of the farmers you would put the credit of the Government behind them, and the implement dealers and the banks, and the credit corporations, all of them which have advanced millions of dollars of worthwhile credit in this Province. They would say, look, when the farmers of this Province of Saskatchewan get in trouble, what does the Government do? It put the entire credit of the Government behind them. It gives us double assurance. Set up a board, you're fond of boards, set up a board. Ask any farmer who is in jeopardy of having his land, his machinery or his cattle repossessed to come before that board. Sure, stop everything until you hear what that farmer has to say. And if he's got a legitimate case, then go to the credit grantor and say, look, what do we as a Government have to do to extend this man for six months, or a year, or maybe 18 months. If you have to make some payment, well, take a chance, take a little risk, show that you mean what you say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some more thoughts on this Bill. We're going to bring them in tomorrow. We have an amendment. If the Speaker won't call it 10:30, I will while away the time reminding you of an Act that's on the books, to show you that you didn't really need to put this act on by bringing this Act in because the farmers of this Province right now have ample protection in the Statutes. What did you say?

Mr. Blakeney: — Limitations of Civil Rights Act is what you're searching for.

Mr. Steuart: — That's right. I'm searching and I've got it right here and I intend to read it. I intend to read it into the records of this House, because obviously you didn't know about it and if you did know about it, and obviously you did, you should get a lawyer. Not the ones you got to draft that Bill, but get a good sensible lawyer who hasn't worked for the Government, Mr. Premier, most of the time, who hasn't worked for labor, Mr. Attorney General, most of the time, but has had something to do with business and knows how the whole system that we live under works.

Well, this is called an Act to amend the Limitations of Civil Rights Act, and it was assented to April 18, 1970, that's when we were the Government, governing the Province of Saskatchewan in an enlightened and a well ordered manner. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will read the first line and I hope you'll understand it. There's your Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), I know he won't understand it, and I'll explain some of the big words. Well, it starts off:

Her Majesty . . .

(That refers to the Queen of Canada)

. . . Wherein with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan an Act as follows:

Now there is a note in the column, it says:

Revise Statute C-103.

1. The Limitations of the Civil Rights Act is amended in the manner hereinafter set forth . . .

That means from now on, Roy.

2. Subsection (1) of Section 18 is amended by striking out the words "The Agricultural Machinery Act" in the seventh line thereof . . .

(That's right after the sixth line, Mr. Minister of Agriculture)

. . . and substituting therefore the words and the number "The Agricultural Implements Act, 1968".

Doesn't that grab you!

An Hon. Member: — Well done!

Mr. Blakeney: — What has that to do with it?

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, it has, in case you're wondering. I haven't even got to the good part yet.

Subsection (3) of Section 18 is repealed.

3. Section 19 to 22 are repealed and the following headings in sections are substituted therefore.

Now this is it —

Procedure for Possession.

(If you've any questions, I'll deal with them later).

In Sections 19(a) to 22(a) agreement means a conditional sales contract or agreement, or a chattel mortgage, contract or agreement heretofore or hereafter executed.

4. The article means (1) an implement to which The Agricultural Implements Act, 1968;

Roy, you're not leaving! He's not even interested in the Acts of the Legislature.

(2) a motor vehicle classified by the Highway Traffic

August 9, 1971

Board in regulations made under The Vehicles Act as a farm truck or a special farm truck and registered under The Vehicles Act as such . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . three years!

Mr. Steuart: — Well, it's been another three years. It must have been the same people who worked on this that you got to work on yours.

. . . a cream separator, a washing machine, a stove, a heater . . .

Mr. Messer: — A what?

Mr. Steuart: — A heater — you know what heaters are.

. . . a sewing machine, -

(They are even going to seize a sewing machine).

A refrigerator or freezer or a unit that is a combination of a refrigerator and a freezer or a snowmobile as defined under The Vehicles Act, that is used by a farmer in connection with his farming operations.

Get this —

(C) creditor means a vendor under a conditional sales agreement or his assignee.

Mr. Messer: — . . . your consultant?

Mr. Steuart: — He's taken that post graduate course, too, and there are a couple of you lawyers over there who could afford the same thing. If you pass this, you get a degree . . .

Debtor means a purchaser under a conditional sales agreement or his assignee. 2. Under a chattel mortgage agreement or his assignee. 4. A person appointed under Subsection (1) of Section 19.

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