

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Seventeenth Legislature
8th Day

Tuesday, August 10, 1971.

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

QUESTIONS

Bertha Army Worms

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I observe the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in this House this morning. I should like to ask him a question. I wonder if he was aware of the potential threat of the infestation of the Bertha army worms, particularly through the critical period from the 1st of July to the 10th of July 1971?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, I believe I have stated in this Legislature before that the first indication of any major or of any infestation of Bertha army worms in this Province was not prevalent until some 10 days ago, indeed a week ago Friday.

The chemical that is now being used to control that infestation was in an experimental stage, both last year and this year, and the people who were carrying out these experiments were having considerable difficulty in trying to find fields where they could run tests on that chemical, showing that even though we were looking for places to test this chemical, we couldn't find them in the Province of Saskatchewan until a week ago last Friday. The outbreak came and it has just propelled itself to a major extent as it is at now.

Mr. MacLeod: — I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question arising out of his answer. I wonder if the Hon. Minister is aware, and does he know, that regular checks on this danger were in fact made every year by the Canada Research Station on the grounds of the University of Saskatchewan, in Saskatoon, and that by the 10th of July light traps which had been maintained by this Canada Research Station at Aylesham and Lloydminster, had clearly demonstrated a heavier than average moth flight for the Bertha army worms and that a heavier than ever infestation was in fact expected by the 10th of July by the Canada Research Station.

I wonder if any steps were taken by this Government to enquire on a regular basis about the potential danger.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, as I have previously stated there was no evidence given to our Department because we were looking, in fact, for army worm infestation to continue the experimentations of the chemical that we are now using. However, we shall take into consideration the establishment of better liaison and communications between Federal and Provincial Governments and their Departments of Agriculture which it seems is lacking at the present time.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! You have asked one question and one supplementary and I don't want a debate on this.

Mr. MacLeod: — I agree, Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate. I wonder if . . . Surely I am entitled to speak to the Speaker. They are trying to deprive me of my right to speak to you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, the only point that I wish to make is that he obviously misunderstood my supplementary question, because that isn't the question that I asked. What I did ask him is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Minister answered the question by saying that they would try to establish a better liaison between the Federal and Provincial Departments for future occasions.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, do I understand his answer is that he just didn't make these checks.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! This is not debatable. A Member has the right to ask a question on Orders of the Day, but the answer cannot be debated at this time.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — May I direct a question, Mr. Speaker. The question is this: that in view of the terrible crisis now faced by our farmers in this Province, due evidently, in no small part, to the lack of that Government looking into and finding out what was happening and stand up in their place and say they didn't know what was happening. That there was no communication, is nonsense. We knew what was happening. We knew where the information was. If any farmers lose their crops of rape they should look for a settlement. They should present their bills to that Government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Stuart: — They were neglectful and they should hang their heads.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would appreciate it if the Leader of the Opposition would respect the Chair. Questions can be asked but statements of this nature cannot be made. It is not a debate, it is a question period and not a debating period. I ask any Member of the Legislature to respect the Chair when the Chair rises.

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry and I will do that. I will ask the question. Is the Premier prepared now to entertain claims from the farmers of this Province for the damage done by these worms to their crops, in view of the absolute terrible negligence of his own Department of Agriculture?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I shall try to

answer the question and I shall try to maintain the decorum of the House, as the Leader of the Opposition so obviously does not want to do.

Firstly, there is not one shred of evidence that the information with respect to Bertha army worms was available to anyone before it became available to the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. Secondly, if it is true that the Opposition had this information, and withheld it from public sources until today, then the burden must rest on them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Thirdly, if it is true that the Federal Department of Agriculture had this information and didn't communicate it to the Provincial Department of Agriculture, then this is just further evidence that the Federal Department of Agriculture has no concern for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I repeat, and I repeat again, that our Department of Agriculture was looking — looking — for evidence of infestation. Looking for infestation of Bertha army worms because they wanted to test chemicals, because there was some evidence that it might be forthcoming and at the first indication they acted and have continued to act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, another question. First of all I want to make it very clear that the Opposition, they had no knowledge of this information until yesterday. But, Mr. Speaker, the information was there and we found out the information by simply picking up a telephone and phoning the Canada Research Station, which has responsibility in this regard and the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Is the Hon. Member asking a question or making a statement. You must ask a question and not make a statement.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Agriculture or any department official in the Department of Agriculture for the Province of Saskatchewan request information regarding the Bertha army worms from the Canada Research Station, where this information is always available and available to any of the public of Saskatchewan, and particularly the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that question. I said that our Department, was in fact, looking for Bertha army worm infestation everywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: — Where . . .

Mr. Messer: — I believe I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. When they found that infestation on Friday last they have since that time brought in five aircraft loads of chemical at a cost to the Department of over one million and a half dollars. They have had the best organized control program that this Province has

ever seen in controlling infestation.

They, have, Mr. Speaker, brought in aircraft from Manitoba, Alberta, Montana, North Dakota and an aircraft is on its way from New Brunswick right now to help spread that chemical. I should like to remind those Members Opposite that the troubles and the concerns and the losses of farmers, due to grasshopper infestation which come with quite some regularity to this Province of Saskatchewan, the problem and the losses they had, because that previous Government did not have the chemical here at that time. We have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! You have had three questions so now I think we will continue on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, with deference, I don't think the Premier answered the question. My question was: are they read to pay . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . the farmers?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I really must insist that when you stand on your feet, the Leader of the Opposition sits down like everyone else in this House, and I would ask you to enforce that rule as we try to observe it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would respectfully ask Members to bow to the Chair when the Chair rises. We have had the usual number of questions on Orders of the Day. Questions can be asked but debates cannot be carried on.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — INDEPENDENT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino):

That this Assembly supports the stand taken by New Democratic Members of this Assembly earlier this year fully endorsing the principle of an independent electoral boundaries commission and confirms, at this time, the grossly unfair nature of the last electoral redistribution which must be corrected as soon as possible by an independent commission.

He said: This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, was essentially the same as the one offered earlier this year, which I moved and the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) seconded. Therein the similarity ends because, as we all know, the surrounding circumstances have changed dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, new Members in this Assembly are bound to ask:

how did this problem about gerrymandering get its distasteful start here in Saskatchewan? For the sake of new Members on both sides of this Chamber, it is best we go back to the year 1965, when a new Liberal Government met in its first Legislative Session. A Bill to change constituency boundaries was introduced and passed at that time. As Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition we were concerned about the direction that that legislation pointed and we said so, as the record will show. As an alternative, we suggested, that the Saskatchewan Liberal Government make use of the Federal Liberal Government's Independent Boundaries Commission, the team had been established, and take the matter of boundary changes out of the hands of the politicians.

The Liberals, at that time, rejected our proposals. In 1968, while meeting in the first session of the 15th Legislature, we suggested by resolution that the Liberal Government abandon its partisan boundary drawing in favor of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. That, too, was rejected, Mr. Speaker. In Bill 86 of 1970, a Bill to amend the Legislative Assembly Act, the Liberal Party confirmed our worst fears about their frontal attack on democratic representation. That Bill was an abandonment of all attempts to hide from the public their open attempt to rig the coming Provincial election.

We responded again, Mr. Speaker, by offering a resolution for an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission, similar to the ones in effect, in both of our sister Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. When it became evident that the resolution would be defeated, we made direct attempts to amend Bill 86, but our attempts were defeated. The Liberal Party and its leadership, some of whom sit opposite us right now, Mr. Speaker, completely and unalterably rejected five clear attempts to introduce an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. And I suggest to you now, today, that their opinion will be exactly the same if they formed the Government. Exactly the same.

Mr. Speaker, they haven't formed the Government. Consequently when they stand here today, as I think they will, and talk in favor and vote in favor of this Resolution, they will be exposing the most gross form of hypocrisy ever displayed in this Chamber. And I predict that they will do exactly that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I predict that they will rise in their places and they will say, that our two or three redistributions in 20 years was equivalent in some way to their three redistributions in six years. I predict that they will say, that a 30 to 40 per cent maximum variance in constituency voting population, is when we drew the electoral boundaries in this Province, is somehow just as serious as the variance that they implemented between Saskatoon Mayfair and Saskatoon City Park, of 300 per cent. Or the variance of 200 per cent between Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South that they implemented. Or the variance of more than 400 per cent between Regina Centre and Regina Albert Park.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the new Members of this Chamber will hear the old time Liberals state, that constituents in multiple seats had to vote for more than one Member, but they won't mention that in those same urban areas, those same voters, at civic election time often vote for four, five or six candidates in an election.

The old time Liberals, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber, will not explain that their obvious attempt to concentrate New Democratic Party votes in some constituencies, on the basis of the 1967 vote, would result in Liberals representing 7,700 voters rather than 8,800 prior to that time, per average constituency, while New Democratic members would represent 12,200 voters, rather than 10,000 voters they would have represented in an average constituency prior to that time.

Since the Liberal election defeat of June 23rd, some Liberal apologists have been saying, that we were proved wrong in our charges about gerrymandering. Simply because we won the election rather than they. As usual, Mr. Speaker, they choose to attempt to confuse the public by mixing two unrelated facts: 1. The gerrymander designed to win the election for the Liberals in what they believed would be a tight race, with each party drawing about 40 to 43 per cent of the popular vote. It wasn't a close race, Mr. Speaker, because we won over 55 per cent of the popular vote.

2. The first item that I have mentioned was superseded by a far more potent force combination than that gerrymander. That was the common rejection of the Liberal Government and its leadership, of which some of the tattered remnants sit opposite us at this time. And the overwhelming acceptance also, Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) of the New Democratic program, its leadership and its candidates.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, the gerrymander figures do show through, and they are available to us since the June 23rd election. For example, there were 20 New Democrats with majorities of more than 1,000 votes, but there was only one Liberal in that category. Only one! For example, Mr. Speaker, if you add up all of the majority of the 13 Liberal candidates over there who won in the election, if you add up all 13 of them, you would find that their combined total would only be 300 votes more than my majority!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — A further comparison, Mr. Speaker, and even more interesting, would show that the 13 Liberals together got a combined majority of 728 votes less than the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). The combined 13, Mr. Speaker! 700 votes less than the Member for Riversdale, who sits on this side of the House.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the shameless effrontery of that gerrymander shows through in the figures that have come to us from the June 23 election. Yes, Mr. Speaker, those eager advocates of protection of the democratic system have exposed themselves before and they will again on this Resolution. And if I were asked to describe their presence here in this Chamber, I can do no better than to quote The Pretender to the Throne, the MLA for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), when he looked over an audience, in Saskatoon during the recent election campaign and was quoted in the June 9, 1971, issue of the Star-Phoenix as having said, "I think this is a rotten lousy turnout."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that his lament was accurate at that time and most descriptive as I look across the way now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — However, I should caution the senior Member from Prince Albert West that he should learn to be a loser with more style and dignity. I recall when the Member from Prince Albert West took a little run over to the Province of Manitoba, this was after the Liberal Party in 1969 sank into the bog in Manitoba. He told them at that time, the Leader of the Liberal Party, that you have to learn with a little more style and grace.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll give you that book now John, it will come in handy for the next election.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Now that I have explained the Liberal gerrymander to the new Members on both sides of the House, they will easily be able to see through the transparent garments that will be donned by those in the leadership minuet as they come out fighting for democracy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Members opposite that they will be running in the next election without the benefit of gerrymander boundaries. The Independent Commission that we have promised will be based on the best experiences of other provinces at the same time avoiding errors which they might have made. Naturally, an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission will pay close attention to community or diversity of population interest means of communication, physical features, sparsity or density of population. With these words, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing the resolution before us at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding this motion on the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I have been in this Legislature for a few years and over the years it gave me great pleasure to meet students at the door of the Legislature introduce them to the House and so on. One thing that it gave me great pleasure to tell these students was that if they didn't like their government they had a way to vote it out and change it by vote, and that they had representation by population. This we could say without bothering our conscience at all, but when Bill 86 was passed in April 15, 1970, according to the Journal . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . the 1966 one.

Mr. Thibault: — Well you know, you could almost live with the 1966 one. But this last one, why even a blind person could have seen it.

Mr. Steuart: — Did you see it?

Mr. Thibault: — Well you sure felt it if you didn't see it.

Until that day I could tell the students and feeling that I was telling the truth, that they had representation by

population, but after this Bill was passed, I could not say that any more, and I never told them again that they had representation by population. But I welcome them to the House and told them that is where the laws of the land for Saskatchewan were made, but the part of representation by population was out.

In order to inform our people, we have two maps, the Liberal and the NDP redistribution. Believe you me this did more to inform the people than any speaker could do in an hour of talk.

We talk about the army worm, the army worm they seem to go in one direction. When you take, for instance, the constituency of Kelvington where the boundary changes direction eighteen times, I refer to it as a drunk caterpillar. Another one was the constituency of Touchwood, when you showed this to grade eight students, they would look at the map and they would pick all the holes in it. They say, you call that representation by population! Whom are we kidding? I think it will be to the everlasting shame of the party that brought this legislation in. I am not accusing the three other Members, the new Members back there, but every last one on that side who voted for this Bill knew what he was doing, and including many who never returned, because they insulted the intelligence — as I said once before — they insulted the intelligence of the people of this Province and even grade students could read through this thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I have a newspaper clipping here. "Guy predicts NDP wipe-out." That is an election prediction, that was the former Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder where he is today? He is trying to come in.

An Hon. Member: — He's the man you won't let in the House.

Mr. Thibault: — That's a very good question. Then I look at this map and you see the constituency of Prince Albert East, it takes such a large area with 15,000 voters. Anybody in his right mind knows very well that that person cannot service this constituency properly. Now you take Prince Albert West for instance, you put your thumb on the map, over Prince Albert West and it disappears. A real tiny little one where you don't need to place a long distance call, in 15 minutes you can go to any part of it. Well I am going to tell the Member for Prince Albert East it takes in the town of Creighton on the borderline of Manitoba, a large part of the town of Prince Albert, and you tell this man, you'll get \$9,000 a year to service Prince Albert East, and Prince Albert West gets the same price. I am beginning to say that any Member — there are some of them, mind you, that were cut down somewhere below the 5,000 voters on the list. I think that those who have over 9,000 voters, should be paid accordingly. I think some need a wage cut here and some need a wage increase in order to service these constituencies properly.

Now I don't want to take too much time of the House, but I would say, let us take this question of boundaries out of the realm of politics. I have heard some complaints from the Opposition saying that we had some multiple seats in the cities, if multiple seats were wrong at that time, I would have had no objection to correcting this situation. But creating two wrongs

to make a right is wrong. Even in multiple seats we saw people of different political shades get elected in an election, so it couldn't have been that bad. In some of the cities they elect their aldermen on that basis, it is a common practice in some cities. If there was anything wrong with Saskatoon and Regina in the redistribution that could have been corrected, but to cut Last Mountain out into a sliver, just sad, well it is an insult, just 12 miles wide at most of the constituency, it's long, it's twisted, it's crooked. Anybody who looked at it certainly didn't have to look very long to see that this was far from being honest.

I think with what I have said already, I don't want to take too much time of the House, but let us prove to our young people that we have representation by population. I am sure if they are well informed that we are not going to see flag burnings and sign carrying and disturbances when you can tell your young people, if you don't like the government, there is a way to change it. But just supposing the Liberal Party should have won the election with 30 some per cent of the vote. What do you tell your people then? That they can change the government? For history clearly tells you how representation by population came about, and it came about by trouble and the Opposition knows how much trouble it was. It meant fight and so on. That's what Members who are left of the Opposition and many who will never come back to this House tried to do to the Province of Saskatchewan.

If we want democracy let us protect it and let us show our young people that we really mean it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I hope that this Resolution will be passed unanimously as soon as possible that we can have a redistribution Bill that makes sense.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) and the Hon. Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) for placing this resolution on the Order Paper.

The last redistribution of constituencies clearly enunciated the need for an Independent Commission. Electoral results are clear-cut evidence that speak conclusively for such legislative action. Voters in this Province, Mr. Speaker, voted for such action and they have asked us to proceed. They indicated that they were fed up with rigged and rotten boroughs like Albert Park and that they were not democratic and that they didn't hint at representation by population and that they smacked of dictatorship.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, there are four Members representing rigged rotten boroughs which were designed by their friends to get them in this House. Mr. Speaker, they are the ridings of Moose Jaw North, Prince Albert West, Whitmore Park and Albert Park. Some of the plans made by their political

cohorts went astray in the rural areas and in Saskatoon because the people revolted because of such bare-face manipulation.

Let us look at the situation by actual tabulation, as a result of the brazen violation of democracy contained in the last redistribution Bill. Second, Mr. Speaker, let us discuss some terms of reference for an independent redistribution committee. And third, perhaps we should look at the type of personnel we should like to see sitting on that committee.

Let us examine some of the tabulations. The Member for the rigged riding of Albert Park, according to the enumeration represents 4,352 voters. The Hon. Member for Regina Centre, the Premier of this Province represents 17,3000 voters, four times as many people located in another riding in the same city. The Member for the rigged riding of Moose Jaw North represents 6,450 voters, while the Minister of Labour and Welfare from the same city represents 12,626 voters. The Member for the rigged riding of Prince Albert West represents 9,463 voters, while the Hon. Member for Prince Albert East represents 14,811 voters.

Mr. Speaker, in rural Saskatchewan the story is the same, perhaps not as blatant, but approximately the same. Mr. Speaker, you represent 10,200 voters or more, the Hon. Member for Milestone represents 5,501 voters. If Members in this House had seats the same size as their riding, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Albert Park would be sitting on a milk stool, and if he was allotted time according to the number of votes he represents, he would be muzzled and quiet a good percentage of the time.

Let's have a look at the total vote in Regina City, Mr. Speaker, and break it down. 60,400 voters are represented by the four New Democratic MLAs in this House, while 21,700 are represented by the successful Opposition MLAs. Equate that if you will, each Opposition Member represents an average of 11,200 voters. Each Government Member represents an average of 15,100 voters. When one considers, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Lakeview, the Hon. Member for Milestone and the vacant seat drew up these boundaries, one might conclude it could have been worse and they probably think it should have been. In any case, the figures say clearly, to all of us, don't let Liberal MLAs draw boundaries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan:— Or, Mr. Speaker, if they jokingly call Kelvington the Harrington riding, then let's not have returning officers drawing boundaries either, Mr. Speaker.

Let us discuss for a moment the terms of reference of such an independent committee. Well, I think the committee should divide the number of voters by the number of constituencies and establish a size for a riding. There are 540,000 votes and 60 ridings, a riding should contain 9,000 votes. Because of distance tolerance should be allowed rural seats, although transportation is such that I doubt the need for a great tolerance, let's say 15 per cent or even less. The maximum then for a city riding would be 10,350 and the minimum for a rural riding would be 7,650. But I should hope that the figure would be closer in most instances. Second, trading centres and present boundaries would be a factor. A boundary should be a straight,

clearly understandable line. Not like they are in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, or in Kelvington, for instance. The individual political parties or groups should have a chance to make representation to this independent committee. Fourth, the ballot should be taken on a straight majority basis.

Five, what about the personnel for such a committee? Well, I think the committee should consist of three members, as chairman, a former Member of this House, fully knowledgeable in the work of an MLA. Some suggestions, Jim Hooker, MLA for Notukeu-Willow Bunch, J.H. Brockelbank, formerly from Kelsey, Martin Pederson, formerly from Arm River. Second a school teacher from urban Saskatchewan and preferably a lady, since half the voters in this Province and many of the workers in the election campaigns are women. Third, someone who has worked as a rural returning officer in a provincial election. The reasons for choosing the people I have suggested are self-explanatory. An ex-MLA knows better than anyone else the need for accessibility, Mr. Brockelbank, Mr. Pederson or Mr. Hooker know every inch of the Province. Teachers communicate to their students about democracy and representation by population, they know the arguments for it very well. Eighty per cent of all the election workers and half the voters are women. And finally, one member of the committee preferably from a rural area should know at first hand the problems of organizing election machinery.

In this last election the people instructed us to proceed with this committee at once, to hear briefs and to write legislation for the next time we have an election. I urge that we get this under way immediately. The people have told us not to set up committees of MLAs to draw boundaries. They have said, loud and clear, to quit playing around with the election date too, and don't you dare use Crown corporations for political advertising before an election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — In electoral reform we must set a fixed date for an election. I suggest the second Wednesday in June, and legislation too, should forbid advertising by Crown corporations for six months at least prior to that date. But these matters fall under another heading.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me sum up. I have shown why we need this independent commission. The figures I have quoted argue for this Resolution. Some of the terms of reference of such a committee have been included in my remarks and third, the possible personnel for such a committee has been suggested. Let me offer in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my condolences to the two surviving Members of the last boundaries committee who are present. The Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson). Their numbers opposite prove that the last committee was ineffective from their point of view and judging by our number, undemocratic from the public's point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, like the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes)

I had not planned to enter this debate on this Resolution. We've heard some of the most hypocritical statements ever given this House by some of the senior Members opposite. The Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) talked about gerrymandering starting in 1965. We have heard the pious statement from the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) about representation by population and how he talked to the students and told them he was proud to say you have representation by population in this House. He said he couldn't say it very recently but he did in the past. I say to you, Mr. Member that you mislead those students and I hope you don't talk to them again in that vein.

The first time I voted in an election in this Province I voted for four people in the City of Saskatoon because Members opposite had the gall to tell the people that there were no natural boundaries in Saskatoon and they could not be divided up. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite had the gall again and the hypocrisy to have five seats in the City of Regina where it was divided up. And what was the reason for that, because the over-riding majority in the City of Saskatoon let them carry the four seats whereas in Regina they had to divide it up to keep the seats that they were able to maintain in the election and that kind of hypocrisy does not sit too well with me, personally. I quite agree with the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) that two wrongs don't make a right but don't get hypocritical with me because I sat through and I tried to vote and have one man, one vote, under your form of government.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have called for an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. I will support an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission, but I want it made clear to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I want an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission and not the window-dressing type of proposals that have been before this House in this Session. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the pious statements given this morning by Members opposite will be evidenced by the Members that they show in that commission. And if that commission is independent and if that commission will be fair, you'll have the support of at least myself and I am assuming all Members of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hear any more hypocrisy from the Members opposite when it comes to electoral distribution and I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAND BANK COMMISSION

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats):

That this Assembly requests that the Government give immediate consideration to the establishment of a Land Bank commission whose purpose it would be, among other things, to purchase land offered voluntarily on the market at competitive prices and lease this land, guaranteeing tenure, on the basis of need, with option to buy, with the objective of promoting the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this Resolution under

my name asking for immediate consideration for the establishment of a Land Bank Commission, I first of all want to point out that this is one of the main agricultural planks in the platform of the New Democratic Party in the June 23rd election.

Why then did I put this on the Order Paper? I did so because of the great interest I found during the campaign, both by young would-be farmers, and also by farmers hoping to retire from the farm. I also bring this forward because of the great urgency for this program, and the necessity of acting on it as soon as possible.

When one considers what has happened in the last ten years or so to the family farm in this Province, one begins to see the real urgency. Farms have continued to get larger and larger. As farmers have decided to retire, or change their occupation, in most cases their land has been bought, not by a smaller farmer who needed the land to make his operation a viable unit, but by some larger farmer, who already has a viable unit.

Let me cite an instance. About six weeks ago a farmer in my area held an auction sale and sold his farm. He had four quarters of land. Who bought it? Not the neighbors close by who could have farmed it, but rather two farmers further away. One of these farmers already had 12 quarters and the other 14 quarters. This trend has been growing year by year. I believe it is an undesirable trend, and I believe that it is the duty of governments to stop this trend.

The average age of a Saskatchewan farmer today is 57 years. In another seven or eight years these men will be retiring, by age if in no other way. Who is to replace them? If we take the recommendations of the Task Force Report, it will be taken over by large corporate farms, economic units. I shall deal with that in a few minutes.

On top of all this, I look around and I see farmers, farming the land themselves, yet with sons working in the cities. These young men, or at least a great majority of them, would like to farm but are not for two main reasons. First, they see how hard their parents have worked, never getting really a square deal, working as many as 16 hours a day, and they say, "Dad, I'm not crazy. I see no sense to working for nothing when I can work for wages and get an eight-hour day." The second reason is that even if the son should come back to run the farm and let Dad retire, he finds that the only way Dad can retire is for him to sell the land, and he, the son, has no money to buy the land. So if Dad is to retire, he then is forced to sell to someone who has the money. A friend of mine a few years ago told me, a farmer who farms just a few miles out of this city and is getting up in years, and he made this statement to me. He said, "The City of Regina is full of frustrated young would-be farmers, farmers' sons who would like to farm but cannot." And I believe that this statement is true.

There is one other factor that begins to scare me. That is the large blocks of land that are being bought up by one man, or a group of men. I can't refer to a previous debate, Mr. Speaker, but the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) discussed this previously. I am concerned that these transactions may well be financed by some large corporation farm companies from the United States. Anyone who has travelled to any extent in the United States have seen the large holdings of some of these companies, and the results of these takeovers on the rural

areas and farm centres situated near by.

In my opinion there is need for urgent action by this Government to stop this trend. I realize that it is impossible to act at this Session. There will be a necessity for planning, of finding out relevant information, and drafting legislation, but I do suggest that it is urgent for the Government to get at it and be prepared to bring in this legislation at the next session of the Legislature.

The purposes of a Land Bank Commission would be several. It would purchase land voluntarily on the market at competitive prices. I envisage that a farmer retiring, such as I mentioned a few minutes ago, would be glad to sell his land to the Government, rather than to an already big farmer, as long as he got the same price. Secondly, the Government would lease this land to young people who want to farm, on a long-term lease, guaranteeing tenure on the basis of need, leaving the farmer the right to buy at a later date. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there are the farmers presently trying to get a viable unit, but no money to purchase more land. The Commission should also give these farmers the opportunity to lease land on a long term basis.

In my opinion, these farmers who acquire land from the commission, must have available technical and financial advice from the Department of Agriculture. The whole face of agriculture has changed and will continue to change. The farmer will have to keep up with all the latest information and research. Here an enlarged and improved Ag. Rep. service could really fill a role in keeping our farmers on top of all the latest information.

I am convinced a program such as I have outlined will be a step to save the family farm, and make our farm communities a worthwhile place to live in. I commend all Members to support this Resolution.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to speak in favor of a resolution of this kind. We have for some years been searching for a means to facilitate the transfer of land for those who wish to retire, or wish to get out of farming to those who wish to enter farming or who require additional land as a base for a more viable farm operation. There can be no question of the need for some fair mechanism to facilitate this transfer.

During the recent election campaign in my riding of Saltcoats, which is as most of you know, a mixed farming area, I was appalled to see how many farms were being operated by farmers who had reached retirement age or beyond. In fact the average age of our farmers in our area is around 55. These are, in the main, farmers whose sons have left the farm, not because they did not wish to farm but because there was no way they could obtain the necessary financing to purchase the land, with the high operating costs, and have a sufficient return to make a decent living. It is very obvious within the next ten years, or possible less, there must be a wholesale turnover of farm holdings from this older group of farmers.

The question arises then, who will take over the land from these retiring farmers? Under normal economic pressures they would be offered for sale on the market and go to the highest bidder, who in most cases would be a well-established farmer or corporation which already has a sufficiently large operation.

The young farmer, or the farmer with the small operation, who did not have sufficient security to qualify for the necessary loans would have little opportunity to bid successfully on these farms. Farmers' sons wishing to start out on their own are the most likely victims of this situation. In a great many cases older farmers would like to pass their operations down to their sons but because their entire life savings are tied up in their farms they must be able to get the cash out before they retire. Under the Land Bank proposal, as I understand it, a mechanism could be provided whereby the retiring farmer could sell his farm to the Commission and his son could apply to lease this farm, with guaranteed tenure, until such a time he is able to obtain enough security to buy it.

The losers in the present game of farm consolidation are not only the farmers on the land but the entire farm community. If the present trend continues many of our small rural towns and villages will disappear because there will not be a sufficiently large market in rural areas to justify their existence. So the problem is compounded. Not only do we lose population on the farms, but from supporting communities as well. The breakdown in social patterns is then the next step. With the declining rural population, it becomes even more difficult to supply essential services, recreational and educational facilities which we need, and the cost per capita of those services becomes oppressively high.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it is either necessary or desirable that this trend should continue. Granted, we may have to accept the demise of some of our very small farms which can't possibly produce a decent living at present day standards. But I do believe that with proper farm programs, a very large number of farms in the intermediate size range, say from 320 acre to 960 acre range, could become viable economic units. I realize, of course, that this applies possibly more so in our parkland area than it does in the western areas. Here, of course, the acreages may have to be considerably higher. But I do have a constituent in my constituency, who up until the drop of hog prices, was making a really good living on a seven acre piece of land. And I think this is the kind of program that we have to look at.

Certainly this means, in the case of a smaller unit, a large measure of diversification. Care will have to be taken to gear production to market requirements. But I am convinced that through establishment of guaranteed floor prices, these units can be economic. We, in rural Saskatchewan, with our great plains area and our parklands, are the Garden of Eden of Canada. We have a way of life which we love and which we must fight to retain.

When one looks at the overcrowded concrete jungles which our cities have become, one begins to wonder at a system which demands that people must be driven from this wonderful land to satisfy the gods of economics and efficiency. Even if alternative employment were available for our displaced population, and present unemployment does not indicate this is the case. Many of our rural people do not readily adapt to new surroundings because of age and lack of education and so many end up in the ranks of the unemployed and on welfare rolls. This becomes an added cost to our society.

Many of us feel that the money spent in trying to

assimilate these up-rooted people into our overcrowded cities and on the social problems they create could be much better spent on a farm maintenance program which would keep the farm population on their farms where they want to stay.

The Land Bank proposal is only one of the steps which must be taken to make this possible. I think it is a very necessary and urgent step. Through the implementation of this program a mechanism is provided whereby the orderly transfer of land can take place, and whereby the young farmers, once again, can get established in the occupation of their choice.

The Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) outlined some of the major requirements of this program. I think safeguards will have to be written into such a program to ensure that the land which becomes available to the commission, is indeed, distributed on the basis of need, so that those farmers who do not now have the security needed to expand are given the first opportunity to lease this land.

Another area which concerns me is that we do not wish to see the Government tied up in buying huge tracts of land. I would suggest that at no time the commission hold more than a small percentage of the land in any local jurisdiction.

The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) the other day expressed what I think is a very sincere concern, about the sale of huge blocks of farm land to American investors. I share that concern and I can assure you that we on this side of the House will be taking early actions to correct this situation.

I am proud to be associated with a government which is prepared to undertake some real steps to ensure that the ownership and control of the agricultural land of this Province, are retained in the hands of Saskatchewan people. The introduction of a Land Bank program will further guarantee that many of our smaller farmers will be able to continue to make their contribution to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to an early introduction of this program and I will support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion which urges the establishment, at an early date, of the Land Bank Commission.

To me this is the most important single piece of legislation that has come before this Session, most important to Saskatchewan as a whole, and most important to Qu'Appelle-Wolseley the constituency that I represent.

Corporate land purchasing can only be controlled in three ways. 1. By restricting the ownership of that land. 2. Through taxation. 3. Through the Land Bank as an alternative to the other two. Now I prefer this third alternative and I think we can get much better co-operation from the Opposition in this type of a program. My constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is mainly an agriculture constituency, diversified to some extent, but right now there are many farmers waiting for the Land Bank to be established. They can't wait too much longer, the fathers or uncles, or widowed mothers for that matter, are wishing to

retire or get rid of their land and yet the children whom they want this land to go to cannot get the credit to buy it.

I shall cite you one example which is fairly close to me because it happened to myself personally. Last year I tried to buy one-half section from my mother, who incidentally is a widow, and I wanted some extra money to build a house. I was buying \$100 an acre land for \$60 an acre and the total loan that I requested was \$32,000. It went through two stages of approval by the Farm Credit Corporation and was refused by the area supervisor who operated out of Regina. At that time I had over 20,000 bushels of grain on hand, a house in the town of Fillmore, which was half paid for. I had a good herd of Charolais cattle which were practically paid for, which I bought under the Government's loan program, and in general I had pretty sound assets. Now the reason that I was refused this loan was not because of the financial situation that agriculture was in. This is what the supervisor told me. He said, "That we feel that at this time you would be better not to go into the farming business." However, at that time I was already farming seven quarters of land and trying to hang on to two quarters of this land. So, when the Opposition says that our Family Farm Protection Act is destroying the credit of the young farmers in Saskatchewan I say that our credit has already been destroyed for the last two years.

The Land Bank, if it had been brought in a couple of years ago, would have saved the situation from developing at Fillmore with regard to the American ownership of the land, or absentee ownership, as I prefer to refer to it. The people around that area were perfectly willing to sell to the young farmers in that area for \$10 to \$15 per acre less than what they were bid by this millionaire from Florida. Yet, there wasn't one young person — and by young I mean under 40 years old — who was trying to purchase this land, who could get any kind of backing from Farm Credit Corporation or any other lending agency to purchase this land. I was just informed that last week this same company purchased another half section of land in the \$100 an acre land area, for \$65 per acre with crop. I say that we have to take some pretty drastic action right away. I think that the Land Bank Commission is the best idea that we have to offer at this time.

The Opposition has stated before that there have been no foreclosures by the Farm Credit Corporation since 1957, I believe they stated. I will agree with them that this is possibly true, but I can cite you cases where Farm Credit Corporation directed the young farmers who were in debt to them, either to sell their land and get off or start paying up. And this doesn't give a young fellow too much opportunity to dicker on a price or to come up with other types of financing. When Farm Credit puts a squeeze on you, you either have to get someone to bail you out in a hurry or else get rid of the land. And whom do they well it to when they get this squeeze put on them? They sell it to that American again.

The principles that we must keep in mind when establishing the Land Bank, I feel, are six in general. 1. It must be completely voluntary between the seller and the commission. In other words the seller must contact the commission in the first place, offering his land for sale. I believe that the seller must have the opportunity to direct the leasing of this land, to his children, nephew or nieces, or whatever, and if this case

August 10, 1971

doesn't arise then the land should be leased on the basis of need. I think the most important idea in establishing a Land Bank Commission is that it must be established to try and keep the family farms going. In other words the transfer of land from a father to son, or an uncle to nephew, or this type of deal.

I feel that the purchase price should also be within 10 per cent of the going market value. I have already stated that in my constituency I know of many farmers who are presently willing to sell to the commission for \$15 an acre less than going market value, if their sons or nephews, or someone, will be guaranteed a lease on this land. It is worth that much to them to have their descendants take over this land. The option to purchase must be left open at any time to the lessee and the price must be negotiated again. You can't keep the prices of land set at a set price over a 10 or 20-year period. You must let them fluctuate reasonably.

The lease must be guaranteed for as many years as the lessee prefers, as long as the lessee meets the conditions of that lease. In other words, if he is farming it in a husband-like manner, the lease that the government would draw up would be similar to any lease that is available today.

And the sixth point that I think is very important, is that improvements on this site must be credited to the lessee and recognized and recoverable at such time as the lease would be cancelled, if and when it ever was.

These improvements would have to be recoverable at depreciated value, but this would permit the farmer the flexibility to make his own decisions, to put up a hog enterprise, or feedlot, or this type of thing, even an extra bedroom on a house.

I predict that in the first year that the cost to Saskatchewan would probably be more than the guaranteed loans that were going to be made available to the pulp mill at Meadow Lake. But I ask the Government, and the Opposition, what safer investment is there than in land itself? So let's borrow this money as quickly as we can and make it available for the establishment of the Land Bank. Saskatchewan would feel the impact of this Land Bank within four months.

I would request that the Federal Government participate in the formation of this Bank. This would give both Governments a responsibility in making sure that the situation of our farms become more equitable. We can let the Federal Government help buy back some of Canada which everybody knows, much of which they have given away right now. Maybe then, Ottawa would finally realize that as go the farms in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Alberta, so goes the economy of Canada, even though it takes them two or three years to feel it.

I will admit that our Family Farm Protection Act may have some shortcomings, but we have ten months to correct these situations. We have to stall for some time right now so that we can set up the Land Bank Commission without any shortcomings. And if we have some shortcomings in our Family Farm Protection Act, I have every confidence that we shall take action, probably next week, to correct these things.

It is really amazing what a little bit of co-operation can

do. I would, again, like to thank the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), Mr. Speaker, who brought up the subject of the American ownership in my district. Since he brought it up the day before, I was going to cover it in my speech, we have had a great amount of interest in our area. We now have a CBC crew coming in to photograph and interview the different people related in this transaction. The Rural Municipality is now pursuing a course of action, requesting that the Government step in. If we can continue to receive this type of co-operation from the Opposition in our move to establish the Land Bank Commission, which as I have said, I feel would be the most important way of controlling foreign ownership, I think that we can have a very effective government here in Saskatchewan and really serve their people in the best interest.

It gives me great pleasure to support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, my first indication of the Resolution is that it is very, very difficult for us on the Opposition side, to be able, in a fair and just manner, to put forward our opinions when we really have nothing concrete laid before us as to what the proposals may actually be.

I must indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure and have been convinced for a great deal of time that there is no difference of opinion in the preservation of the family farm as far as the Members of the Assembly are concerned.

Mr. Romanow: — It's a hastily drafted Resolution.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, despite the political posturing that takes place, I doubt very much if there is any serious disagreement among the Members of this Assembly as far as the preservation of the family farm is concerned. I should find it difficult to disagree with any of the comments made by the three speakers on the Government side, this morning. I should like to say a few things because undoubtedly any type of system in agriculture, which is initiated and which will result, Mr. Speaker, in the transfer of land from the older generation to the younger farmers so that they may become productive and remain in the rural community as farmers, certainly would, I am sure, receive a great deal of support from all the people of Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I am convinced that a proposal which we are convinced will do this, we will support. As I mentioned it is very difficult for us to know at this time precisely what these proposals will be.

I do want to say just a few words, Mr. Speaker, about the problems which have been brought up and will be hearing a great deal more about as far as the family farm is concerned. Because despite the fact that we may all have the desire of preserving the family farm, I think that the political aspect of this particular subject, while it had great appeal and still has great appeal of producing more young farmers, that the operation of the plan will be a great deal more difficult than has been put forth by the political popularity of such a move. I want to mention, at least two particular reasons why I think this will

be exceptionally difficult. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is as practically every economist knows, or people involved in agriculture know, that there is hardly such a thing as a farm in this country that returns a decent rate of interest. There is hardly such a farm, Mr. Speaker, except for the best managed and the most profitable farms that will return a rate of interest comparable to Savings Bonds, approximately yielding, I think, about 8 per cent and currently guaranteed by the Government of Canada.

There are a few diversified farms that will return a good rate of interest but most farms if they have \$100,000 investment, the farmer would actually make a greater return if he could sell all of his investment, invest \$100,000 in Savings Bonds and receive his \$8,000 interest, he would be financially better off. This is, of course, despite the fact that he is charging absolutely nothing for his labor.

So, Mr. Speaker, we immediately come to the very first problem. The Government, if they are to involve themselves in a Land Bank, which is meaningful in any respect, will first of all have to buy that land at a low price or failing that, Mr. Speaker, it will mean that the Government has to evolve a very, very heavy subsidy of the interest rate. The reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is for the obvious reason that if we set up a young farmer on a piece of land and he has to pay the rate of interest the Government has paid to borrow the money to buy the land originally, if he has bought a quarter section at \$10,000, the Government has borrowed the money, say at 6 or 7 per cent. If that farmer is going to pay the interest on that land at 6 or 7 per cent he will have an exceptional difficult time earning a living on that property. So the Government, I am convinced, from my experience with farming — except for the most profitable operation and best managed — will find that in order to have a meaningful program it will either have to heavily subsidize the interest rate of Saskatchewan which will cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan many, many millions of dollars, or they will have to buy the land at a much lower price than it is currently selling. So I say, Mr. Speaker, while the objective by the Government opposite is a laudable one, that in order to be very meaningful, it will likely be a very severe financial drain on the Province unless they are able to come forth with some type of program which I think none of us are aware of at this time.

I should just like to say a few words on what the young Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) has mentioned in regard to Farm Credit Corporation loans, because I have encountered this with many of my own constituents and I know every rural Member has. But the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Farm Credit Corporation a long time ago developed a formula on productive capacity. The Farm Credit Corporation has told farmers for many, many years that the price of land in Saskatchewan is over-valued for what you can earn on it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, land wasn't worth \$125 an acre for what you could earn from it. The result was the Farm Credit Corporation recognized this fact, and said, 'we'll only lend you \$50 or \$60 an acre because that's what you can make to be able to repay the interest plus capital.' I think that the Farm Credit Corporation has protected the farmer in many instances by not lending money in cases to farmers where it was obvious the farmer would not be able to repay the debt plus interest unless he accepted a very, very low standard of living for himself.

I think there is the other aspect, Mr. Speaker, if the Government's program gets into it in a very, very sizable manner, despite the financial aspects, I think there would also be great concern about the political aspect of any government controlling large tracts of land in the Province. I think that we on this side would certainly have our second thoughts on that particular subject as I think many farmers in Saskatchewan would have. I think that all the Members on this side would express great concern over the political aspects of the Government controlling very, very large size tracts of land.

I think in the days ahead that many other farmers will express this concern. We all know that it is far too easy to find out how a particular person, who is after land, votes and I think that this certainly could be a possibility of very wide-spread political implications in any government controlling large portions of land in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, while we will give support to the motion on the basis that we are anxious to do something for the family farm, anxious to facilitate any transfer to the young farmers, that we also reserve our right and our duty to scrutinize any proposal that comes forth. Certainly there are no definite proposals, only the indication from the Members opposite that this is a desirable objective. We don't disagree with the objective, we agree with the objective, but we are going to be watching very, very carefully what the definite concrete proposals are, because we think that these will have great magnitude possibly from the financial point of view, and from the political control of agriculture in Saskatchewan. While we will support the motion, we do so only with reservations in regard to what these actual proposals are going to be. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RULING BY SPEAKER ON RESOLUTIONS 3, 4, 5, 6 AND 7

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Hon. Member begins to move this motion I am going to draw to the attention of the House that Resolutions in the Legislature cannot contain a preamble. The Speaker has the right to either amend the motion, or on the other hand, he could declare the motion out of order if any part of it is out of order. I do not intend to rule these motions out of order, this one and also the next four which follow, but I am ruling that all the words after the word 'that' in the first line and the first three words in the second line up to and including June 5, 1971, are out of order because they are in the same context as a preamble. Therefore, the Resolution will be debated with the argument of the Resolution without the preamble, so I ruled the first line and the next three words out of order.

I rule on this one (Resolution No. 4) out of order up to the word 'this' in the first line after the word 'that'. The same ruling, without me repeating, will apply to the next Resolutions up to and including No. 7.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — FEDERAL PAYMENT TO PRAIRIE FARMERS

Mr. D. Faris (Arm River) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Tchorzewski

(Humboldt):

That this Assembly urgently requests the Government of Canada to separate the \$100 million payment mentioned in Bill C-244 (Prairie Grain Stabilization Act) and make payment to prairie farmers immediately.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my comments regarding this Resolution are going to be brief, they are simply this. That this cash injection is in itself too little and too late. But although it is too little and too late, it is needed at this time. There should be no delay in this and it should not be tied to the acceptance of the Stabilization Plan which simply is not acceptable to the farmers in Canada. There were very few issues in which you can get almost total unanimity amongst the farming population, but if you would look at the reports of the Federal Government's Agriculture Committee, which I have on my desk here, you will see there that there are briefs presented by every major farm organization in Canada, first of all opposing the stabilization plan as it stands now, and secondly, urging that this payment be made immediately. I should like to enter into the records of this Government the names of some of those organizations which back these points which are made in our Resolution. We have briefs which will support our position made by the National Farmers Union, by UNIFORM in Alberta, by the Alberta Wheat Pool, by the Manitoba Wheat Pool, by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, by the United Grain Growers Association, by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter and it is one which should in this Province go beyond party lines. We need this cash injection for our farmers, we need it now, we must present a united front against the Federal Government in their entire direction in which they wish to take agriculture. I hope this Resolution will receive the unanimous support of the Members of this House. It is with great pleasure I move the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to second this motion by my colleague the Hon. Member from Arm River. I am pleased because it gives me the opportunity to add my voice to the many others in this Legislature and to many groups in Western Canada urging the Federal Government to immediately separate the \$100 million payment mentioned in Bill C-244, the Prairie Grains Stabilization Act, and make a payment to prairie farmers as soon as possible.

There is a need for the two to be separated for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, because the Prairie Grains Stabilization Act needs a lot of study and improvement, and secondly, because Western farmers are in no position to wait indefinitely for the cash injection. They have needed it for two years and they need it now.

I just want to deal briefly with the first reason, Mr. Speaker. In the stabilization scheme there are obvious deficiencies, because the plan is based on gross receipts. It provides no factor to compensate for rising production costs, the cost-price squeeze. It is not a net income plan and may very well be nothing more than a guarantee to keep farmers of Western Canada poor. A series of bad years necessitating payouts from

the fund could reduce the on-going averages to an extent that further payouts would be eliminated or made minimal. For instance, if the Stabilization Plan had been in effect in 1933 a payment of \$130 million would have been that year. In 1934 a \$22 million payout would have been made, but at that point the plan's average would have been so run down that no further payout would have been made until 1954. This plan needs careful scrutiny, also because it is just another in a series of steps of implementing the recommendations of the famous, or I should probably say, infamous, Task Force Report.

The Task Force Report carries serious implications for Saskatchewan. If two-thirds of the farmers are to be taken out of farming, there will be a greatly reduced demand for services throughout this Province. Many dozens of Saskatchewan vendors will disappear and we shall experience an unprecedented exodus of population, even worse probably than we have had in the last seven years. It is conceivable that even the major cities could lose population. The new style farm aimed for by the Task Force will be to a large extent a vertically integrated corporate operation. Much of its input will come from internal corporate colleagues and supplies and not from community business. Employment will be minimal and probably be seasonal and under such conditions there is little future for most communities in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, rural life will disappear, our churches, our schools, our stores, our homes, our skating rinks will stand empty, symbols of the stupidity of governments and man. These are some of the reasons why the \$100 million must be separated from Bill C-244.

Some very serious questions must be asked. The key question to be asked about the Task Force of which Bill C-244 is a partner, is whether it is in the national interest? Is it in the people's interest to reduce our rural and small town population to a bare minimum? I think not. I think that the value of rural life must be considered. Mr. Speaker, is it of any net value to move the largest part of our population into concentrated urban settings, or is it of advantage to maintain a greater distribution of population? Sociological considerations are important in the decision. The Federal Liberal Government should separate the \$100 million payment and stop trying to blackmail Western Canadian farmers by tying it up to something which is undesirable in its present state.

Mr. Speaker, I said that there was another reason why the \$100 million should be separated from Bill C-244. That reason is that Western Canadian farmers, Saskatchewan farmers, cannot wait while the stabilization Bill is studied and debated in detail as it needs to be. Farm income is the key to the provincial economy. It is a well known cliché that when the farmer is hard up, so is everybody else. Farm income figures make the most damning indictment of the do-nothing Liberal policies. Mr. Speaker, in 1970 the level of gross income has dropped by 30 per cent from 1967, it has dropped from \$977 million in 1967 to \$684 million in 1970. But as everyone knows or should know the costs of operation are astronomical, the net farm income has been cut by two-thirds between 1967 and 1970 from \$484 million to \$150 million. Because farming is the mainstay of the provincial economy this drastic decline works with a multiple effect. Many small businesses have closed in the last three years, auction sell-outs are common. Small communities have

lost many services vital to their survival. The depression is forcing a massive depopulation, more extensive even than that of the great depression. The most disastrous effects are being felt in the rural areas, 32,000 persons emigrated to other provinces in the period of October 1969 to October 1970 alone and this exodus is continuing right now.

The income situation of the farmer is desperate, these figures and facts make that quite clear. Almost everything that he has tried to produce eventually drops in price. Not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan urged farmers to borrow money and to build expensive hog barns and raise hogs. That wasn't so bad. Diversification, I believe is a good thing, it is important, but I am questioning whether this was really diversification. It was more specialization. I have here the results of this advice, Mr. Speaker, it is a photocopy of a cheque, Wyler and Williams Livestock Commission Agent, Saskatoon - Regina: One hog 350 pounds, 2 cents a pound, gross amount \$7; yard insurance 14 cents; commission 85 cents; hauling \$2.95, total deductions \$4.56. The farmer went home with \$2.44. No wonder that they are in a desperate situation, Mr. Speaker. Last year I can remember sitting in the auction market and watching farmers giving away their weanling pigs at \$3 apiece, some of them wouldn't even sell. The farmers were urged to go into hogs but when the crash came the advisers who advised them to go into hogs ran out of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party believes Government must accept this responsibility as democratic representative of all the people to assure conditions suitable for a decent life. A cash injection has been needed and is still needed in order to stabilize agriculture and its related services but the Federal Liberal Government and Mr. Lang, the Member from Saskatchewan, and one would think that at least he would know better being from Saskatchewan, have stubbornly refused to bend in any way. Mr. Lang holds out a basket of questionable suspicious looking goods in the form of the Prairie Grain Stabilization Act then he holds out a plum, the \$100 million, and says to the Western farmer, "Here you are boys, if you want the plum you are going to have to eat the whole basket." And I suppose that the hope is that pretty soon the farmer is going to be starved enough to eat anything.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what answer have the Hon. Members who made up the Government before June 23rd to this? Their answer was a resolution in 1970 saying "that this Legislature commends the Government of Saskatchewan for recognizing the incoming inadequacy of Prairie farmers by instituting programs that will bring relief in the way of income assistance." Mr. Speaker, the farm people of Saskatchewan spoke out and showed what they thought of this rejection of the cash injection proposal. They were ready, willing and able, the Members opposite, to stumble all over themselves in their readiness to risk over \$100 million on a pulp mill deal that guaranteed Parsons and Whittemore a profit before the mill was even producing but for the Saskatchewan farmers they were only able to say, "Liberals are satisfied." In essence they were saying that they were satisfied while farmers went broke. They were satisfied while hundreds moved to the cities to live in poor housing and be jobless. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not satisfied while Mr. Lang and Mr. Trudeau play politics with the \$100 million that should have been in the farmers' wallets and in the small businessmen's cash registers long ago.

The New Democratic Party has said before and we have continued to say and we are saying now that the farmers of Saskatchewan should not have to wait for that \$100 million. The cash is needed in Western Canada more than ever and we urge the Federal Government to show that they are not completely heartless; to show that they are prepared to do at least a little for Western Canada. We urge the Government of Canada to separate the \$100 million payment mentioned in Bill 2 C-244 and make payment to Prairie farmers immediately. I ask Members opposite to join with us and make this request unanimous so that we can assess very strongly on the Federal Government the need of this.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to second the motion by the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two things I want to say. I think we have heard from the farm Members, but, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it that we support the idea of getting the \$100 million into Western Canada as quickly as possible. I think everybody here knows that it is needed by our farmers; it is needed to improve business in the province and I think we all know that it would have been here a long time ago if your NDP blood brothers in Ottawa hadn't sabotaged the Bill in all phases of it. There is no doubt about this and the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) knows this. No matter what he talks about there was sabotage by the NDP Members and all you have to do is read Hansard to find out.

Mr. Speaker, we will have more to say on this and I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

RULING ON BILL NO. 10

Mr. Speaker: — I have perused Bill No. 10 — An Act respecting Certain Elections in the Constituencies of Athabasca and Gravelbourg which is standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and I wish to make the following ruling:

I would refer all Hon. Members to Rule 30 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1970, which is as follows:

Any vote, resolution, address or bill introduced in the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever, or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people, or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown, or to grant any property of the Crown, or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of the Province, shall be recommended to the Assembly by Message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor before it is considered by the Assembly.

The Speaker's ruling in the Journal of the Legislative

Assembly of Saskatchewan, March 30, 1965, states that a principle of our constitution is that the purpose of the Bill must be recommended to this Assembly by message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. A corollary principle is that such a message can only be delivered to this Assembly by one of His Honour's advisers who is a Minister of the Crown.

The question that arises at this point is as to whether Bill No. 10 — An Act respecting Certain Elections in the Constituencies of Athabasca and Gravelbourg is a charge upon the consolidated fund. Section 2 of the said Bill has the effect, if passed, of seating a Member in the Legislative Assembly. Section 48 of The Legislative Assembly Act, Chapter 3, R.S.S. 1965, provides for the payment out of the consolidated fund, of indemnities to Members of the Legislative Assembly. Because of this charge on the consolidated fund, I rule that it is a money Bill and that it is out of order.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order and to your ruling, the only thing I would question about it is that while I recognize the principle that the Opposition cannot, and I agree should not, be able to propose Bills and Acts that would cost the Government money or force the Government to spend money — I think it is a good sound principle. But at the same time the only question I would raise and ask you to enlighten me on or rule on is the following: the appropriations to pay the indemnity to Members of the Legislative Assembly while it may not be voted in total it is recognized that there shall be 60 Members in this Legislative Assembly and provision, I'm sure, has been made for 60 Members and since this is not an added impost or an added charge on the Government, would not this particular Bill be in a different category than if we had brought in a Bill that would request or suggest, or if passed, cause the Government to spend new money or raise added revenue.

Mr. Speaker: — I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the vote for the Member's indemnity as far as I recall without having to check the wording of the Act is statutory, but at the same time this Assembly on previous occasions has passed election Acts which says certain things must be done before any Member can take his place in this Assembly as a Member of this Assembly. I am not prepared to decide whether the rulings laid down in the Election Act are correct or incorrect. That is not the point at issue. But that compliance has not been fully met with. I feel that the only ones who can move a Bill to seat a Member in this Chamber when he hasn't fully complied with the rules as laid down by this Assembly on previous occasions, in the Elections Act, such a Bill would have to be moved by one who is a Member of His Honour's advisers, namely a Member of the Cabinet, therefore I would say that regardless of one's personal feelings or otherwise, this is a money Bill and is out of order.

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that what this ruling does is stretch beyond all reason the meaning and intent of a money Bill. There is no question about it that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled, by law, to be represented by 60 Members of this House. Mr. Speaker, we are merely identifying one of these Members and the real import of this Bill is the identification of the person who properly should sit during

this Session only for a particular constituency of this Province. It is, therefore, reaching far back to determine that this is in fact a money Bill and quite frankly we should like, Mr. Speaker, to appeal the ruling because we do not think that in all fairness the meaning of a money Bill can be stretched to the point where the ruling has stretched it.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Hon. Member appealing the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. MacLeod: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I should advise Members that that is always open to Members to appeal the ruling of the Chair and I hope that debates don't take place but appeal is always in order to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The ruling of the Chair has been appealed. Is it the wish of the House that the ruling of the Chair be upheld?

Ruling of the Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 38

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

And the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. MacDonald (Milestone):

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

This Bill be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, when we rose last night I was attempting to give the Hon. Members opposite, especially the two Members from the legal profession, one of them who is now leaving the House, a post-graduate review of certain statutes but I must say I am very disappointed they didn't seem to be prepared to take it in then, and they don't seem to be either prepared or able to take it in now, so I won't continue that post-graduate course.

I shall review for a few moments some of the highlights of the Bill that have been brought out by the Members opposite, the Bill that is before us now. Weaknesses have been brought out in this Bill by the Opposition and by the people who have had a chance, who have been given a chance, because we didn't allow the Government with their huge majority to steamroller this Act through the Legislature in one day as they wanted. Some of those weaknesses have been brought out and I am confident, and I am sure, that the Government itself has realized and has recognized that this Bill needs to be changed and changed drastically. I predict that when we move into Committee of the Whole, if they continue adamantly to refuse to put this Bill into committee to give the people who will be concerned and affected by this Bill a democratic chance to be heard, to be listened to; if they refuse to show the public of Saskatchewan that they are, in fact, prepared to let democracy work in this Province as they so blithely promised in the last election; if they, in fact, meant their promise that they would bring about a New Deal for People and they would let the people take part actively in the process of Government, and yet here we have the spectacle from a Government only elected six weeks, of a Bill, for an Act that could put in jeopardy the credit of every farmer in this Province.

This isn't what I say. This has been brought to their attention by credit grantors, by small businessmen, by implement dealers who met with them and pleaded with them, by representation from implement manufacturers. Again credit granters witnessed the letter we all had from the Credit Union. And these people — and I am sure others — have written to them and have talked to them just as they have written and talked to us and said this Bill has implications that may be far more serious than the Government realizes, and so why not take a day or two days to listen to these people and let them be heard in the proper manner. That is why the Law Amendments Committee is set up. That's the purpose of the Law Amendments Committee, so that we can take legislation, refer it to the Law Amendments Committee, call in witnesses, allow people to present briefs, allow the public who are affected to come to us legislators and say, "Here is our thinking on it." Surely, by denying them this right, what the Government is really saying is that we 45 NDP Members so freshly elected, about six weeks ago, have all the knowledge, all the wisdom, we know exactly what's best for the farmer, we know exactly what is best for the business community and we are prepared, in spite of everything, to ram this Bill through without

proper consultation.

Let me review just some of the highlights, some of the weaknesses that have become apparent since this Bill was so hastily introduced into this Session.

I mentioned last night Section 13. It talks about a farmer who has sold his farm or leased his farm and has come to depend on the one-third share of the crop. Now that's very bad and a very badly written clause in there because it doesn't say who will decide — as far as I can gather — who will decide what are legitimate expenses. It, in fact, as far as I can read, leaves it up to the individual farmer and it could deny, it could deny many of our senior citizens, many of our retired farmers, the income over the next year or even longer that they have come to depend on.

There's the question of depreciation. They say they have moved in this Act to protect the implement dealer and the small businessman. But they haven't yet answered the question of what happens, who pays the difference in depreciation between the machine that would have been seized today or yesterday or last week or tomorrow, and cannot now be touched for one year. The same farmer who couldn't pay or wouldn't pay today and is either not in a position or refuses to pay a year from now after he's had his moratorium and the dealer who has to take that machine back, the machine is worth \$500, \$800 or \$1,000 less. Who makes up that difference in the depreciation?

As it stands now the little independent dealer has to make up that depreciation because most of the time he's had to co-sign the note or the paper that granted the credit to the farmer in the first place.

The question raised by Mr. Weatherald, the MLA for Cannington, is an excellent one — the machinery that has now been seized, machinery that has been taken back legitimately, and the implement dealer has already spent \$200, \$300, \$400, \$500 or maybe \$1,000 on it, that that farmer can now — the minute this bill is passed, and will be I am sure — present himself to that dealer and take that tractor, that implement, that truck and take it back. And who makes up the difference in the \$500 or \$1,000 or \$800 or \$100 that has been spent to put that in shape so that it can be sold?

The question hasn't been answered of how the Government intends to protect the small credit union, the small credit grantor, the implement dealer, automobile dealer, or the manufacturer or anyone else who is involved in this, who have, in fact, granted credit . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . in good faith to our farmers. These questions haven't been answered and they need to be answered. And surely, surely the Government doesn't think that they have all the wisdom in the world that they are not prepared to sit down and listen to these people who have made their livelihood, whose whole life is tied up in granting credit, selling machinery, selling cars, selling land, and the farmers themselves to say, "Can we do what we want to do?" And there isn't anyone, no one that I have seen yet — certainly not this Opposition — who says if there is a real problem and a real crisis, and we recognize there

is a crisis on the farm, and if that Government wishes to help the farmer over this difficult period, there isn't anyone that I have seen, including this Opposition and including the implement dealers and the manufacturers and the credit grantors, that say, 'look, if we can find some way to tide them over, we'll do it.' But again, let's come back to the basic point. The Government says, "We will help the family farm," but where in this Act, where in any of the speeches made by the Members opposite have they stated or do they state in this Act the Government will, in fact, lift one little finger themselves to help the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Members who just sat down, two or three of them, one talked about the credit he had. He bought some Charolais and he bought some land and then he said he went to borrow some more money and he found he couldn't borrow any because the individual credit grantor said, "Well, we think the farming business isn't that good." But what he failed to think about was that he already had had some credit. He says, "Well the credit is dried up now." No one recognizes better than we do that it is already difficult enough for farmers in Saskatchewan to get credit. And yet by the stroke of a pen, you are going to make it far more difficult for many solid farmers, or impossible. There may be a better way. Other Members there talk glibly about our Government being prepared to put up \$100 million to help Parsons and Whittemore with some pulp mill. Sure, we were ready to risk something to build a pulp mill to supply work, to put money into our economy. Okay, that Government cancelled it, that was their right and their privilege.

At the same time that they cancelled it and across the hustings when they smeared the pulp mill, Member after Member, candidate after candidate said, "What could we do with that \$100 million for the farmers? What could we do with that \$100 million for the poor people?" So they were elected, so they cancelled the pulp mill, so theoretically at least they've got a credit line of \$100 million or \$107 million. They haven't quite had the opportunity to destroy the credit of this Province and we left it in excellent shape. Why have they not been prepared to put some of it — it wouldn't take \$100 million, it wouldn't take \$50 million — why are they not prepared to put some of it behind the farmers? Why do they insist on taking the credit in words for saving the family farm which is hypocritical nonsense and at the same time place the entire burden of monetary credit or almost the entire burden, on the little implement dealer, the local garage man, the local credit union?

We ask the Government to have the courage and the flexibility to recognize and to admit that they have made a terrible mistake in this Bill, that while their intentions were good — no one denies that — that they have gone down that blind alley and they now recognize that they are liable, very liable, to do far more damage to the farm economy and to the farmers than they do good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And if they are not prepared to withdraw it, bring in another Bill that would, in fact, put the credit of this

Government behind the farmers which would have the effect of helping the farmers, saving the farmers, tiding them over this period, whether it's a month, a year or two years, and at the same time enhancing his credit. Then credit grantors, large or small, would say when the farmers of Saskatchewan are in trouble, the Government of Saskatchewan goes behind them and there are lots of precedents for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We got behind the farmers to put them in the cow-calf operation, behind the farmers to the tune of almost \$30 million, behind the farmers to the tune of actually subsidizing the interest. Let this Government show its real concern, its real grasp of the problem, let them do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that is worth mentioning. This is a very vital Bill. We have heard Members on that side, and we agree with them, say that the institution of the family farm is threatened. The number of farmers during our term of office went down. Of course it did. The number of family farms during their 20 years of office also went down. There used to be about 120,000 or 130,000 or 140,000 farmers in this Province. It's gone down to 80,000 or 90,000 and it's been going down ever since World War II. It went down during the 20 years of Socialism and it went down during the seven years of Liberal administration, and it will still go down and this Government has a golden opportunity show that they really mean business, that they are serious when they say that they will pay more than lip service to helping the family farm. Let them, to put it crudely, put their money where their mouth is. And they have the money and they have the credit, because we left this Government in good financial shape.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — This is a vital Bill. The Premier is out of his seat. He was out of his seat yesterday afternoon, part of the time. I don't blame him, he is a very busy man. But I should like to hear him. I challenge him, I hope he speaks. I hope he speaks on this Bill. I hope he just doesn't leave it to his Minister. I hope he stands up in Second Reading and says what he thinks about this Bill.

What is happening in this Bill? First, it's an agricultural Bill, touted as one of the most important pieces of agricultural legislation brought before this House at any time in the history of this Province. But does the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) bring it forward? No. He has to have a labor lawyer from Saskatoon, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) bring it forward. I have never witnessed — since 1962 when you people sat there and the seven years that we sat there — seen a senior Minister — surely the Minister of Agriculture is a senior Minister — have to turn to someone else to bring in and guide through the House a vital piece of legislation. I think this speaks volumes about the ability or lack of ability of the Minister. Or it does something else — it then states automatically that this Bill is so complicated that only a lawyer would dare take it through the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I think that the Minister of Agriculture has a great deal of explaining to do to the people of this Province — why in his first time up, his first opportunity to do something for the farmers, he struck out. In fact, he didn't even come to bat. I think it is also significant that the Premier has not spoken. I don't know whether he intends to speak or not, but if he doesn't speak, I draw the attention of the people of this Province to that fact — that the Premier of this Province has not spoken to this point. And I challenge him to speak. I challenge him to show the same concern for the farmers, for the small businessmen, that he showed to the labor unions when he got up and said publicly, "We will not change Bill 2," and then when the labor bosses said, "You will change Bill 2," Oh, he showed great flexibility then — he changed Bill 2 that quick (snapped fingers).

When he started to negotiate for the pulp mill, responsible members of union organizations came to him and said there were 1,000 high-paid union jobs right around the corner and "we need them". And he thought maybe he'd go ahead with the pulp mill but when the Wafflers and the radicals snapped their fingers, he showed a great flexibility then and he threw the pulp mill out of the window. Let him show the same kind of flexibility now that the little implement dealers have spoken, now that the credit unions have spoken, now that people have pointed out that he should have second thoughts about this proposed Bill before the House that it may, in fact, and probably will, do more harm than good. Let the Premier of this Province show the same concern and the same eagerness and willingness to be sensitive to the needs of the farmers and the small businessmen in rural Saskatchewan as he was to those labor bosses who sat in this gallery, and behind us, the other night when they brought in the repeal of Bill 2.

I hope he speaks. If he doesn't speak on this Bill in Second Reading, I say it in itself speaks volumes for the attitude of that Government and the attitude of that Premier towards the farmers and the farming community, and the small businessmen in the small towns in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I ask on behalf of the Opposition of the Government, we are not going to hold this Bill up much longer. We held it up, and we held it up deliberately because if we hadn't held it up last night, it would have been in Committee today, it would have been passed today and there is no rush because it is back-dated it is retroactive.

Mr. Romanow: — Not really!

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, yes, really — nobody is attempting to take over a piece of land or a piece of machinery. I don't think they were anyway because they know if they take it back, the farmer can be back the next day and take it back. So there is a clause in there that this whole Bill is retroactive. So there is no rush for a day or two. And as a matter of fact, if you can take a couple of days off to go to Victoria, then I guess this Bill isn't in such a hurry after all.

So, again I ask you — when we vote on the motion to refer it to the Law Amendments Committee, show that you are really a democratic elected Government. Show that you really have the

guts and the courage to stand up and think for yourselves. Don't follow the lead like a bunch of little sheep, and when Allan, or the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) or someone else pulls the string, you'll all stand up like sheep and say, "We refuse to hear the farmers, we refuse to hear the implement dealers, we refuse to hear the car dealers, we refuse to hear anybody. We say by this action, we know what's best for everyone — big brother knows what's best."

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members opposite to reconsider and support our motion to refer this to the Law Amendments Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, this Act, The Family Farm Protection Act, will provide the necessary legislation to allow some hard-pressed farmers, especially the young farmers who have just got established, to have time to sell more grain or livestock or to re-finance at lower payments if necessary.

I feel that the Government which allowed the present prices of agriculture to develop, must accept full responsibility. Such Liberal policies as the LIFT and the Grain Stabilization program have forced many farmers into bankruptcy. As I see it, the LIFT program did nothing but in fact to help push the grain farmer deeper into debt.

Now in our area, in the southwest, some went into it in a big way. Some of the farms are very large but it wasn't without its problems. Soil erosion became a very severe problem, grainhandling was another one. Elevators became so congested, even the big farmers had trouble getting rid of their grain. And now the Grain Stabilization Plan will force even more farmers off the land.

The conditions in the livestock industry also became serious. And I can speak with some authority on the hog enterprise. I was one of those who bit on the diversification pitch, and I went into hogs on a fair scale from farrow to finishing operations. I had borrowed additional money over and above my capital loan to buy material for barns, sows and feed. Within the next few months, the price dropped from 32 cents to 19 cents a pound. At that time I figured my break-even point was 25 cents a pound. I couldn't make ends meet on the enterprise, let alone meet any loan repayments. Therefore, I was forced to sell off my sows and terminate the enterprise. Shortly thereafter the hog prices levelled off and stayed at about the 20-cent to 22-cent level. But I did some calculations and found that had I stayed with the enterprise, I should have lost some \$2,700 in the following three months. The following year a hailstorm completely destroyed the 800 acres I had in crop. I was one of the fortunate ones, though, to have the education to fall back on. I had been teaching previously before I went farming full-time and I was fortunate enough to get a teaching position fairly close to the farm, and I began teaching again and in this way I subsidized my farm.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can readily sympathize with those farmers who are caught between the financial institutions and the agricultural crisis which they are experiencing.

The threat of foreclosure is a terrible experience, especially when it involves the land and dwellings of a person who has spent many years of toil, sweat and tears to establish it, and then call it home.

I remember in the early 1940s when my father's farm was threatened with foreclosure due to a heavy debt load of the 1930s. I'll never forget seeing Dad sitting, staring off into space, worrying over where we were going to live. Mother would tell us not to bother him, and we always liked to horse around down by the creek, and at this time we always had the opportunity to sneak off, we didn't have to ask him. But he was a beaten man. And I remember how he went to the field with shoulders drooped, and looking down, all the time, he never looked up. He didn't want to discuss anything. He had tried to get work off the farm, he even tried to get work on the CPR, and in his mind that was rock-bottom, but to no avail.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have seen the threat of foreclosure in our family and the emotional problems it caused there. I should like to inform the Opposition Member who just spoke that I have presently a request from a young farmer, one of my constituents, for help due to foreclosure. He has five small children, the oldest being 11, and foreclosure is in progress right now. I believe poor management is a contributing factor to such a farmer's plight. However, I can see that this particular farmer would benefit by this Act. He has a considerable amount of grain on hand, a small herd of cattle and a few pigs. He can't sell his grain to alleviate his payments, he has sold many of his cattle, as many as possible without jeopardizing his basic breeding herd. And since he has just started in pigs this won't help in any appreciable degree. The amount budgeted for his land payment has been used to complete a new deal on a bigger tractor when his old one had a major breakdown. I believe this was poor judgment on his behalf, but he thought he was going to sign a rental agreement for an additional section of land. But, unfortunately the land was sold. Now this family is faced with foreclosure of the land that is necessary for their very existence. I feel The Family Farm Protection Act will, in all likelihood, give this and other farmers who are in similar situations, the necessary time to meet their commitments.

The Members opposite have tried to turn the farmer against his friend and neighbor, the machine dealer. They have intimated that the farmer is so simple minded that he can't resist the temptation of taking advantage of the one-year moratorium. They have often stated the Act will have the effect of doubling the farmers debt at the end of one year postponement. Well, this is ridiculous. There are so few farmers who are of an unscrupulous nature — 5 per cent, according to the Implement Dealers Association — who will cause some problems in this regard. I would suggest that the machine dealers more carefully scrutinize the credit rating of this minority group of farmers. I also believe it is from this minority group of farmers that the feelings of antagonism towards a particular machine dealer arises. The argument being that the dealer took a greater profit than necessary.

My personal feelings toward some machine dealers are that they are causing the smaller farm to subsidize the larger farmer in many machine trades. Usually the small farmer is stuck with used machinery and seldom has a brand new machine, while the larger farmer, on the other hand, is able to purchase new

machinery and equipment. When a larger farmer trades in an old machine on a newer one, the dealer usually allows much more than the actual value of its resale value to make the deal a little more appetizing. However, when the dealer offers this same machine to another farmer, usually a small farmer who is unable to afford a new one, he must make up the difference between the trade-in allowance and its actual value. This, in my mind, is a form of subsidy.

Mr. Lane: — May I ask the Member a question at this point?

Mr. Oliver: — No, there may be abuses but I am sure there will be few. This legislation must not be held up in the fear that it can't be implemented because of some abuses. If there are going to be abuses, they will most likely be in the machinery loans end of it. As I understand it, the machine companies force the agents to sign the promissory notes of the farmers. If the farmer defaults in payment foreclosure is necessary.

I think the machine agent can help the farmer in as much that he could advise the farmer of the advantage of lower interest rates, provided by such institutions as were mentioned across the way, the credit unions, in financing the implements. I believe that such actions by the agent could build up his reputation and his business in the community. I would also suggest to the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association that they use their united powers to force a better agreement between a dealer and the machine company. If they have the membership they claim they have, then I am sure they could get a much better deal for the small machinery dealer. I believe the matter of financing farm machinery should be left to the credit unions and not to machine dealers.

This Act was designed to assist farmers in their hour of need and, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have used poor delaying tactics, and even poor reading ability as we heard last night — grade one level or so. And some have displayed total disregard for the authority of the Speaker. They have used arguments that are as useful as a screen door in a submarine. I believe that this Act is a good one and it is with great pleasure that I support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Can I ask the Member if he will entertain a question at this point. With regard to your constituent, what stage are the foreclosure proceedings?

Mr. Oliver: — The foreclosure now is with the lawyers to have the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that that is a proper question to ask what stage it is before the courts. I don't think it's a proper question.

Mr. Oliver: — It is before the courts.

Mr. Speaker: — You may discuss it with the Member privately. I don't

think it is a matter for the Assembly.

Mr. D. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, when I first saw the list of the legislation of this Special Session, I thought that this Bill 9 was different from Bills 3 to 8. Bills numbers 3 to 8 were all politically motivated Bills, however, when I saw that Bill 9 was to be an Act respecting the Protection of Farm Property, I thought that we should have some legislation that was not entirely politically motivated. It looked at first glance that this new Government was going to try and alleviate the problems of the farmer. Everyone of us in this Legislature recognizes the problems of our Saskatchewan family farms. The reasons for this so-called degeneration of the farm economy have been amply discussed both in and out of this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I saw the name of this Bill 9, Family Farm Protection Act, 1971, and I felt the Government opposite was going to make a sincere attempt to alleviate the farm economy problem. I had first thought that this was a Bill that wasn't necessarily political in nature but rather a Bill that would offer honest relief.

When I read the Bill I couldn't believe the contents of this legislation. This Bill, as the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) has already stated, will have devastating results on the smaller family farm. This is supposed to be a Bill designed to protect two groups, namely, the implement dealers and the family farmer. This Bill was supposed to be drafted to benefit only these two groups and no others. Mr. Speaker, it protects neither of these groups. This legislation jeopardizes both the farmer and the implement dealer. The suggestion that this legislation offers protection to the implement dealer is a ridiculous joke. Members from this side of the House have amply shown this. Implement dealers have also made representations to show the great harm this legislation will do to their members. To suggest that this legislation will actually protect the implement dealer is nothing short of stupidity, however, this Bill is supposedly aimed at the small family farmer. Surely, it is not for the benefit of the large corporate farm, surely it is not being brought in for the benefit of the large successful or rich family farm. I am sure our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) doesn't feel these people need this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what does this legislation offer the small, struggling family farmer? It offers nothing but trouble. For the very small family farm it offers one year and then a total collapse of his farm. At the end of the one-year moratorium it will be absolutely impossible for the smallest and poorest family farm ever to hope to pay off two years' debt. It might be possible to help the small family farm if this Act was accompanied with some assistance to help him get on his feet. But this Government opposite has made not one effort to give any assistance to the degraded farm economy, as the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) likes to term it.

What does this legislation mean to the small family farmer who is finding it tough but who has been getting along, progressing slowly, but only with a struggle? I think, Mr. Speaker, that this type of farmer is going to take a look at this legislation and think it looks all right, and he is going to think it would give him a year's relief from the struggle of budgeting and belt-tightening and he will likely take advantage of this Bill. He will enjoy a few months of not meeting regular payments. He will undoubtedly have a little more money and will spend a

little extra on a few luxuries. Then all of a sudden, the year will be over and the roof will fall in. Two years' debts have piled up. The small family farmer will then wonder what the definition of the word 'protection' is. I think the small family farmer will only too late realize that he can only keep going by budgeting wisely.

I don't suppose there is any group that realizes the necessity of credit more than the farmer. No family farm can exist without credit. This Bill is going to destroy credit to the small family farmer. It likely won't destroy credit to the same extent to the very large family farm and again Members opposite can check this out with their own family farmer, the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe any group has had the same access to credit as has the small farmer. Small community businesses have always gone out of their way to aid the farmer in any way and offering credit to farmers is a trade-mark of small community businesses.

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

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, at 12:30 I was explaining to the House that I don't believe there was any group that has had the same access to credit as the small farmer. Small community businesses have always gone out of their way to aid the farmer in any way and offering credit to farmers is a trade-mark of small community businesses. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is that all small farmers are needed in order to keep the community businesses alive and healthy. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill threatens to destroy this credit and trust. This Bill attempts to convince the farmers that the machine dealers and the credit unions are the root of the farmers' problems. This Government promised help to the family farmer and now is introducing a Bill that takes all the responsibility off his shoulders, or at least they think so. Instead of giving any assistance this Government is trying to crowd the issue by putting the family farmer against the machine dealers and the credit unions.

Who, Mr. Speaker, might this legislation benefit, if anyone? It is difficult to see any benefit but if there is then I suggest it might possibly be the large, rich, successful farmers and possibly the corporate farm. It will likely give these two groups of farmers the opportunity to get even larger. When land becomes available for sale the rich farmer will be the only one able to buy. Certainly the small family farmer won't be even given a chance to bid on the land. No old farmers who want to sell their land and retire on the proceeds from this sale could possibly consider extending the old credit system to one of his struggling small neighbors. The retiring farmer can hardly retire on the proceeds under the new deal laid out in Bill 9. However, the retiring farmer doesn't need to worry, the corporate farm or some wealthy American will likely have cash to buy it.

I must admit, as did the Minister, that this is going to be an experiment, is one of the most obnoxious statements that I have heard in this House. This Government plans to experiment with the lives of thousands of families in our province. This experiment will cause the extermination of hundreds of our smallest family farms.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I would ask the Government why it needs to make this disastrous experiment? Surely all Members opposite need only read this Bill to see the obvious practical consequences. Quite possibly there may be many opposite who are too academic to understand or visualize the practical consequences. I don't suppose this problem was ever posed in Economics 101. But I submit that it was entirely unnecessary to plunge into a wild experiment. If Members opposite don't understand the practical consequences then I suggest they confer with a few people who are learned in this field. There are all kinds of people who do know what this is all about. We have already had two groups, the credit unions and the Implement Dealers Association, who offered to show this Government that this is a disastrous experiment. I would suggest that these two groups, and there are many others, know what this game is all about. I would also suggest that the small family farmer is very important to these two groups. Neither of these groups would exist without the family farm. The welfare of the family farm is the most important issue to both these groups and yet this Government ignores their advice and leaps blindly into a useless experiment. Is that Government afraid to face the practicality of this Bill? It seems this Government makes an experiment for experiment's sake. It seems they are amused with this academic exercise. I think they have not considered the consequences of a failure of this experiment. I wonder how many Members opposite would appreciate some government playing around with an experiment that would involve their livelihood, especially a government with no knowledge of the particular vocational field.

Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't seen it I should have believed it. The Minister is probably saying, with a smirk on his face, that we must remember this is just an experiment. Mr. Speaker, if an outsider were to come to Saskatchewan to study this Bill, I am sure he would deduce that this Government was out to destroy the family farm as soon as possible. He wouldn't know, of course, that this was the sanctimonious NDP Government that has pledged to save the family farm. We couldn't blame this outsider for believing that the NDP was trying to create large corporate-type farms. This outsider could hardly be expected to know that 'corporate' is a dirty word that doesn't even exist in the NDP vocabulary except as a term of derision.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two excuses for this Bill, neither one is acceptable to me. One, is that the NDP truly are trying to destroy the small family farm and, two, is that the NDP has made a mistake. To be perfectly honest, I believe the second to be the case. The NDP have made a mistake. However, this Bill has not been enacted and, therefore, the only mistake is in the introduction of the Bill and this can easily be remedied. If this Government is big enough, they will admit their mistake and take the experienced help offered to them. There has been a confidence and a trust developed between the small business community and the smaller farmer. This has developed over many years and has developed out of sheer necessity. Neither group can exist without the other. This trust has become a way of life and has its own set of rules and regulations. The same rules do not exist in any other form of business. If the small farmer is going to exist he can only do so under these very special conditions. This Bill 9 will destroy these conditions. Members opposite admit that there are shortcomings in

this Bill. They think this is no problem because they will have ten months to correct it. As the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) has said, he is sure they will make changes as time goes along. The thing he forgets is that the damage is done the minute this Act is proclaimed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In fact there has been a lot of damage done just by presenting this Bill even if it were never proclaimed. The very presentation of this Bill has started the wedge between the family farmer and his community. I should like to remind the Government to remember that anyone who has sold land to an American, no matter how rich or powerful, can take no action to force this American to pay one red cent during this year. The same regulations that will apply to Canadians that are wealthy will not apply to their American counterparts. I should like to see this Government stop playing around with experiments and either get down to the job of assisting the farm economy or else leave it alone.

I believe the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) made a good point. He told us a heart-rendering story about a pending foreclosure and yet this Government hasn't taken one step to alleviate his position. This Government hasn't offered a guarantee for his credit nor has it offered any plans for the future. I think it is very indicative.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of supporting this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on this Bill, may I say I feel very strongly about the current situation in the agricultural industry in this Province and the rural scene in this Province. I should like Members of the Opposition to know that I do know something about farming and that I engage in farming and that I was farming all last Saturday. I do this quite regularly. I know the difference between a nut and a bolt on the farm, although it is a little more difficult to differentiate in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Over the past weekend I was in a rural area with which I am quite familiar and about which I have a fair bit of knowledge and information. I conducted a bit of a personal survey with respect to 18 farms currently operated by farmers in that area. Of these farms one-third of them are in a difficult immediate short-term debt position. A little better than 11 per cent of them are in an extremely difficult position. One should also keep in mind that this area, which is now occupied by 18 farms formerly had 26 farm operators in the area, and that was during the period which Members opposite are pleased to call the prosperous years. Some 8 of them have disappeared — about 31 per cent of them in the last 10-year period. There is room for reasonable doubt to assume that of the 18 who are there now, any more than 12 of them will survive the next 10-year period, assuming nothing is done.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who argues that Bill 9 is perfect by any means.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I am not one who does not argue that it will have some difficulties. But I am amazed when the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. D. MacDonald) for example, gives us a lecture in terms of how it is going to affect credit unions, assumes on the basis of us having some academic standing on this side know nothing about the practical implications of credit extension. Personally I sat on the board of a credit union for 27 years; I have been the president of a credit union for a period of time; I am on the investment committee of a credit union; we make many loans to farmers and we will continue to make many loans to farmers after this Bill is passed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I do not argue that this Bill is any more than a breather or a stop-gap because of an extremely difficult situation at the present time in the farming community.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member would permit a question at this time?

Mr. Robbins: — No, when I am finished I will.

I would contend that it is being introduced only as a temporary measure to provide some immediate relief and a breathing space to assist in achieving a reversal from the most recent deteriorating agricultural scene which primarily began in the year 1967 and has been accelerating ever since. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the people opposite, actually called the election in 1967 because of that deteriorating situation on an earlier date than which would ordinarily have been the case. In fact, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) when he was Provincial Treasurer made a statement one year ago, commenting on the White Paper which is published by the Treasury Department that "there is room for optimism in the future." Now I don't think he was predicting New Democratic Government a year hence but nevertheless he had that in mind perhaps.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — He mentioned that wheat was beginning to move and that interest rates appeared to be coming down. Well they did come down for awhile, they've gone back up again and he has been wrong before and of course could be wrong again.

Saskatchewan's net farm income was \$192 million in 1970, a drop of approximately 60 per cent from 1967. If we clearly keep in our minds the fact that that trend has been there for the last three or four year period then we see some reason for the setting up of a Bill of this nature.

President, E.K. Turner, of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has reported that the consensus of the Pool membership with respect

to the Federal Stabilization Plan is woefully inadequate. Even the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) the other day told us that the present member in charge of the Wheat Board was a Communist. I was a little amazed about that frankly, but I think that is what the Member said.

Mr. D. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that he was a Communist, I said that it was Communistic legislation.

Mr. Steuart: — You don't know the difference.

Mr. Robbins: — Sorry. Grain farmers cannot be expected to be content to live solely from the revenue of the market place in a world where grain farmers in most other countries receive some form of direct government assistance. This is an academic question which should be even apparent to the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. D. MacDonald). It is reasonable to assume that some upturn is now in progress and in process in the agricultural industry in this Province. I don't think any government can claim credit for that necessarily. It is a condition of world situation in terms of markets. However, farmers will probably continue to repay more cash advances, for example, in the current year they will draw down as they did the year before, cash advanced reduced by some \$105 million in 1970, but, there was still \$100 million in outstanding cash advances at the end of 1970. We should not forget these facts.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, the Act may well require some amendment. This appears particularly true in relation to machine dealers to protect them against the depreciation factor which the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) mentioned and about which I think he had a very good point.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I feel it important that some breathing space be available to the agricultural industry at this particular time. This Bill should be a factor in achieving that result. I think all the doom and gloom from the other side in terms of destroying credit entirely is simply window dressing, grandstanding, that's all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I therefore, Mr. Speaker, support the intent of the Bill. And I think if the Members opposite really think about this Bill they will realize that they are blowing up the implications very greatly in relation to what they feel will happen in terms of credit extension.

I might make one or two comments with respect to the comments of the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) when he spoke on this Bill. He mentioned the fact that the previous Liberal Government did many things for farmers; he mentioned purple gas. I shall just give you one example in relation to that thing and which I think will be rather interesting to the House. It did introduce purple gas and it saved some money for farmers. I think the major advantage in that was that it was a convenient thing. I can think of a farm where the saving of purple gas in relation to that farm truck was \$75 a year. Then the Members opposite introduced a 2-cent per gallon agricultural tax which

made that farmer pay \$100 a year in additional tax. And they found it so difficult for the people of Saskatchewan to stomach that they took it off and put a 3-cent per gallon tax on everybody including this particular farm. I've made a complete study of it where they have five children now living away from the farm — and incidentally two of them are two-car families — and they have spent last year \$144 in gasoline tax. Now that's a great way to save money for the farmer and the farming community, you give them \$75 and take away \$100 and then you take away that tax and put on \$144. With tax reductions like that who needs increases.

Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, as an implement dealer, there are a few things I should like to say about this Bill. I have been in the business quite awhile and I have observed quite a few things over the years. I was quite interested in the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins). I think if he had checked with his campaign managers and several of the implement dealers in Saskatoon that he would have a different opinion of this Bill because he may have talked to a few farmers but I don't think he has talked to the implement dealers which this Bill affects.

Mr. Romanow: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — I'll give you a chance to speak later, Mr. Romanow, the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale.

Never in the history, Mr. Speaker, so far as an implement dealer is concerned has there been a Bill that is more unconstitutional than Bill 9.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — This Bill, Mr. Speaker, if passed, and there are some over 625 implement dealers in this Province; there are 510 automobile dealers in this Province, Mr. Speaker; there are some 372 credit unions; and it will also bankrupt every small business in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, some of the gentlemen over there — I know the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) knows what is going on in the implement business and also the Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens) — they are in the business. I should just like to go over a case which happened in the past where a farmer buys a combine, he has put one-third of the price down, he arranges the financing with the dealer and one of the lending institutions comes in and it makes the payment to the dealer and from then on the farmer makes the payment to the lending institution. Now these payments are usually made on the basis of three years to suit the farmer and they are laid down as to the specific day. But always in these deals and I think this is something, Mr. Speaker, the Members to your right have missed is that this paper the farmer signs and the implement dealer signs is full

recourse. In other words, if the farmer doesn't make the payment it all falls back on the implement dealer or the automobile dealer. I might say there has been criticism of the lending institutions — and I am not sticking up for them — but they have been fair in the past and have extended farmers not one, two, but have gone up to three and four years in order to rearrange the payments. It is still the implement dealer or the automobile dealer who pays it out so this is the man the Bill is affecting. If a farmer is going to be repossessed, all this legislation will do is postpone it for a year and the dealer will have to take another year's loss as the combine, as has been pointed out, will have been depreciated during that period.

If you think, Mr. Speaker, that the implement dealer and the automobile dealer are happy with this Bill, I should ask every Member to your right, Sir, to ask the dealers when they go home and see if they will go along with this Bill and think it is a good Bill. If this Government, Mr. Speaker, wants to do something for the farmer, as it has been said before, they should guarantee the loans presently held by the farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, there is adequate legislation under the Limitation of Civil Rights to protect the farmer. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in hearings under this Act, there is not a farmer who has gone away saying he has not been treated in a courteous and respectful manner and did not receive a fair hearing from the judge.

Mr. Speaker, I feel satisfied that every farmer who has come away from the hearings feels that someone in a responsible position feels concern and wants to do something for them. I think, Mr. Speaker, this Limitation of Civil Rights was working well and a farmer who needed assistance was getting assistance. This Bill was producing a respect for undertaking a covenant to pay a sum of money. It was also inducing a respect for the judicial system and at the same time giving the farmer an opportunity for a reasonable time to make payment of his account where circumstances warranted this time being given.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that there is any way in which this Bill and this kind of legislation can be terminated on July 31, 1972 without there being far more difficulty for the farmer than now exists. If a farmer is given the idea that he can rely on the Government to protect him in respect to his farm and truck equipment purchases, how can you cut it off at one point in time when his payments have accumulated and his problem therefore accentuated rather than cleared away. I do not see how the Government can embark on this kind of program unless they are prepared to provide the financial assistance that every farmer needs. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we received a letter from Mr. Tender of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society saying that this Bill will interfere with the ability of Saskatchewan credit unions to meet their commitments and obligations and these are the people whom it will effect. We deposit with them and borrow from the credit unions all over this country.

Mr. Romanow: — He didn't say that, Don.

Mr. McPherson: — This is the way the letter

read. "There is no other way that the hundreds of credit unions can look to the future of their organization with anything but apprehension and concern." I can see, Mr. Speaker, a substantial cost factor working into the equipment operation which has got to take its toll some place and the only place that I can see it coming out of is in the end cost of the unit or the interest rate which the farmer has to pay.

I feel that this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is going to hurt the credit rating of every farmer in this Province and there is no doubt about it. This Bill will hurt financially every one of the 625 implement dealers in this Province. This Bill will hurt the automobile dealers. It is going to hurt everyone that I know of and that's the small businessman in particular. The small farmer needs credit to enable him to carry on his operations. If this Bill is passed, Mr. Speaker, there will not be one of these small farmers able to receive a line of credit. He will have to increase the down payments on the implements and this could go up to in excess of 50 per cent.

If the Government to your right wants to do something, I say again, Mr. Speaker, they should guarantee the farmer's loans. I don't know who thought up this Bill but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, they didn't talk to the people this Bill affects. I said before and I say again that this Bill is unconstitutional; it is a bad Bill hurting thousands of small businessmen in the Province of Saskatchewan. If you want to do something for the farmers then guarantee their loans and take the financial worries away from them and away from the implement dealers and the automobile dealers and all the rest. Then you will really be doing something to help the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very seriously about this. It is a bad Bill and I will not support the Bill, I will vote for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I had asked the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) if he would accept a question during his speech and he said, No, and I wanted to ask him at the end and I wonder if I might now have permission to do so.

Mr. Speaker: — I think you have lost your right because another speaker has come in between.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take part in this debate. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief as most of the comments which I should have made, of course, have been ably and capably made by some of my worthy colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, since the day we entered this House, some eight or nine days ago, the Opposition over there have been crying "grandstand" and if there has ever been a display of grandstanding last night by the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) when he stood up reading his book just like George Gobel reading out of the Canary book.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Why would they do anything like this? May I ask you: why would they go about this kind of way of treating this Assembly? There is only one thing I can say, it's because they wanted to have an opportunity — and they say they wanted to have an opportunity — to meet with delegations and that's the reason why they went to work and adjourned the debate on four occasions. That wasn't the real reason, Mr. Member. The real reason is that you had a gallery full of implement dealers and that's the reason you wanted to have that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there is only one reason and that is because the gallery was full of implement dealers and they wanted to have them look as though they really thought of the implement dealer. I haven't seen them in the last 30 or 40 years ever caring about an implement dealer, now in the last three hours they are interested in implement dealers.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this piece of legislation before us will do the job which it has set out to do. I think this Bill plays a double role. It will give the farmers a year's breathing room and at the same time allow them to pay local merchants and allow them to pay local stores, hardware, garages, and above all, yes, credit unions too.

Mr. Speaker, the largest debt which a farmer ever encounters is the payment for land, machinery and livestock. It is for that reason these three items, these three commodities were put under this Bill. And it is for that reason that this Bill will do the job.

Mr. Speaker, I know of several farmers in my constituency who have lost combines and tractors. How do we expect these farmers to continue on farming? Mr. Speaker, these are what I term family farmers. These are three-quarter section farmers, and that's the kind of protection that we in the New Democratic Party believe and see necessary for the family farm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Let me ask the Opposition, what would you do in a case where a man loses his combine and his tractor?

Mr. Steuart: — Name one.

Mr. Cody: — Name one — let me tell you, Mister, that if you'd go out and look after your constituents like New Democrats do, you would have the names and add up to a thousand names that we have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party believe that the family farm is necessary, is necessary to keep Saskatchewan rural and therefore we believe that this kind of legislation will give these family farmers the necessary breathing

August 10, 1971

time so that they can re-establish themselves financially and become a more viable unit and remain where we really truly want them, and that's on the farm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) that these farmers whom I have cited are not like he said yesterday, 'two-bit' farmers, they are good farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I can cite another case in my constituency where a farmer purchased a tractor in 1969, he used his old machine for a trade-in for the down payment and in 1970 he was unable to pay. Now in 1971 he is threatened with repossession.

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . dealer . . . money!

Mr. Cody: — He is threatened with repossession, my friend from Cannington, not from the dealer, No, not from the dealer, but from the machine company. Mr. Speaker, I submit this farmer would do all in his power to try and come up with this money. But in the interval, what is happening to him? This farmer is not paying his local merchant. This farmer is not paying his local store. He is not paying his local garage and he is not paying his local credit union. All this time, this man is scrambling to try and find the money to pay to this gigantic corporation which is likely in the United States.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that if we allow this kind of legislation as Bill No. 9 for one year, this man will not lose his machine and he will also have a chance to pay his local people who have extended him credit on a day to day basis.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we are only a Government for six weeks and already we have put forth progressive legislation like Bill 9.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — I am confident that before the year is over the Hon. Jack Messer, Minister of Agriculture, will have more legislation drafted which will put the farmer on an economic road to recovery from the slump, Mr. Speaker, which was foisted on him by Saskatchewan Liberals and by Ottawa Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals, as they have said in this last couple of hours, were so interested in helping farmers, why would they not suggest as the New Democrats have in Ottawa, that the Grain Stabilization Bill be split and the \$100 million sent to the farmers immediately? No, they wouldn't have that

done, they are not interested in farmers. They are just interested in blackmailing the farmer into accepting a Grain Stabilization Bill just for the sake of getting the \$100 million.

Mr. Speaker, if I have heard once in this Assembly, I have heard it 50 times from the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) saying that we are doing nothing for the farmer financially, we are doing nothing but not giving him even a five-cent piece. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if Liberals were really interested in helping farmers, they could have given them more than a five-cent piece six or eight months ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — They could have asked their counterparts, as I said a moment ago, to split the Bill on Grain Stabilization and sent the \$100 million to the farmers who, I say, need it immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here for one moment saying this Bill may not have some kind of implications. No doubt about it, all bills may have some kind of implication. We don't know until we are getting into them, but I am confident that if there is any kind of pressure necessary to be alleviated for any particular group, that this Government will see that it is done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — And I am sure that the Hon. Cabinet Ministers if they see fit, will bring in amendments to help these machinery dealers who you people appear to be so . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Yeah, there is no more concern for the machinery dealers from those Members opposite than there was for the farmers six or eight months ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, with these few comments and with these few brief comments, I am sure that you are aware that I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good Bill and it deserves the support of every Member of this Legislature.

From the Members opposite we have heard about the plight of the machine agents. I say to them over there, who will speak and when will they speak, against the high cost of the farm machinery? The profits of these financial giants have a direct relationship to the price paid by the farmer and hence his unhappy plight. Their silence in this area will not go unnoticed, I suggest, Mr. Speaker. The need for lower interest rates is obvious. To condemn and identify the money changers whether they be Canadian or United States based should be their role if they

are going to be consistent and responsible. They shirk that responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

You know, rising in their place, they said people will take advantage of this legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, for years the Mediation Board had the Moratorium Act, more restrictive than this, 13 years in all. It covered everything. Did it ruin credit — the farmers' credit — did it? Did it ruin the confidence that people held when they were dealing with these people — malarkey!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The Limitation of Civil Rights Act, the Land Contracts Action Act, the whole enforcement procedure — all can be used by a delinquent debtor and have been used many times. But I say, how many times was it used unfairly? Very few times. Check the statistics. Delinquent debtors in all categories make up less than two per cent of all transactions. Mr. Speaker, 75 per cent of that 2 per cent worked their way out if we helped them. This racket that they are making, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is for those who finance the Liberal Party, and for the press. They know that this legislation concerns the people who need it. They ignore them, and although it is only a small number, we can't ignore these people, and we won't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — And why are these people in this situation? Because the farmer has had seven years of abandonment provincially, and nine years federally.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Their numbers may be small, the number of farmers who are in a desperate financial position, may be small but, Mr. Speaker, we are pledged to help them and to help their neighbors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the obstructionist tactics by the Opposition, these tactics represent a wholesale desertion by them of the farmers of this Province in time of need. But, Mr. Speaker, this wholesale desertion has been taking place over the past seven years, quietly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Let me, if I may, present just a little of the evidence to indicate the attitude of my hon. friends opposite when they were the Government.

All of us know, I am sure, that under a section of The Farm Security Act, it is impossible to take away from a farmer the home quarter unless an exemption order is made by the Provincial Mediation Board. Sure, all of us are aware of this. This order, while the CCF was in power, was made as each mortgage foreclosure came before that Board for consideration. Mortgage companies considered carefully the value of the foreclosure without the home quarter and thus negotiated with reason and I am prepared to prove, Mr. Speaker, in the long run with good success because

in many instances this exemption kept the farmer in business, kept the mortgage company in business, and they were both satisfied. In the final analysis, with very few exceptions, the mortgage was paid off. But that isn't what the mortgage companies did when the Liberals were the Government. This is very enlightening.

Now, the Hon. Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) said when he was speaking that we should give the Mediation Board instructions. Now he thinks that that's exactly what they did when these people were the Government just a few short months ago. Their instructions, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Mediation Board made wholesale exemptions for mortgage companies, eliminated by one stroke of a pen the protection that had been developed and guaranteed and appreciated and proven necessary over a period of many years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Let me be explicit, Mr. Speaker. Details regarding just one mortgage company show that under their instructions, this is what the Hon. Member for Regina Albert Park suggested, the Provincial Mediation Board made an exemption so that in no case, in no case — and this is just one mortgage company, there were others but I am just going to quote one — could the farmer claim protection for his home quarter. They wrote it off, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacLeod: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not say that at all. What I said was something entirely different. Mr. Speaker, he just said that I made a statement which I did not make.

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, that's not a point of order. The Hon. Member is sitting on his conscience and his conscience is bothering him.

Mr. MacLeod: — No, it doesn't. Let's get the record and read it. Mr. Speaker, we can get the record and read it. I did not say the words that the Hon. Member imputes to me.

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure he isn't going to like what I am going to say and if it is still bothering him, as I said, but they wrote of this exemption, I am convinced that they had instructions to do this . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Are you withdrawing that?

Mr. Whelan: — . . . and by doing this they sold the farmers' protection out for that home quarter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — You can get the list. A blanket of 112 exemptions totalling, mortgages \$7,397,406.94 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

August 10, 1971

Mr. Whelan: — . . . between August 25, 1964 and March 6, 1970 — for one mortgage company. One mortgage company!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to have a little ruling on this matter. He alleged that I had made a statement . . .

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, this isn't a point of order.

Mr. MacLeod: — Well, a point of privilege. He made a statement, he said that I was making this long-winded allegation and I did not. Mr. Speaker, the only comment which I made, quite frankly, was that this Government could give instructions to the Mediation Board to deal with mortgages and prevent foreclosure of mortgages. They don't need the section that deals with orders nisi because it cannot be carried out unless the Board gives consent, and the same is true under a Tax Enforcement Act.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. MacLeod: — Now, I don't know what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I don't think that is a point of order. What it really is is a point of personal clarification.

Mr. MacLeod: — Point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — No, it's not a point of personal privilege, it is a point of personal clarification which should be made at the conclusion of the speech of the Member who is speaking. Any Member who feels he has been misquoted has the right at the end of the person's speech to rise on a point of personal privilege for clarification and make a correction in the statement attributed to him, but he cannot enter a debate or introduce new material.

Mr. MacLeod: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have been misquoted but I won't pursue it now then.

Mr. Whelan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, you know even after the correction by him it is precisely what I was saying, you know, it is the same thing exactly. He suggested that we talk to the Provincial Mediation Board and get them to consider this and that with mortgages and I am suggesting that this is precisely what has been done for look, look at the facts. Look what we have. A list of mortgages, a blanket exemption for 112 mortgages totalling \$7,397,406.94 between August 4, 1964 and March 6, 1970 for one mortgage company. Well, I don't think they thought . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — . . . I don't think the Provincial Mediation Board didn't think this idea all by themselves. And so on and on it goes, Mr. Speaker. And the thing that really appals me is to

find that many of these mortgages had an interest rate of 9 1/4 per cent, and, Mr. Speaker, among some of them are three of them at 9 1/2 per cent and all of them over 7 per cent. And you know the Liberals say, "We didn't give," — you know, pointing at us they say, "You fellows didn't give the farmers a nickel." Well, this is the way they gave it to them. Right through the middle. Exploitation deluxe.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — This is the way they gave it to them. They even removed the protection they had.

Mr. Speaker, I have the details of one of these mortgages, a mortgage for \$100,000, paying interest of 8 1/4 per cent. He pays \$8,250 yearly in interest before he pays anything on the principal. He is a good farmer, he has a very good operation and he is in trouble. And on top of this he has to pay taxes and he has to pay back the principal. And, Mr. Speaker, you can be sure that if he got a loan for \$100 thousand from this free enterprise mortgage company based in the United States, he had an operation they considered to be worth \$160 thousand or thereabouts. This farmer is now in the last stages of a complete foreclosure, without so much as the protection of the home quarter. He has paid \$18,000 off on the mortgage that is only two years old and is being foreclosed. He is going to lose his \$18,000, all the equity he owns in the whole operation over the \$82,000, and I repeat, he doesn't have the protection on the home quarter because of the Members opposite and the order they issued through the Provincial Mediation Board. They tell you that they were worried about the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, I have only told this House about one company that they have allowed to move in on a farmer, a farmer who would gladly give up his exemption because he thought at the time that he was told everything was economically rosy, and he now will lose not only what he has put into the loan, but his complete equity in the operation, probably altogether a loss of \$60,000 to \$80,000 in two short years. No protection whatsoever, unless we pass this Bill, and these people who removed the only protection on the home quarter, and have done this not just for one mortgage company but for a number of mortgage companies, these people now stand before us pleading the case for the credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the case of the credit unions, Mr. Speaker, it is not the machine agents. They stand in their places with their 112 exemption orders for one mortgage company and these mortgages amounting to \$7 million. They are the Government that allowed the farmers to be stripped of their protection. And when we introduce legislation to protect the victims of these mortgage giants, why don't they have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say they are coming out fighting for the banks, fighting for these mortgage companies to whom they granted these exemptions; for the mortgage companies and their millions of dollars, against the farmer whose life-work, whose investment in this Province, whose future is threatened and at stake. Make no mistake about it, watch who comes to bat against this legislation. Mr. Speaker, to complete the picture of what has happened on these mortgages. Among these 112 exemptions for one company, represented by my friends opposite, who gave them the exemption, this company is now indicating under The Land Contracts Action Act legislation that

they are going to move against the farmer. Presently before the courts there are 20 some farmers in some stage — just this one company — of legal action which can only end with the farmer's land in the hands of the mortgage company if these people opposite get their way.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite say that this Bill will jeopardize the credit of the farmers in this Province. What credit, Mr. Speaker? Do they need the credit of a mortgage company that will strip them of their protection before they will even loan them a nickel, protection guaranteed by law and withdrawn by a rubber-kneed, gutless government? They say to this that this is no solution to the farmers' problems, and I say to them that loaning farmers money at 9.5 per cent interest, and stripping them of their protection is not exactly the solution to the farmers' problems either. This legislation is supposed to be a threat to the small business community, and, Mr. Speaker, the business communities in this Province, in town after town, have not only been threatened, they have been wrecked, they have been mutilated, and, Mr. Speaker, they have been dissolved under the policies of the former Government, and . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — . . . and I say, Mr. Speaker, that the blank-faced stores in every nook and cranny of this Province bear witness. The former Government was the biggest threat to the business communities that has ever hit this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — And, Mr. Speaker, their proud record over there of bankruptcies and empty store fronts stands in mock evidence of their now phoney sympathy for the small business community.

Mr. Speaker, if this thing goes to its logical conclusion, without this legislation, as it would if these people opposite have their way, there would be nothing between these farmers and the road allowance, nothing. Because there is no sympathy over there, and there is no sympathy on that side of the House or concern for the farmer. Their concern is for the mortgage companies, for the high interest chargers, concern for the machinery profiteers. And I serve notice on them now that, standing between the high interest people, and the farmer, between the mortgage companies and the farmer, between the farmer and the road allowance, is this legislation.,

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and this Government and every last member of it.

Mr. Speaker, at one time Liberal Governments in this Province felt differently about the plight of the farmer. At one time they were better turned to the problems, economic and otherwise, of the people they represented. The recent election proved that these people were out of touch, out of step and out of sympathy and eventually out of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, Liberals who at one time, in 1943, and I ask the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) to take note of this, in 1943 a Liberal Government presented the all-embracing Moratorium Act, which finally fell before the courts in the late '50s. This moratorium would cover almost anything, but I say that those Liberals would hang their heads in shame at the look of these present day Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, that Act was all-embracing, it was legislation that was introduced in 1943 when economic recovery was on the way. Let us be generous enough to say that they recognized the need. That legislation which finally fell before the courts, Mr. Speaker, was comprehensive, wider in its scope, more coercive than this, with its limited application for a period of one year and yet, Mr. Speaker, legislation written by Liberals who proudly boasted that they voted for it. What a sad end to the Liberal Party to see them here today fighting against the farmer, punching the very life out of the farmer. Liberals of the 1943 era must be shamed.

There will be byelections, Mr. Speaker, and in these byelections we will be prepared to give names, we will have the foreclosures in the ridings and we will show them to the farmers and their neighbors who were going to be foreclosed, neighbors who were going to lose their farms, and we will tell them who stood with the mortgage companies, the banker, the high interest people, and, Mr. Speaker, we will tell them who stood with the farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill, an Act respecting the Protection of Farm Property is timely, necessary and urgent. Discussion, support and eventual adoption of the Bill will be watched and appreciated by many worried farmers in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members should not misjudge or misunderstand the introduction of this kind of legislation. Let us clearly assure everyone that the legislation is written not to evade or cancel but to postpone financial commitments. Farmers in debt have a record of sincerity, honesty and integrity. They have proven by the record that they will meet their obligations if given half an opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — First, let us examine the background of this Bill. Second, let us look to what it will do to help the farmer who is in financial trouble. And third, let us speculate on the type of legislative machinery, debtors will need in the immediate future.

What is the background? To modernize farming methods, to meet the need for more land, to purchase machinery, contracts were made, and money was borrowed. Farmers were assured that there was a ready market for their crops. "Grow the grain and we will sell it," they said. Debts in the farm area increased.

For instance, from 1959 to 1968, according to a survey in Canadian Farm Economics, December, 1969, total farm investment on medium-size farms, increased from \$31,000 to \$63,000 per farm and on large-sized farms, the investment increased from \$52,000 to \$114,000 per farm. The returns were not as inflationary as the investment. The farmers' income did not increase in proportion to his investment. This has resulted in heavy, heavy indebtedness. Fifty per cent of the farmers were in debt in 1959. The figure had risen to 68.2 by 1969 and is probably much higher now. Both medium-term and long-term debts increased. For instance, long-term debts for large farms increased from \$3,814 per farm in 1959 to \$19,343 per farm in 1969 and it was probably much higher because of the drop in farm income at the end of 1970. 1. In summary, the farmers are in a very bad debt position, a dilemma created not because he cannot produce, but because he cannot market at the right price. 2. Income from hogs and other products has dropped rapidly, reducing the farmers ability to pay.

What has the farmer done? Searching for refinancing and because Federal and Provincial agencies already held a huge portion of his debt, the farmer in desperation, has turned to higher interest financing through trust companies, finance companies and credit unions. The result has been higher interest costs for the farmer. It is a fairly accurate assumption that at the end of 1970, the overall farm debt in Canada had reached \$4 billion or more and the interest on this debt was close on the yearly basis to \$300 million.

Repayment of the debt and payment of the current interest, is a grave problem in the prairie area but more particularly to Saskatchewan. The farmer is facing an economic hurricane. Governments, federal and provincial, should be prepared to legislate to protect the farmers' equity to keep him in business.

Mr. Speaker, what will this Act do? This Act, Mr. Speaker, will give the farmers of this Province, temporary protection through a legal procedure that is available if they are in need of protection. The legislation is effective for a limited period until July 31, 1972. The protection in the legislation is limited to farmers and the legal description of farmers is set out in the legislation. As I have already pointed out many time, a procedure is provided to protect the vendor where he believes the farmer is unjustly and unfairly seeking a stay of proceedings or where the vendor believes personal property involved is about to be sold or disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, the scope of the Act is broad; the discretion of the judge, wide, but it had to be thus, if immediate effective all-embracing protection, where it is needed, was to be provided.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite worry about its scope and those who may take advantage of it. My 10 years experience negotiating farm debts tells me emphatically, that few will take advantage of it. Most creditors will co-operate and the legislation is necessary, I feel.

Is the legislation valid? Will it stand scrutiny by the courts? The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in 1954 by a majority decision upheld the constitutional validity of the Moratorium Act (Saskatchewan, 1943) but this decision was reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1956. Both courts, however, agreed that under certain circumstances the Province might enact

moratorium legislation. I am glad one of the legal profession has returned.

I was talking about the legality of this legislation. I will repeat that. The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in 1954 by a majority decision upheld the constitutional validity of the Moratorium Act (Saskatchewan, 1943) but this decision was reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1956. Both courts, however, agreed that under certain circumstances the Province might enact moratorium legislation. The late Mr. Justice Rand in his judgment indicated that it would, and I quote:

Depend on the facts, circumstances and means adopted determining the true character of the moratorium.

The Privy Council also felt that, according to the Abitibi Power case (1943), the Province might limit moratorium legislation to a special class or suitor, or one particular class of action or suitor.

It seems obvious to me that, without reducing debt or interfering with the interest rate, but because of the civil rights and property jurisdiction of the Province, one might write legislation that would stay certain proceedings, or freeze, as it were, an action for a period of time if, say, the courts felt such notice to refrain or stay, was justified.

True, this is not a Moratorium Act, but in as far as it is possible to do so, the Attorney General and his officers have tried to stay within the boundaries suggested by the late Mr. Justice Rand and also the Privy Council according to the Abitibi Power case (1943).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The legislation will help the farmer in debt trouble who stands to lose his equity. The legislation, if voted against by the Members opposite, will lose some of its weight before the courts. Therefore, I caution Members opposite and I challenge them at least to uphold the heritage of the Liberal Party which wrote the Moratorium Act in 1943.

All parties understand the economic fluctuation of market and price. Every Provincial party has a bit of the proud heritage of Saskatchewan debt legislation, that is accepted in Saskatchewan as a standard way of doing business. The Saskatchewan Appeal Court which uphold the Moratorium Act in the 1950s, was made up, to a large degree, of former Members of this Legislature and Members of their party. Mr. Speaker, they will break the tradition, they will ruin their record with the farmer, if they vote against this Bill.

Let me for a moment speculate on the administration of this legislation. I am sure it will be used consistently where it is needed, but in practice, it will be most effective as a means of negotiation. Meanwhile, I think there are some steps that should be taken and I notice that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has begun one of these steps. I hope that the committee of the House will study and devise proceedings that a debtor can use without the cost of legal counsel and a procedure that will be quick and accurate.

As soon as possible, when we talk about the Mediation Board, the staff of the Provincial Mediation Board should be expanded to provide legal advice and to administer debt consolidation on a full scale. At the present time they haven't nearly adequate staff to handle this type of thing. A booklet providing full information on all debt legislation that is available to all rural and urban citizens should be published. We should begin negotiation with the Federal Government to provide machinery for intervening or negotiation where Federal legislation controls the administration of the source of finance.

In conclusion, I have provided some of the background and justification for this Bill. In general terms, I have tried to set out the manner in which I think it will operate. And, finally, I have urged immediate and future study of this whole area of debt legislation, rural and urban.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment, I am in favor of second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words I should like to say. I am very interested to see that the benches opposite are almost totally vacated. It seems that Members opposite are not really interested in hearing any of the salient facts that may pertain to any of the legislation that is before this Assembly.

Now, I want to say at the outset that I am pleased to take part in what has turned out to be a very amazing debate. It is amazing from many points of view. It is amazing particularly from the point of view of the Opposition. I want to deal for a few moments with some of the things that have been said.

The Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is in his seat and I want to remind him of some of the things that he has said in some of his opening remarks, probably the opening guns of the leadership campaign. He said something very interesting about poor grain sales and poor markets. I want to remind him of a few things that probably he has either conveniently or for other reasons forgotten. I want to go back to a very eventful year in Saskatchewan, the year 1967. We had a provincial election coming up. It looked rather difficult for the Liberal Party at that time. It looked difficult for several reasons, one of them was the fact that as of August 1st of that year, we had reached the end of the International Wheat Agreement. There was no new agreement to take its place. We saw United States, Argentina, Australia enter into a price-cutting war, a price-cutting game. They cut the price of wheat in the world market something to the extent of 18 or 20 cents. This left the Canadian Wheat Board in a very difficult position. It also left, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan in a very difficult position. Things weren't going too well for them. A lot of pleas were sent to Ottawa, pleas for some help.

You will recall, and I hope the Hon. Member for Milestone recalls, that in October of that year, a very crucial month, we had the Federal Government pegging the price of wheat at \$1.95 1/2 per bushel. A very noble move, a move that could have meant something to the farmers of Saskatchewan and Western Canada particularly. But nothing happened, no wheat sales were forthcoming, no great inrush of buyers was forthcoming, simply because, it is my contention and I suggest to this House, that

when the Liberal Government at Ottawa pegged the price of wheat at \$1.95 1/2, based at Thunder Bay, instructions went out, specific instructions that if you don't get \$1.95 1/2 basis at Thunder Bay, don't sell. This tied the hands of the Wheat Board completely and the results, of course, are very well known. If there were poor markets and if there were poor prices, as the Hon. Member for Milestone suggested, I say it is the fault of the Liberal Government at Ottawa who were not prepared to put one single cottonpickin penny into the coffers of the Wheat Board to maintain a price to the farmer, and at the same time allow the Canadian Wheat Board to sell wheat in the world markets at the prevailing competitive prices. This has been very conveniently forgotten, very conveniently overlooked.

The results of this disastrous move is, of course, very well known. We lost our markets and it is as any businessman will tell you, if you lose customers it is very difficult to get them back. We have gone through the whole period and the whole gamut of Canadian wheat piling up on the farms, not being able to be sold, because of the fact that we had lost reliable markets and other countries that were prepared to subsidize their farmers, that were prepared to take some of the load off the producers' shoulders, got into those markets and were able to squeeze and keep us out. I want the Hon. Member to remember this.

Now, 1968, was, of course, a very eventful year for the farmers. A Liberal Federal election and, of course, we had the spectacle as some Members have suggested of being told, "Grow all the wheat you want and we'll sell it. Diversify, go into hogs, go into cattle, go into everything, we'll sell it." Well, this was done, the farmers took Governments at their word, and I was one of them. I thought, boy, this is going to be good, real good. Then when we had a glut of wheat, granaries full, piled upon the ground, lying all over the place, we were told, "Why should I sell your wheat." So this is the situation that we found ourselves in.

Of course, then we had another very important figure who entered on to the Canadian agricultural scene, and this is one Otto Lang, the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. Well, he said, you know we have some very good ideas, some real good ideas. We can't continue to pile this wheat up, we can't continue to let this happen, so he invented the LIFT program. LIFT, it was well named, very well named. It lifted the farmers right out of production. I was one of those that was caught in the LIFT schedule. If you had wheat on hand, you were forced to summerfallow in order to sell. The net result of this whole total caper, as far as I am concerned, is that it meant on my farm, operated together with my son, a loss in grain sales at a gross of \$23,000 in the best years of the 1960s to a drop of \$13,500 in 1970 under LIFT. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how is a farmer with an over \$10,000 cutback on his gross income going to be able to survive under this kind of legislation and this kind of government program.

This wasn't the whole picture. When you look at the cost of production and I know what they were, I find that in 1970 it had gone up approximately 4 to 5 per cent. So this is the total dilemma that we find ourselves in. Then, of course, when LIFT didn't work out so well we had the Task Force on Agriculture. It was supposed to be a blueprint and a pattern for the whole agricultural industry in Western Canada. Well, it was a pattern all right. It was a continuation of what was already going on,

moving two out of three farmers off the land. A really big solution. Move them off the land, take the gross income from agriculture, divide it by what is considered a fair amount of income to the farmers, divide this into the gross amount and whatever you can come out with, this is the number of farmers we can support. This is the number of farmers we ought to have in the business. A real computerized program. Absolutely no regard to humanity, absolutely no regard to any of the consequences that this will bring. This was the solution.

Well, it wasn't too well received, not too well received at all. So someone else had to get into the act and someone else had to say, well, now look this is not going over too well, we had better come up with something else, but we want to keep in mind that the recommendations of the Task Force and the computer are right. So we invent the Stabilization Program. Yes, it is quite a program. When you look into it and when you really get the full intent of it, it means that farmers, if we are to stay in the position of family farms, are going to be stabilized in absolute poverty. Stabilized in poverty. So then, of course, this didn't go over too well.

Now, we have had this total debate on the removal of the carrying charges on grain, the storage charges on grain from this Bill. We are going to lose the PFAA benefits and all this whole fiasco when tied together with the very salient fact that some money has to be put into the hands of the farmers and the Liberal Government at Ottawa refusing. I want to remind Hon. Members who are suggesting that the New Democrats held this Bill up, that on June 8th, David Lewis, seconded by Alf Gleave, moved in the House of Commons, in Ottawa, that the \$100 million that Otto Lang so generously suggested he wanted to put into the Bill be made available to farmers in June, be taken out and paid to farmers. The amendment was defeated.

Now there is an interesting little development out of all this. A Liberal Government at Ottawa, a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan endorsed all the programs by the Liberals at Ottawa, was endorsed by the Saskatchewan Liberals. The Saskatchewan Liberals endorsing it. Oh, yes, there was some shadowboxing. There was even some name calling of the Wheat Board. There was some real attempt made to blame the Wheat Board. Blame the poor scapegoat that is not able to talk back to you. This is the philosophy. Destroy the Wheat Board. Well I, for one, am not prepared to go along with this, nor are the people of Saskatchewan.

Now getting back to the Bill before us I want to say that it is very interesting to watch, as I said, the actions in the House during not only this Bill but the whole Session. All at once farmers are going to become deadbeats and crooks.

Mr. Romanow: — Two-bit operators, according to . . .

Mr. Larson: — Yes, two-bit operators and these kinds of slogans and these kind of cliches. First, it was the workers in the repeal of Bill 2. We have to have a club to hold over their heads, we can't trust them, got to have some real club to hold over their heads. Next deterrent fees and utilization fees, oh no, you can't remove them because everybody is going to flock to the hospitals and to the doctors. Don't touch it. Then you

have the teacher-pupil ratio and, of course, a lot of nitpicking and a lot of talk about this whole thing. Now, we have, because a Bill is brought in to give some relief to the farmers, all farmers are being thrown into the same kettle, into the same pot. All at once we are crooks, all at once we are going to rob the implement dealers. All at once we are going to wear the machinery out and we are going to haul it back by truck loads.

I want to say something to the Members opposite and to the implement dealers of Saskatchewan that if the farmers hang, the implement dealers will hang with them. There is absolutely no denying this fact and the farmers have had the noose tightened around their necks by the Liberals at Ottawa and the Liberals in Saskatchewan to a point where if we don't get some kind of protection, we are hung and the dealers will be hung with us.

There is a lot of crying about the credit unions. Well this is a very interesting point.

Mr. Romanow: — Crocodile tears, Leonard.

Mr. Larson: — Crocodile tears is right. You know, I happen to have about six small credit unions in my constituency and, again, Mr. Speaker, if the farmers hang, these credit unions are going to hang with us. They are going to be hung, long before we are. Don't ever get the idea that the Members opposite are the only ones that know anything about credit unions.

As the Hon. Member from Saskatoon has pointed out many of us on this side of the House have some very close and some very friendly associations with credit unions. We have more than this, Mr. Speaker, we have some major investments with them and to suggest that because of this Bill the farmers are going to destroy their credit unions, is to suggest that we are destroying ourselves, because most of these credit unions are financed and sponsored and looked after by the farmers. We have set them up to provide ourselves with some protection and some form of counter power to the general type of commercial finance that we have been able to get. So I can't buy this story that all at once the farmers are going to be so crooked and that they are going to destroy their credit unions.

I also want to say that the farmers depend very heavily on their implement dealers. We have said many times, and I am one of those who have said this, that the implement dealers are and have been discriminated against. Their contracts, their method of operating, the kind of competitive society that they have to operate in, makes it a very difficult field. Farmers recognize this but, yet, do we have a choice? We have set up the Canadian Co-operative Implements as a form of trying to bring some stability into this chaotic whole situation of implement distribution. It's working to a point but we still need and we still must have our local implement dealers and the services that they provide. The farmers are going to be very reluctant and they are going to be very resentful of the inference that they are not going to look after their dealers if and when it is possible. But when you have a position, and the farmer is in a position where he just cannot, due to circumstances beyond his control, circumstances that I have only very limitedly mentioned today, brought on him, he can't help the dealer any more than he can help himself.

This legislation simply gives a breathing spell. It has been said in the House before, that if the effects are profound and if the effects are harmful, I am absolutely certain that this Government will take in hand and do what becomes necessary when the time comes.

My hon. friend shakes his head. Well, I hope that he and I can meet in this House, if and when the crisis arises, and I shall have the opportunity to point out to him that we mean what we say. Legislation is being brought in in good faith, it's being brought in to alleviate a situation that is utterly critical.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — Not only because of farm machinery sales but because of farm mortgages. I have a young friend at home, struggling in cattle, struggling and trying to do what he was told by Ottawa to establish himself. In the whole process he got behind in his payments to the Farm Credit Corporation. Oh, no, they didn't foreclose, they didn't do this, but they did something that was equally harmful and put him into an even straighter strait-jacket. They went to the elevators and they put a third-party claim against his grain. A claim against a cash advance already, a third-party claim by the Farm Credit Corporation which left him with almost nothing to feed himself and his family on. This is the kind of thing that this Bill is designed and meant to give a breathing spell to. This is all that it is intended to do. And in that spirit and in that faith it is being presented.

Now the debate has been very prolonged, and I think that about all that has been said, or needs to be said, has been said. I, for one, am not afraid to meet my implement dealers. As a matter of fact I have already met them. Certainly they have some areas where they may be a little bit afraid, because they depend entirely on the farmers for their living. But on the other hand, they all agree — and my hon. friend from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) is laughing — they all agree — you listen carefully — that if something isn't done they are not going to be here a year from now. They are not going to be here nor are many of their farmer customers. So they are quite prepared to say, let's give it a try and let's see what will happen. And, if and when it does happen, we expect — and they are quite clear on this — we expect the Government to be prepared to take steps to do what has to be done when the time comes.

I have been prepared to assure them that we will do this, and that I would take my place in this House and raise as much cain as is necessary, if that time comes.

So, Mr. Speaker, the whole debate has been almost a circus, a repetitious circus. I, for one, am proud to support it. I am sorry, I am very sorry, that the people of Saskatchewan and the farmers and dealers were forced into this hopeless position not of their own making, not of their own desire, not of their own wish, but because of political circumstances beyond their control, emanating out of Ottawa and Regina.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and I will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The question being put on the amendment it was negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 12

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 37

Messieurs

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

The debate continued on the motion.

Mr. G.B. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, as so often has been heard in this House, Members will stand and say I hadn't planned on speaking on this Bill, but. I am one of those because I really didn't think that I was a farmer but after reading this Bill, I discovered that I am a farmer. I have so many small family farm owners in my constituency who have asked me to speak on their behalf, that I feel that I am forced to expound on this very important Bill today.

Before doing so, however, I should like to point out that earlier in the Session, I thought that we had 14 school teachers in the Government, but I find we have 13 1/2 now. The Member from Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver), he is half teacher and half hog raiser. I am sure that his family has no difficulty in determining in which profession he has been at when he comes home. I have visited a good many hog farms and there is just a little bit different odor between teaching and farming.

I should suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member from Shaunavon table the name of the company, or the individual, who is foreclosing on that farm down in the Shaunavon area. I am satisfied there are peculiar conditions to this foreclosure and he was unwise in bringing it to the attention of the Members of this House. I suggest, Sir, in fact I request him, to table the name of the company or the individual of foreclosing and the name of the individual guaranteeing the agreement for sale.

Now the Hon. Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody), I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, is a mean, miserable unhappy individual. I am sorry to have to say this. I had never met the chap and he is a pretty good looking chap, and there are some pretty good

looking fellows over there. I recognize a few of them. But I am disappointed because he had the looks of a happy type, but he is not only mean, miserable and unhappy, but I think he is confused as well. In some of the statements that he made about what this Bill is going to do and won't do for the farmers and to the credit lending institutions.

He took exception to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and made a little bit of ridicule of his reading some of the statutes last night, and I want him to realize that this is quite in order. There is nothing wrong with it, whatsoever. And if you consider that a waste of time, you have wasted the time of this House for almost two days now by being so impatient, not only to steamroller but just to bulldoze this piece of legislation through.

I will remind the Hon. Member that not too many years ago one of the Members of the NDP read 100 letters in this House, and they were repetitious, really served no purpose after the first or second. I have heard, personally, Members read at great length from various statutes. So let's not kid ourselves it is quite in order.

Mr. Speaker, I think maybe I should explain why I feel that I am a family farmer now. Well, I am a small farmer. I am not as large as the Hon. John Burton, our Member of Parliament for Regina East. He has now joined the ranks of the family farmers. He has purchased a farm south of Fort Qu'Appelle. I only have a half a section. I am not very active on the farm, but I think I am possibly better qualified to speak on this Bill than some of the school teachers opposite, because Section 2C says that a farmer means a person whose principal occupation consists of farming and includes an executor or administrator of a deceased farmer, or a person appointed under an Act or by order of any court, of competent jurisdiction to administer the affairs of the farmer.

Well, I have been doing that for 33 years, so I guess I am a farmer. And I am a family farmer because it is just a wee little half section farm.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, a family farm is really not described in the Act. They are very ready to call it the Family Farm Protection Act, but they don't describe what a family farm is. I really don't know. I don't think the Government knows. I don't know whether the Minister of Agriculture is an operator of a family farm. I suppose he could be considered that. Certainly this one that I am involved in is a family farm as families have been involved in it for many years. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is bad legislation, to use the words of the Members opposite when were the Government. I should like to know who cooked it up, because it certainly is a real stew, everything was thrown in at the last minute. It is not only bad, but it is unnecessary legislation, and worst of all — and the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) will be interested in this — it is one of those mean, dirty pieces of legislation that is retroactive.

Mr. Speaker, this certainly doesn't help the small businessman, the people that the Government said they were going to help in all their campaign material, they mentioned this. How they were going to help the small businessman. Well, I can't see how credit restrictions to consumers of the type they are introducing is going to be of any help to the businessman — not

by any stretch of the imagination. And it is bound to affect everyone.

We have been talking about implement dealers, credit unions and lending institutions, but let's not kid ourselves, when the farmer doesn't have credit it is going to affect the hardware store, the drug store, the dry goods store, the grocery store, everyone. And just as soon as this legislation was announced or introduced, it had an effect on the atmosphere of this Province. Because people said, it can easily be extended. It can be extended in time, and it can be extended in scope. I say once again, that the best help you people on the right of the Speaker, can give the small businessman is just leave him alone and let him run his own affairs and stop introducing legislation that interferes with him.

I took time off to go downtown at noon and ran into three people — two of whom I haven't seen for five years — so they certainly aren't my constituents. And each one of them made the point of stopping me on the street and mentioning how ineffective the Government has been in this Session and what a complete waste of time this Session has been.

One said, "My goodness, you would think they would find a better way of spending our money." It is no help to the farmer, Mr. Speaker. It would be repetitious of me to speak at length on this, because I doubt very much whether I can add any new points, but I guarantee it is going to create new problems and create more risk for the farmers and the creditors.

As I say, it has created, and will create, an unfavorable business environment in this Province. Heaven knows that we don't need any more of this trend. The temporary delay, I hope, of the iron mine was bad enough; the cancellation of the pulp mill agreement was another blow; the announcement that the Government is going to pay for these goodies by increased corporate taxation — this is a wonderful way to attract business in Saskatchewan and encourage the small businessman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the egg-heads and the school teachers at the back there, supporting this Bill. Absolutely! Because they are not very practical. I can understand the protectionist lawyers, but the practical farmers, absolutely no. I have great respect for the Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I feel that he is sincere, trying to do the best job. He is fair to both sides of the House, but I should like to know, just how on earth he can live with himself when he goes home at night, if he is going to support this kind of legislation, because he is a practical farmer. He has rubbed shoulders with farmers down in the Swift Current area. Surely he must realize that this is not necessary legislation and it certainly isn't good legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of the woolly thinking of the Socialists, the levelling thinking of Socialists, drag everybody down to the common level to help the few. It is absolutely unnecessary to introduce this legislation. Everything they wanted to do could have been done by other means to look after the needy few whom they have cited. The Hon. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) his case could have been looked after by a mediation-type board to deal with the individual cases. But why ruin the credit of every farmer in Saskatchewan? Why cast a blight on the business atmosphere of this Province for the

sake of a few? Purely and simply because it is fuzzy Socialist thinking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand why they were so obstinate and bullheaded. We get references to them as steamrollers. I guess that is out of date, they are diesel powered rollers now. Why wouldn't they consider our amendment and support us? They won't tell us why they won't refer it to the Law Amendments Committee. They have ignored briefs, they have ignored our pleas. They remind me of a fellow who is halfway down a ski jump. He would like to change his mind but he can't.

Well, actually, Mr. Speaker, they are not halfway down the ski jump. They haven't gone off the platform yet. They can still backtrack. Oh, yes, I can tell you that you fellows are going to be on the ski slope and you are going to land like some of those skiers do — sprawled all over the atmosphere.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can't support this ill-timed, ill-considered, rushed, hasty Bill, a bad piece of legislation — to use the words of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). I am sorry that the new Members opposite cannot see the light of day that they are being led down this blind dark alley. But, Mr. Speaker, since I cannot support the Bill, I should like to move an amendment, seconded by the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt):

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

This Bill, be not now read a second time, but it be read six months hence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order on whether or not the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who has spoken on the Bill can second the second amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order has been raised on this motion as to whether the seconder, having spoken, can second this motion. Now the other motion which was before us, was a concurrent motion which covered the Bill and the amendment, which the Hon. Member had spoken to. Therefore, this is somewhat of a similar motion. It covers both the Bill and a six-month hoist. So I should have to say, I believe in my opinion, that the Member has spoken to the motion which this also covers. So I should have to, for that reason, rule you out of order.

Mr. Steuart: — Speaking to your point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware if a Member who has spoken in a debate cannot second an amendment, that's one point. But to say that because he has spoken in a debate that contained a motion — we spoke on that debate concurrently — that the motion referred to a committee is a far different thing than as you say, the six-month hoist. That the Bill be not now considered and be considered six months hence, is, as we all know, a parliamentary procedure really to say that we will drop this Bill. We shall not be in session six months from now and so this is traditionally considered one means that the Opposition has for asking that the Bill be literally

removed from the Order Paper and not considered.

With all deference, I don't think that it can be considered the same thing at all. The other was to keep the Bill alive. The other amendment would have referred it to the Law Amendments Committee. The Law Amendments Committee would have listened to representation made by various people. It may, or may not have, suggested any amendment, brought it back into this House, and either passed it or defeated it. But the Bill would still be alive, would be on the Order Paper and would be a fact of life before this House. But this proposed amendment literally takes this Bill right out of contention, right out of the consideration of the House. With all deference, I do think they are different and I really don't think that the Government should even try to hang their hat on such a technicality.

The Opposition has the right and it is a right that they exercised when they were in the Opposition, to ask that bills which they found repugnant, be given a six-month hoist. We are asking this now. If your ruling is that this is against parliamentary procedure, that having spoken in a general debate an individual Member cannot make an amendment, and you gave us the citation from Beauchesne or May or wherever — I don't know, I don't pretend to have any knowledge on that subject — well, then, we would have to bow to your ruling. But, surely to rule that because it's literally almost the same motion, with deference, it is not the same motion. And I think we should be allowed to proceed with this amendment.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it is my understanding that a move for a six-month hoist is not debated concurrently with the motion, the first motion plus the amendment of a six-month hoist are not debated concurrently, which means that if this motion is seconded and debated by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) it would be strictly on the provision for a six-month hoist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the person follows through on this rule then it would become obvious that if we are allowed to debate them concurrently, that the Member for Rosthern then would have been precluded from speaking to the main motion, simply because he would now be limited to speaking on the six-month hoist.

Therefore, I submit that because the motion for a six-month hoist is not concurrent with the main motion, the speaker from Rosthern does have the right to move or second the six-month hoist provision.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the only point I wanted to make was that my understanding of the rules is that when there is nothing before the House but the main motion, as there is now, then the only person who can move a further amendment — and I am submitting the only person who can second a further amendment — is someone who is qualified to speak.

Now, the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) is qualified to speak since he has not spoken on the main motion or the amendment which was debated concurrently.

The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) cannot now speak in this debate. He cannot speak to the motion which he is

seconding, in my submission, because he could not speak in the debate. He could not move what the Member for Regina Whitmore Park just moved because he would have no status to stand up and say anything. And I am submitting that if he couldn't move it, he couldn't second it.

We agree that he couldn't move it since he has spoken in the debate on the main motion, or in an amendment which was concurrent thereto. He could not have moved the motion and I think we all agree on that. It is my submission that he cannot second that which he cannot move, and that's my simple position. It may not be right. This is my understanding of the rules.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. First of all, I am not going to debate the issue at hand but what I should like to say is that we are all very interested in the highest pronouncement of the Premier, we are all very interested in the speculation that he has put forth to the House but at least we would ask him to quote the citation that he is referring to which are the rules of the House in which his judgment is that the seconder of the motion must not have previously spoken.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, since I am involved in this motion and I am not allowed to second, I'd like to speak on a point of order.

We have a Member over at Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) you know, and I don't think there is any rule as to how long the bell can ring. If you want to be technical, we can get technical and I'll appeal your ruling and we'll ring the bell and we'll wait until the Member for Meadow Lake is here.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, with respect to the point raised by the Premier, I would certainly ask, Sir, that before you make any ruling that you look and see if there are such references in Erskine May. It seems to me that the seconder is in a different position than the mover of the motion. I can't agree with the Premier's thinking here because the Member for Rosthern who is unable to move the motion, we agree, in turn then couldn't second the motion that was made and put before this Assembly.

It is an alternate motion. It is one certainly that he can speak on and there is no citation, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, — I would be very interested in hearing one — that could be found to support the Premier's contention and if you feel, Sir, that you need a few moments to review the parliamentary references in this regard, I am sure we would all agree to a short recess to let you do that, because this is a pretty key ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, just before retiring to make a ruling, I should like to examine what would happen if the ruling that you have just made were to be sustained.

To begin with, we discussed the main motion and the first amendment to it, which was a referral. Now in order for me to hold back the right to speak to this present motion, I would have to refrain from speaking to the referral motion. Now if the referral motion were passed, the amendment to refer, pardon

me — the referral motion if it were passed, then, of course, there is no need for this particular motion to be considered.

The net effect is that I am deprived of my right to speak to the first motion. Now, I therefore have to hold myself in reserve just in case there is no passage of the first one. And the net effect then is to deprive Members of this House to speak.

Now, I suggest, therefore, that the main motion and an amendment having been put to this House, I have every right to speak to it. Now if that is defeated, then I should have the right to speak to a new motion. And any other ruling deprives me of that right and here we are 12 Members in this House, 13 entitled to sit here, we are then deprived of having two Members speak until after we know the result of a previous vote, and that isn't reasonable.

Mr. Romanow: — That's democracy!

Mr. MacLeod: — That's democracy, indeed! We've got to deprive ourselves of the right to speak and that's not fair. Now, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if Rule 44 means what I think it is, but as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, it reads this way:

When Mr. Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the Assembly is contrary to the Rules and Privileges of the Legislature, he shall apprise the Assembly thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon . . .

(which, Mr. Speaker, you have done)

. . . and quote the authority applicable to the case.

And, Mr. Speaker, we do ask, pursuant to Rule 44 that that authority be presented to us.

I will speak further if necessary.

RULING BY Mr. Speaker

AMENDMENTS ON BILL NO. 9

He said: Is there anyone further wishing to comment on the problem which is now before the Chair? Well, I will just have a minute's consultation with the Clerk before I give my ruling on this.

Well, I must admit that this is a type of ruling which we can't find that has come before the House before but the Standing Orders 28 (1) does say that no Member may speak to a question twice except in explanation of the material part of his speech, which may have been misquoted or misunderstood. Now that in itself does not cover what is before us at this time.

But the rule is plain in Beauchesne that no Member may speak to the same question twice and that's Rule 28, it also covers that part.

The motion which we have just concluded started off that all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This Bill be not now read a second time.

Every Member, with the exception of the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) spoke to that main motion and the amendment. Now the motion which is moved by the Member for Regina Whitmore Park starts in identically the same way:

that this Bill be not now read a second time.

but a different conclusion drawn.

I feel that a person who is entitled to move a motion, would also have the right to second it. Anyone who would have the right to second the motion, would also have the right to move a motion. Had some of the Members of the Opposition spoken prior to Mr. MacDonald of Milestone moving his first amendment, they themselves would have been eligible to come back in and second this amendment, because they had spoken to the main motion but not to the amendment.

But the Members having spoken after the amendment was introduced, all with the exception of the Member for Regina Whitmore Park, they have spoken to the main motion and to the amendment and the second motion, while it is a tabling motion for a six-month hoist, in itself deals with Bill No. 9 and, therefore, to debate this motion without referring to Bill No. 9 would almost be impossible because it doesn't say Bill No. 9, it just says 'that this Bill' and this Bill means Bill No. 9. And I would feel, therefore, that the mover was eligible to move the motion but the seconder is ineligible to second the motion in a case like this. And I hope that in the future if Members wish to move such motions, which is their right, that they will plan so that they have a seconder who spoke either before the amendment was moved, or reserve themselves so that they could second a second amendment. It would facilitate the work of this House.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a word on that.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and in all due deference, that this would be one of the most dangerous judgments that you yourself, Sir, could make in relation to this House or this Legislature.

If there is one thing in the British Parliamentary System, it is that every Member has an absolute right to speak on every Bill and every issue and every motion. By this particular amendment, if this amendment is accepted as legal, it seems that all the remarks of Members of this House must be restricted to that motion or to that amendment, and that means that they cannot speak on the previous amendment or the previous main motion.

So what you are doing, Sir, is saying that a Member in order to second a motion or an amendment, is being deprived now and hereafter if you set a precedent in this House, of never being able to speak on a main motion, if he hopes to second an amendment, Sir. And I think that that would be a very dangerous precedent. In all due deference, I ask you to think about it again. I would ask you to look back and find an authority because I think, Sir, that this would be the only House of Parliament in the British Commonwealth where a Member would be restricted on speaking on a main motion or a bill in order to second an amendment which might have nothing to do with the original amendment or the original motion. And it would be a

denial of free speech in this House or in this Legislature, Sir. And I know that you yourself would point out that all remarks in relation to this amendment must be restricted to the amendment, not to the main motion, and not to the first amendment. So it would be a definite denial of the right of free speech of a Member to speak on that main motion and that main Bill and I would ask you, Sir, to reconsider very, very seriously.

Mr. Speaker: — I thought I tried to make it clear that a Member could speak on the main motion and if only one Member had spoken prior to the first amendment being moved, they would be eligible to second this motion because they hadn't spoken to the other amendment.

The other amendment was voted on and cleaned off, the House voted against that "this Bill be not now be read a second time."

I feel from what I can peruse here that if such a ruling wasn't made, there would be no way of determining the length of any debate because every Member could speak once, twice, three, four or as many times as they wished because it would be just a matter of bringing in more amendments by Members who had already spoken on previous amendments and previous debates. They had lost their right, I would feel. So, that is the way that I see it at this time. I feel that the motion is out of order for that reason.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question. If the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) came in momentarily and he seconded the motion, you are saying to us, the 12 that have spoken, that we have no right to speak to this amendment. Is that right?

Mr. Speaker: — No, I am not saying you would have no right to speak to the amendment . . . but what I am saying is that your remarks would have to be confined entirely to the amendment then.

Mr. Boldt: — That's exactly what we will do. How do you know what I am going to talk about. I haven't spoken and if this amendment is passed, then I can speak to the amendment, to the amendment only, and you can't pre-judge me that I am going to roam all over the Throne Speech Debate or all over the Bill. I am going to speak to that amendment.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

AMENDMENT ON BILL NO. 9

He said: This will clarify the thing a little further in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, Citation 165(6) and (7), page 138, which is as follows:

(6) A member who has already spoken to a question has no right to propose an amendment, though he may speak to an amendment when moved by another member.

(7) A member who has already spoken to a question has no right to move an adjournment of the debate of the House.

A motion cannot be before the House unless it is moved and seconded. Therefore the seconder is in the same class, I believe, as the mover, because he has spoken before. An amendment cannot be proposed unless the mover has a seconder. Therefore the mover cannot find a seconder who has spoken before for the same purpose as a Member who moves a motion must not have spoken before. It would apply to the mover or the seconder because a motion is not before the House until properly moved and seconded.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, with respect I should like to enquire, when the Speaker was quoting and when he stopped quoting, I wonder where the end of that quotation was. Now it is my understanding of the rules of this House that a Member who has spoken has no right to propose an amendment. Now that has been our understanding and that was the understanding on which we have operated and that is the understanding upon which we based the amendment made by the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). Then, Mr. Speaker, went on to say something about, "he feels . . . " and I wonder if he was quoting Beauchesne's or whether this was part of your ruling. Was this your interpretation or was this part of the quotation, Mr. Speaker? I just didn't understand it.

Mr. Speaker: — I will repeat the quotation again if the House wishes. The quotation is on page 138, Citation 165 of Beauchesne's, 4th edition. It is clause (6):

A member who has already spoken to a question has no right to propose an amendment, though he may speak to an amendment when moved by another member.

Mr. MacLeod: — Is that the end of the quotation?

Mr. Speaker: — That's the end of the quotation.

An amendment cannot be before this House until it is duly moved and seconded. The seconder must have the same status to be able to move a motion as the mover himself has as to be properly before the House.

Mr. MacLeod: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the authority for the proposition which Mr. Speaker just proposed. You advanced a particular proposition and the proposition as I understand it is this: you say that the seconder of a motion is in the same position as the mover of the motion. Now, where is the authority for that?

Mr. Speaker: — The common practice is plain that a motion before it can be debated in this House must be moved and seconded. Therefore in order to propose a motion it takes more than one Member to propose a motion. It takes a mover and a seconder. So that is my ruling and the Members have the right to challenge my ruling if they so wish.

I rule that the motion is out order and the seconder is not eligible to . . .

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, one more comment if I might, Sir. If you recall you just said that the mover must be able to speak to move the motion, but can you show me anywhere, Sir, which indicates that the seconder has to speak on any motion. A man can stand up in this House and move an amendment and he can have a seconder who may never speak on any motion that is seconded or moved by the mover of any amendment or any original motion. So to state that the mover must be able to speak, that the seconder has to be able to speak, Sir, I say does not follow therefrom. It is absolutely without question that a seconder need never stand up in this House and speak in seconding a motion.

Mr. Speaker: — A seconder may not exercise his right but I rule that he must be in a position that he could if he so wished to and a seconder on numerous occasions in the history of this Legislature has not exercised that right.

Further down in Beauchesne's it says:

A member who has spoken on the main question cannot second a motion for the adjournment.

This would be the same thing. A Member having already spoken to the motion would be seconding the motion for the postponement rather than the adjournment. That is on the same page of Beauchesne's Clause (7). So I feel it is the same thing when a Member who has spoken on the main question cannot second a motion for the adjournment, then I would rule that a Member who has spoken to the main question cannot second the motion for postponement. I so rule.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, if I may, Sir, on your ruling, you made mention here just in your latter comments here that if the seconder chose not to speak, this was fine, and we recognize this, but that he should be able to speak on that motion, if he chose to exercise his right. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Rosthern, or indeed any of us sitting here could speak on the motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) if indeed it were before the House. Surely all of us could speak on that motion, six-month hoist motion. It is an alternate proposal, it is a different proposal and if we can all speak on that motion, to follow the argument backwards, then certainly the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) or any one of the rest of us sitting here could also second that motion. I very seriously, Mr. Speaker, and with all deference would really ask you to review these citations in this regard and reconsider this because as I said earlier, I think it is a very, very key ruling that we are entertaining here now.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — May I make a comment, Mr. Speaker, please. I don't need to remind anyone in this House that the first rule of this House that everything must be done to expedite freedom of speech and I submit with respect, Mr. Speaker, that in order to take away from that right or to derogate from that right that there should be much, much stronger authority than Mr. Speaker has given today. I should hope that Mr. Speaker would reconsider his ruling and try to present to the House a ruling which would expedite the right of every Member in this House to speak.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I do not wish to prolong this argument but when you are considering this matter I should like to bring to your attention a possible other alternative and that is a resultant ruling on April 10, 1968, which I think brings into question the possible necessity or lack of necessity of having a seconder for the motion at all. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, in the records of April 10, 1968, Mr. Lloyd, then Leader of the Opposition, speaking on deterrent fees — April 10, 1968, page 1775, Mr. Lloyd then speaking to deterrent fees moved a motion suggesting, "That all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted thereof, an amendment — I won't read the amendment, Mr. Speaker, — but in this particular case there was no seconder to the motion, Mr. Speaker, and I think the record will show that the amendment was moved then by the Leader of the Opposition with no seconder. I submit that at that particular time the Speaker of the House accepted the validity of the amendment without a seconder and I submit to your perusal the possibility that no seconder may be required on this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I would respectfully suggest that in the Journals while it says that a motion is moved by a certain Member, many a time it doesn't say who the seconder is but if you peruse the Votes and Proceedings themselves I think you will find that every motion had a seconder and the former Speaker was very strict to see that he did have.

Now coming back to what we were debating before, Clause (7) of Citation 165, page 138, says:

A member who has already spoken to a question has no right to move an adjournment of the debate or of the House.

And further:

A Member who has already spoken on the main question cannot second a motion for the adjournment.

So from that ruling there I say that a Member, if he cannot second a motion for the adjournment then he cannot second the motion for a postponement. My ruling is that this motion is out of order.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point. I don't think you answered my question. If the motion was in order can any of the Members who have spoken speak to that motion on this side of the House?

Mr. Speaker: — Providing that they did . . .

Mr. Boldt: — I would like to have a yes or no.

Mr. Speaker: — It would be a very strict, close debate.

Mr. Boldt: — I would like to have an answer, Yes or No.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, they could if it . . .

Mr. Boldt: — They could. All right I am saying that I am in order and I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that the Motion is out of order because the seconder is not eligible to second the motion.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — The ruling of the Chair is appealed.

Ruling of the Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 39

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

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

Debate continues on the main motion.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, this has been a strange debate with a strange spectacle by the Leader of an Opposition who is now leaving this very important debate having requested an adjournment. This in the short 8 or 9 days that we've had this Session. We have had — and I ask the people of Saskatchewan to take careful note of this — we've had the spectacle of this irresponsible Opposition requesting five adjournments with respect to one Bill and challenging on two occasions, Mr. Speaker's ruling in seven days. When we were in Opposition we didn't do that in the four years that I was sitting in Opposition. They had the audacity to come to this Legislature and to expect the people of Saskatchewan to believe in their credibility. I ask the Hon. Members of this House and the people of Saskatchewan to remind themselves what the situation was when we first introduced the ruling with respect to extended hours of sitting. The Leader of the Opposition and now the Member for Whitmore Park, who is leaving his chair,

they get up and they say, "Oh, no we can't do it."

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I always thought that the ruling of this House . . . Now you have been very firm in making a decision which I think has established a very bad precedent, but I always thought that in closing the debate it was the responsibility of the closer of the debate to answer the replies of Members of the Opposition in the comments in the debate and not to introduce new material and to make a political speech.

Mr. Romanow: — How many times did you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! It is true that a Member in closing the debate cannot introduce new material. They can debate on the speeches that have taken place or on what has happened during the debate itself but cannot introduce new material.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, thank you for the ruling. I should like to ask the Hon. Member for Milestone, where was he when, during the adjournments last night in the course of this debate. Four adjournments, Mr. Speaker, and then the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition bringing this entire House into disrepute with the reading of the Limitations Act.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — You muzzled us.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I was about to tell the Members of this House what the position was of the Opposition when we introduced the motion with respect to extended hours. They argued that they needed time to consider this Bill. We assured them they would have time. The Hon. Premier then made a motion to adjourn the Legislature to go to Victoria and to give them time to consider the Bill. Their position then was, "Oh, no, don't adjourn the House, we've got a very important farm Bill to deal with." I recall them getting up and I recall reading in the papers, "You can't adjourn the House on this business, this very important business of the Legislature coming before this farm Bill, don't adjourn to go to Victoria." So now they contradict themselves at least twice. We came back from Victoria after four days, after they had ample opportunity to consider every aspect of this Bill, after they had every ample opportunity to get on to the phone to 17 different organizations trying to solicit those organizations to make representations to the Government to oppose the Bill, and after doing that, they had the audacity to come to the Legislature and say that we are muzzling them. Now I want to tell the Member from Milestone and the people of Saskatchewan, I just finished, up until about six weeks ago, four years in Opposition, under what I consider to be the most high-handed and dictatorial Government that probably the Province of Saskatchewan has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I want to say that we had many issues which were of momentous importance. They didn't agree with us; we didn't agree with them; we fought vigorously; we fought them every step of

the way; we put up every speaker that we could put up at the time when the issue came up. But we never degraded this Assembly to the point of adjourning simultaneously four times, any issue, during the course of its consideration. Neither did we ever during four years, Mr. Speaker, get up like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) did yesterday and some members of the press, saying that it was a good time by all, standing for 10 minutes, mocking the Assembly and the prestige and the honor of this House. That's what brings down democracy in the eyes of the young people and all the people of the Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words with respect to this Bill. We say that there is a farm crisis. Speaker after speaker opposite, has said that there is a farm crisis too. Some of the briefs that I have received say there is a farm crisis too. Everybody agrees that there is a farm crisis. Who created this farm crisis, Mr. Speaker? Keep in mind that we have been the Government only five or six weeks. We've never been in Government federally where agriculture is more directly related. After seven long years we became the Government after a Liberal Party in power. Who created this crisis? I'll tell this House who created this. Federal-Liberals who implemented hair-brained schemes like Operation LIFT and rammed it down the throats of our farmers. I'll tell you who is creating this crisis. Federal-Liberals who implement or seek to implement a Stabilization Bill to get rid of our family farmers. That's who created this crisis. I'll tell you who created this crisis. Federal-Liberals who introduced the Farm Adjustments Act and other legislation which will destroy rural Saskatchewan. Now that would be all right I suppose, provincially. If a Provincial Government could sort of say we didn't support it but I recall the Members who are opposite there of the Liberal Party then and now agreeing with every piece of legislation that the Federal-Liberals put into operation. I say that the crisis, to a large extent, is created by the Minister of the Crown who was the former Minister of Highways, the former Minister of Welfare, and the Leader of the Opposition when they got up and they attacked the Canadian Wheat Board.

I say the crisis was created when they put on tax on farm fuels. I say the crisis was created when they said diversify, diversify to every farmer in Saskatchewan leaving the farmer to think that there was a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow and causing for that farmer nothing but heartache and disillusionment. That's who created the crisis, the farming crisis that we are seeking now to resolve. We are reacting to try to resolve this crisis, not created by the New Democrats, not created by Conservatives, not created by Social Credit, but created and perpetrated by Prime Minister Trudeau and Otto Lang, aided and abetted by the Liberal Party sitting opposite.

Now here we are in office, five, six weeks; we are coming into a harvest period in about a week and a half or two weeks in the southern areas, if not sooner; valuable equipment is needed in the harvesting operations; cash is needed to make sure that the farmers get what appears to be in many areas a bumper crop and the Members opposite come to this House and they say, "Well in five weeks you've got hastily drafted legislation," after they sat and did nothing for seven years in agriculture. Now they say refer it to a committee. Oh, the farmers have got

lots of time to while away at a committee while harvest is around the corner. Oh, the farmer's won't mind coming to a committee and listening to the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) harangue about his concern for the mortgage companies and the finance companies. Oh, the farmers won't mind delaying their harvesting if a repossession happens or a foreclosure occurs. They won't mind whatsoever coming to this special committee so that the mortgage companies and the finance companies can be heard with respect to this Bill. Now all of a sudden they are democratic. I want to tell the Hon. Members opposite that an election was held six weeks ago wherein the party in power received over 55 per cent of the popular vote. I don't want to get into the political aspect of it but that's a fact. 55 per cent! I doubt if ever in the history of Saskatchewan there has been a 55 per cent majority popular vote. Why? Because we campaigned on the crisis, we said we would try to ease the crisis, that's why we got 55 per cent. And to do as the Liberals would have us do, have this Bill killed in second reading, have us do nothing with respect to debt legislation would be betraying the trust that 55 per cent of the population gave to this Government to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few specific comments with respect to the observations made by some of the Members during the course of this debate. First of all, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) I think, made a very worthwhile contribution with respect to the comments on the Bill. He complained about Section 8 in particular and the repairs. He questioned what would happen if repairs were added to a repossessed piece of machinery. What would occur then? And I think it was a very valid point. My answer to the Hon. Member is that, in our opinion, Section 15 is likely the answer. Section 15 is the section which allows a machinery dealer or any other creditor or plaintiff in the action to make an application before the judge and to make sure on certain evidence the judge gives him an order allowing that creditor or plaintiff to go ahead and obtain a release.

Mr. MacDonald: — Who pays the bill?

Mr. Romanow: —Now, we think that this is an adequate solution to the matter. In any event, if we do enact any particular amendment as suggested by the Member from Cannington there are likely to be disputes as to the value of the quantity of the work put on, that is between the creditor and the farmer, and we are back into court anyway. Now to answer the question with respect to the Member as to who pays the bill. In any event there is likely to be a bill. We think the procedure in Section 15 is quick, it is remedial, it does not involve too many legal documentations, the matter can be quickly heard and determined. In fact, Members opposite have expressed their confidence in the way the courts have handled it. I recall one of the Members opposite saying that the courts deal with all people fairly in these matters on the applications on the Limitation of Civil Rights. I think it was the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) I am not sure, and I agree with him. We think they will do the same in the case suggested by the Hon. Member from Cannington.

Now in respect to the comments of the Hon. Member from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) frankly I must say I was rather confused as to his reasoning. I gathered the thrust of

his remarks that the Hon. Member from Albert Park said this. He said we now have adequate legislation, he said we have The Land Contract Actions Act and he said, as I marked his words down, "This was now doing a good job." Then, he said, in fact all that this Act does, all that it does — the farm Bill that we have here — is that it expands the provisions of The Land Contract Act. And then he referred to The Limitation of Civil Rights Act. We now have that and he said a former Liberal Government in 1970 brought in amendments and all this Act does is expand the provisions of The Limitation of Civil Rights Act. Then he goes on to a wholesale attack on this particular Bill. Having improved in principle The Land Contract Actions Act and The Limitation of Civil Rights Act and having said that this Bill is merely an extension of those two principles that he adheres to, he says throw out the principle of this Bill.

With all due respect to the Member from Regina Albert Park you can't have it both ways. You either like the principle contained in The Land Contracts Actions Act and The Limitation of Civil Rights Act or you don't. And I really submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that what is behind the Member's criticism on this Bill, when he is really criticizing this Bill what he is really, deep down, criticizing is The Land Contract Actions Act and the principle contained therein and the principle contained in The Limitation Civil Rights Act. Because if he doesn't criticize the principle in those two Acts he would be supporting the principle of this Act, which by his very own words are mere extensions of The Land Contracts Actions Act and The Limitation of Civil Rights. May I say to the Hon. Member that he is 100 per cent right, it is a mere extension.

Now the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), the former Minister of Highways, had a contribution to make, I suppose in this debate as well. I have perused my notes at length to determine what precisely that contribution was and I regret to inform the Hon. Member and other Members of the House that I can't quite determine it, other than to say that all he was talking about was communistic legislation, talking about Otto Lang, and talking about the Minister of Agriculture. I thought it was very strange indeed that one could conclude that here he had Messer and Lang, two fellow travellers, according to the judgment of the former Minister of Highways. I must say with extreme regret that, in my view, the contribution made by the Member from Rosthern did not help the deliberations of this very important issue one iota.

Now the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) got up in his place last night when the Opposition got a little silly and he thought that he would be part of this stalling and obstructionist tactics that have been evident throughout this entire Session by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Liberal Party. And that disappointed me, because I have a high personal regard for the Member from Wilkie, the former Minister of Education. I didn't ever think that he would get into any debate anywhere in any Legislature and get up and demean himself to the point where he reads verbatim, a brief, that all Members of the Legislature have had and perused. Then advancing, following on that brief, what appeared to be purely a contradictory argument. This is the brief of the implement dealers.

I have much sympathy with many of the things the implement dealers talk of but there is a contradictory argument in their

brief and it was advanced by the Member from Wilkie. On the one hand the brief says things are so good that you don't need this legislation, the farming economy is going up, and then on page 2, in the middle of it, it says but on the other hand things are getting so bad that next year you are going to extend the legislation. I say to the Member from Wilkie and with respect to the implement dealers, you can't have it both ways. Things are either getting so good that we don't need this Bill period, and you oppose it. And if that's what the Liberal Party believes let them, for goodness sake, get up and say that things are so good you don't need this Bill, or you have it the other way. But you can't do it. And what the Member from Wilkie and what the implement dealers in that regard did was to have a contradictory argument. That's all that the Member from Wilkie said. He didn't say anything with any substance with respect to individual implement dealers in his riding. All he did was to take this brief and to read it word for word to delay the proceedings of this House.

The Liberal Party opposite says that this legislation will force implement dealers to close up throughout Saskatchewan. I say to the Liberals that in the past seven years we have probably witnessed more closures of implement dealers in Saskatchewan than in a long, long while. I ask the Hon. Members why that was so? We didn't have this type of evil legislation, according to them on the books. We didn't have any legislation which is restrictive and yet they went bankrupt in many cases and I ask you to ask yourselves, why did they go bankrupt? They did not go bankrupt because they had so-called restrictive legislation, Mr. Speaker. The implement dealer, like the lawyer, like the small town merchant, like all of us in this Assembly will always go bankrupt if the farmers are going bankrupt, and that is why he was going belly-up because the economic circumstances were critical for him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So when Members say to me in the House that this legislation will only mean more dealers are going bankrupt, all the small towns drying up, I say the facts belie your argument. The fact of the situation is, unfortunately, and it causes the Government a great deal of concern. We want the implement dealers to be a viable part of our community. I hope that we can devise policies to give them support to grow and have the communities grow. But the facts are that in the meantime under the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan in the past seven years they did suffer serious losses and not because of legislation but because of the economic circumstances.

Now we come to the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). He talked about the position of the retired farmers, the ordinary person. These are words coming, Mr. Speaker, from a man who but six weeks ago would hardly look at the ordinary person in his haste to deal with the large corporations of the United States and other parts of Canada. This comes from a former leader in a former Government that didn't lift — and you can check the statute books — one little finger to help those retiring farmers and now he is condemning the Government that in six weeks time we haven't been able to do it. I was very disappointed in the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. He criticized my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for not introducing the Bill. Oh, he said, this

showed the Minister of Agriculture was not qualified. He said, never has it ever happened in the history of this House since he has been here that a farm Bill or a piece of legislation relating to farmers wasn't introduced by an Agriculture Minister. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement like all the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition is patently false.

And I am going to show the House why it was false. While he was reading so eloquently or otherwise, while he was taking up the time of this House and the people's money of the Province, reading The Limitation to Civil Rights Act, I would have suggested that he would have been better off reading the Debates and Proceedings of Legislature in 1970, because if one turns to Volume No. 3 of that session, page 1781 he would have seen there one speech made respecting second reading of Bill No. 80, an Act to Amend the Limitations of Civil Rights Act, the very Act which afforded the farmers some measure of protection in respect to repossession. It was a Bill that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) introduced and defended. It was a Bill that said this:

The provisions of this Bill reflect the economic downturn and are designed to assist debtors. In this Session much has been said about the economic situation of the farmers in our province.

And he piloted the Bill through himself and not one word from the former Minister of Agriculture. Not one word. And here was a piece of legislation that the Attorney General of the Government of the day came and explained to the Legislature and piloted it through, a piece of legislation related to the farmers. But the Leader of the Opposition tells the House that it has never been done and it was done about a year ago. He asked us to believe that statement and I say to the Members of the House and to all of Saskatchewan that statement reflects the untruths that the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He says we have to have a committee hearing, a committee hearing so that Liberals can get time to form little committees again to try to organize pressure and protest groups where no pressure or protest groups exist.

Mr. MacLeod: — How about the Credit Union letter?

Mr. Romanow: — How come the Credit Union letter? I have had a little chat with the gentleman. Isn't it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that when this Bill was first introduced on one of the numerous motions to adjourn that was made by the Members opposite, one of them got up and said, 'well, you know we have contacted 17 various organizations that want to have representations made before this Legislature.' Please notice, Members of the House, who contacted whom with respect to representations. It wasn't the Government, it wasn't any of the back benchers of the Government, all it was was the Leader of the Opposition contacting them hoping to foment some crisis among them to embarrass the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And so what he did was he said to all these fellows, look it, the Government is putting in Bill No. 9, it affects you, you are an implement dealer. Isn't it terrible, you are going to be forced out of business, they are going to bankrupt you, these bad Socialists. Now isn't it fair and isn't it democratic that you'd like to come forward and have your views presented and if you agree with me, please write a letter to the Government telling them that you want a committee hearing in this regard so that we can be supported in our argument and our case will embarrass the Government. That's what the Liberal Party did opposite and they did that because they know those techniques and tactics very well. I thought we should have a Keep-our-Dealers Committee, a KOD started. We haven't yet but I wouldn't put it past the Liberals if they had had time to organize it because we all know in Saskatchewan that that's the way they operated when they fought medicare in 1962. So, what the Leader of the Opposition would want this Government to do is to sit back and sit around and do nothing, let the repossession continue during the harvesting period so that he can have a committee and have representations made to this committee.

The Leader of the Opposition says Section 13 of this Bill is very bad. Who decides what decisions are necessary for a farmer? Well, with respect to him I say that the principle, Section 13, is a carry-over from the principle of The Farm Security Act, a Bill that has a long history in Saskatchewan. Courts know how to deal and to define those things. Courts know how to arbitrate and determine how many provisions are required. All of a sudden we have opposition to Section 13 and we have The Farm Security Bill sitting there for years when they were in Government and if he opposed it he could have brought an amendment, got rid of that principle. But he didn't and he laughs. You know why he wouldn't do that because he knows that it would have meant, like it did ultimately, political suicide for the Government to amend that type of provision. But now because he hopes to instill some fear among our people, now because he wants to arouse a little political pot-boiling for the Liberal Party, he says Section 13 is very, very bad. And having sat on the legislation for years he now attacks it as being very, very bad.

Our Leader of the Opposition did raise a point in his speech that was of interest. How do we protect the small dealers? I say to the Members of this House, as I said in second reading, I feel that Act does provide adequate protection for the small implement dealers. I say it does so in the two Sections 14 and 23. Secondly, I say to the House that we have two differences of opinion as to what is going to happen about this Bill. The Government feels that the average farmer will continue making his payments and that the small dealer will not be hard pressed.

Here is another inconsistent argument by the Liberals opposite. They all say as a sop, a political sop, they say, oh, the farmers are honest. We wouldn't suggest otherwise. But all of a sudden there is going to be a catastrophe economically because all of them are going to escape their liabilities and all the credit unions are going to go bankrupt and all the finance companies are going to go bankrupt and all the implement dealers are going to go bankrupt. That's what this campaign has been all about. On the one hand they say they trust the farmer and they believe that he is honest, and on the other hand they say, No, we don't believe he is honest. Do you see? What they are

trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is sit on the fence with one ear to the ground, which is impossible to do even for the Liberal Party although they try. You can't have it both ways, my friend. I want to say to all Members in this House that if you vote against this Bill you will have told the farmers which side of that argument you stand on. If you vote against this Bill I say to the farmers and to you that more than speeches, more than any Liberal propaganda, you will have told all of Saskatchewan that you do not believe in the inherent honest and hard work and integrity of the farmers of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I say to the Leader of the Opposition sitting over there that I don't think that will happen. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has proposed a committee which I hope the House will accept, a committee in which the Opposition will be represented, a committee which will be designed, as the motion said, to determine its effectiveness. As the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) said, to look at new proposals and who, by the way made one of the finest speeches that I have heard in the four years I have been in the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Leader of the Opposition wasn't even here for one word of that speech. Mr. Whelan made one of the finest speeches on this matter to look at new ways and means to make it easier to get around the court aspect.

I think if there is danger and the Bill isn't working, the position of the Government is clear. We have told it to the delegations we have talked to and I have said it to the House, the position is that we are going to reconsider the Bill and take the necessary, remedial steps, legislatively, to correct any defects that may occur, but I am confident that those defects will not come about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the speeches that we have heard opposite I am told by those who are much older and much wiser than myself are very, very reminiscent of some of the speeches of the old Liberal Party of the 1930s and 1940s. When the CCF came in in 1944 and tried to give some security to the farmers, all you have to do is check the newspaper reports of the day, and you heard the same, same speeches made by the Members opposite today. Oh, it's going to ruin the credit of the farmers; oh, it is going to bankrupt the small farmer; on, you will see all the business corporations leaving; oh, it will be such a catastrophe, oh, you will see the CCF defeated in 1948, we are going to abolish them off the map. As the former Minister of Health said, "They are on a long ski hill, they haven't got off the cliff yet, but they are going to go." That's what we heard in 1944 I am told. Scare tactics. They try to impress upon our people that somehow they don't have the backbone, that they don't have the co-operation to work together with all segments of society to get through this particular period of crisis.

If there is unrest, I say to the people of Saskatchewan, that unrest has been fomented by the Liberal Party opposite in this week or ten days of debate that they dragged their heels. I will also go one step further. I don't think the Opposition really wants this Bill to work. The best thing for them to

happen is for their predictions to come true about credit and implement dealers. They don't want to co-operate with the Government in making it work, they don't want to co-operate with the implement dealers to explain the Act or to the farmers. They want the economic structure to collapse so that they can gain something in a cheap political run. I say that arguments about credit unions being hurt, arguments about credit drying up, are absolutely untrue, absolutely unwarranted and I believe totally dishonest in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. The farmers will pay their bills, if they don't it will only be because the Liberal Party is endeavoring to foment crisis and divisions among our people in our province.

Someone wants proof again about the crisis, we all agree about that. I commend to the consideration of the Leader of the Opposition, since he wasn't here, the facts put forward by my colleague from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). In your administration, 112 exemptions totalling \$7.3 million, to one mortgage company only, according to his research, something in the order of 20 various applications before the courts in respect to foreclosures. You people haven't even talked about the issues with respect to mortgages and to foreclosures, you haven't raised one concern that this crisis exists. I am prepared to show this letter to any Member who comes and asks for it, but I don't want to release the names because I don't think it is a good policy to bandy around names, I could show you other letters, but I think this is indicative. A letter with respect to a company, and a farmer . . .

An Hon. Member: — Dear Allan . . .

Mr. Romanow: — No, not dear Allan, actually in desperation it is addressed even shortly after the Government got into power, July 9th. What is the situation? Here is a farmer who has 400 acres in crop seeded to rape and he may face ruination now, in light of the rape situation, and the others, 250 acres seeded to wheat, considerable equity in the land. He has paid \$2,000 down on the mortgage, he faces foreclosure now because of the order nisi. He writes, "Please help us out." You might say to me, oh, but that's only one farmer. You might say to me like the former Minister of Highways said to this House, "Oh, he's a two-bit farmer, he can't make it go." Well I don't think the people of this Province will take too kindly to the description of 'two-bit farmers', by the Liberal Party or that this may be an isolated case. With all of the family farmers who have been forced off the lands because of the crisis created by the Members opposite, I should think that if one farmer goes, that's one farmer too many, and we should try to seek to protect them.

But they have no concern for them, they go down to their political meetings in Ottawa with Prime Minister Trudeau at a convention in 1970 to discuss agricultural problems and how concerned they were about the family farm and how easy it is to protect. Here is a Leader-Post article, "Saskatchewan MLAs absent from meeting," not one MLA, not even the Minister of Agriculture, who was the most silent Member of this House in the four years I have been here, not the critic of agriculture now, the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). He was not there. Not the Leader of the Opposition, he wasn't there. No one was there except the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who arrived on the last day. No one was there to try to talk to Prime Minister Trudeau and say, look we've got a crisis on our

hands. Where were they? Where was their concern for the family farmers? Yes, they were home looking after the interests of various corporations, but they neglected the most important industry in the Province of Saskatchewan, the farming industry. Now they come to this House and they say they are for the family farmer.

I want to say before I close this debate, Mr. Speaker, that if I may, as a very young member in politics, frankly admitting that whether it is good or bad, I think one of the easiest ways for a political party to destroy itself, is to lose its credibility with the people. The moment that the people don't believe that the party is sincerely and honestly putting forward a view, a view that we may disagree with or they may disagree with, and alternatives to that view, the moment that the people stop believing that the political party is believable, is credible, then this party is destroyed and the election of six weeks ago is absolute proof positive of what I have said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And not only proof positive, of what I have said, but proof positive of what will be in the years ahead if the leadership of the Members opposite who are sitting, not only the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), but the others with him, continue the actions which only debilitate their credibility and the credibility of this House. Four, five adjournments in one session, two questioning the Speaker's rulings, in one session, six, seven, eight days. Saying one thing on the one hand, another thing on the other hand, voting one way, saying that they are for deterrent fees and against them. Now all of a sudden, they come to this House. What they do with their party is their business, but I don't think the people of our province will ever, ever again return a political party that has no philosophy, no principles and no program for the farming people of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the issue is simple. In our view there is a crisis. How do we seek to meet it, temporarily in five or six weeks? We seek to meet it by Bill No. 9. It is a Bill that will have amendments, some House amendments, some of the suggestions made by the Members opposite. It is a Bill that may be hastily drafted, for that I make no apologies to anyone in power over five years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I make no apologies for having been part of a Government team that took a positive step to at least try to help our most important industry. The issue is as simple as that in this vote, you either stand for the family farmer, with him or against him. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, for when the byelections are called as they must be by law sooner or later, when the people of Saskatchewan are told, as I hope they are told on the hustings, maybe from the media and through the hustings of the actions and the credibility of the former Government opposite, I am confident, that no one, but no one, will fault this Government for having put forward one of the best

pieces of legislation in an honest attempt to give the farmer the breathing space. I am proud to have moved second reading and do move second reading of Bill No. 9.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

YEAS — 39

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

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

SECOND READINGS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — **An Act respecting Allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to Certain other persons, for the Second Session of 1971.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with the sessional indemnity for this Session. Members will be aware that under The Legislative Assembly Act, whenever a session is called, the Members are entitled to a statutory indemnity of \$6,000 together with expenses and it has been the invariable practice of this House when a second session is called, or what is other than a regular session is called, it is the practice of this House to pass an Act very much reducing the statutory indemnity. The purpose of this Bill is to do just that.

The Bill was drafted at an early part of the Session when it was anticipated the Session would not go on for some nine or ten days. We, therefore, provided for an amount of \$75 per day which for a short session is not an unreasonable amount, since there is always at least one caucus at the beginning and usually a two-day session involves four or five days of actual time spent by Members, for which they will get two days paid at \$75 per day. Perhaps it doesn't involve four, but it involves at least three. I think every party always has a caucus before a session, and usually sometimes a longer than one day caucus.

The Bill then provides for \$75 per day with a \$300 ceiling, and with the usual expense account of one-half of those standard provisions. It is the view of the Government that \$75 a day for a longer session is a rather larger amount than what we think might be appropriate. On the other hand, a \$300 limit for a session of this length is, I think, rather smaller than a fair amount. Having regard to the fact that this has extended now over three weeks and Members have had to come and go and come and go. It will be the intention of the Government to introduce some House amendments and our present thinking that the \$300 will be \$500, with the appropriate changes throughout. The other figures will be changed, increasing them by applying a five thirds fraction to all of the other figures, \$150 then becomes \$250, for the ceiling for the other people in here who are set at \$150 for the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, the Sergeant at Arms, that would become \$250 in the same pattern. That is the proposal, I think that all Members of the House will agree that certainly we have to pass a Bill, certainly we cannot take a full indemnity for this, it would be wholly inappropriate. We have to find what is a fair amount for a session which, as I say, has extended over three weeks and have had nine or ten sitting days by the time we leave. I am thinking that a figure of \$500 is not unreasonable. I think this is something that the House can consider, but I believe that that to be fair and this is our present proposal. On that basis I move second reading.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like a brief word or two on the motion and associate myself in general and perhaps even in exact particular with the comments of the Premier in this regard. We will certainly be supporting the motion.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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