

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session - Seventeenth Legislature
33rd Day

Tuesday April 11, 1972

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, Sir, I want to introduce a group of children in the Speaker's Gallery, Grade Ten students from Wishart School under the leadership of their teacher, Mr. Milham and their bus driver, Mr. Leo Kowalski. I also want to add my own good wishes for their trip to this Legislature. Part of the young folks come from my constituency. Wishart has been, in a sense, my home country all of my life. I know that through you and the rest of the Members of the House we wish them an educational day today in the Legislature and hope that they have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you and to the Members of this House the Grade Eleven and Twelve Class from Govan High School. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Borsa and staff teacher, Mr. Dobler. Mr. Speaker, they have already visited the television station and they are proceeding from here to the RCMP Barracks. We welcome them and we hope that they have a very worthwhile day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, through you, Sir, I want today to welcome the first school that has visited this Legislature from my constituency this year, the Balcarres School consisting of some 38 Grade Eight students. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Bob Dougherty and Mr. Charles Datchko. Their good bus driver is Mr. Barry Trapp. We sincerely hope that your visit here will realistically add to your knowledge of parliamentary procedure and that it will broaden your scope of information as to what really goes on in the Saskatchewan Legislature and I believe it is part of your Grade Eight course. Therefore, I am sure all Members of this House, myself and you, Sir, wish them a real good visit here and a safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this House a group of 72 students from St. James School from the constituency of Nutana South. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Wanzura and Mr. Bryski. I hope that their stay here in Regina will be worthwhile and that they will enjoy their trip here today to the Legislature. I am sure the Members will join with me in wishing them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

April 11, 1972

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to the House through you, Mr. Speaker, 40 students from Rosthern School at Hepburn, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the east gallery and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Herman Berg. We certainly wish them a very enjoyable afternoon and a very safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to on behalf of the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) to introduce a group of students to this Chamber from Cardinal Leger School in University constituency in Saskatoon. I believe they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Orosz. I am sure it is the wish of all the Members here today that these students have an interesting and fruitful day in the Legislative Chamber and wish them a safe journey back to Saskatoon University.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

PASSING OF PRIMATE OF UKRAINIAN GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Before the Orders of the Day, may I through you, Sir, share with the Hon. Members of this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan and Canada the sorrow in the passing in Winnipeg, Manitoba on March 29th of His Beatitude Metropolitan Ilarion, Dr. Ivan Ohienko, Primate of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada.

Metropolitan Ilarion was born on January 15, 1882 at Brusyliv, Ukraine and at a very early age became a distinguished student at the University of Kiev under Vladimir Peretz, Professor of Slavic philology.

The scholarly world in general and the Ukrainians throughout the globe in particular are mourning the death of Dr. Ivan Ohienko, one of the most distinguished experts in the field of Slavic studies of the twentieth century, author of over 1,000 books, pamphlets and articles and reviews.

His work, Mr. Speaker, occupied a unique place in the Canadian scholastic and academic life. Dean, professor, church dignitary, translator of the Bible from Hebrew to literary Ukrainian, editor and publisher and as one of his close associates once remarked of him — ‘golden-tongued’ in speeches and sermons.

Dr. Ohienko was one of those Ukrainians of the older generation who cherished and tried to transmit to the younger generation the native language and culture which might otherwise have been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it would take a great deal of time to evaluate his achievements in the field of education, scholarship, church and community life. It should, however, suffice to mention that Dr. Ohienko was the founder and president of the University of

Kamenec, Podilskyj in 1919. He was Minister of Education and Religious Cults in the Government of the Ukrainian National Republic from 1918 to 1921 and the last surviving Minister of that Cabinet until his death; Professor of Old Church Slavic at the University of Warsaw 1926-32; Professor Dean of Theology at St. Andrew's College in Winnipeg from 1951 to 1967; Honorary Professor at the Department of Slavic Studies at the University of Manitoba from 1963 to 1972. In addition, Sir, to his main activity in Canada, that of the Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada from 1951 until his passing at the age of 90 on March 29th last.

Mr. Speaker, in life his creed was simple and he expressed it in these terms, 'to serve people is to serve God'. On the anniversary of his 75th birthday and his tenth year of service to the Greek Orthodox Church, the late Dr. Ohienko said and may I quote,

My life ideology arose from the people. During my early childhood I had seen the suffering of my people and I convinced myself that if I will not work for them, their condition will not improve. From now on my total effort will be for people and people to me are above all else.

Later during his remarks he stated and may I quote again,

I was a teacher, professor, now Metropolitan. I lectured at the university, now in church. Is there any remarkable change? None. There is only change of place or position, the objective is the same.

Mr. Speaker, to the Ukrainians generally and the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada in particular, his passing is indeed a great loss. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members will join with me in remembering this man's contribution to Canada in education, religion and culture.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to stand in my place and join with the Hon. Member from Redberry in paying a tribute to His Beatitude Metropolitan, Primate of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada, Dr. Ivan Ohienko. He was not only a great Ukrainian but he was a great Canadian, He was, as the Member pointed out, the last direct link to the Ukrainian National Republic. He enriched the culture, the educational and religious life not only of this country but of his own native country as well. His passing is a great loss, not only to the Ukrainian people who follow the Greek Orthodox Church but to all Canadians and, in fact, to the world. He was one of a kind, in fact, and we will not see his like or a man of his stature again for many, many years in this country or anywhere else in the world. I agree with the Hon. Member and I am positive all Members of this Legislative Assembly as well as all people in this province and in this country join with him in paying tribute to this great man and mourn his passing.

April 11, 1972

QUESTIONS

REMUNERATION TO MEDICAL PERSONNEL IN PRINCE ALBERT COMMUNITY CLINIC

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). I wonder if he can tell us if there has been any recent changes in the method of payment or remuneration to medical personnel in the Prince Albert Community Clinic?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in terms of remuneration to the medical personnel in Prince Albert I am not sure whether there has been any particular change there. I can advise the Hon. Member that we have been in negotiations and have concluded agreements with the Community Clinic on a global budget basis rather than a fee for service method of payment.

MR. GRANT: — A supplementary question, is the Minister not aware whether there is any change or not in the method of payment to the physicians themselves?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Member first of all asked whether there was any change in their remuneration and this is a matter for the global budget that was arrived at which takes into account the physician services as well as other services that are provided. The arrangement is now between the Community Clinic and the physicians who are working there as to the amounts they pay them.

TRIBUTE TO THE HON. GORDON GRANT

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before the Orders of the Day I might ask the House to join with me in paying a tribute to an individual in this province who has shown outstanding non-partisanship in his approach to politics. I refer to the Hon. Gordon Grant for his work in going to Calgary and assisting the Government in maintaining an industry here. I think this is an outstanding example of non-partisanship, constructive Opposition at its best and on behalf of the Opposition, I am prepared, having consulted with Mr. Grant, to lend Mr. Grant to the Government on a, not fee for service basis, but from time to time because this is the only success they have had. I know that all Members will want to congratulate Mr. Grant on his very enlightened approach.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INDUSTRIES RETAINED

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all of the Members on this side of the House in saying that we want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park for everything he deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that he made quite a point some time ago of saying he had visited Mr. Child, the President of Burns Foods Limited. I didn't notice any announcement after his visit that Burns Foods would reopen their Regina plant or reverse their decision and keep the Regina plant open. However, I was about to rise and say that I am sure that all Members of the House on both sides would want to congratulate Burns Foods and Intercontinental Packers Limited for the announcements which they made yesterday respecting the meat packing industry in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON: — I was very pleased to have a very full discussion with Mr. Child at Burns Foods Limited about two and one-half weeks ago. I have been very pleased to have some discussion with the people at Intercontinental Packers Limited and I am delighted to be able to say that our confidence, that is the confidence of the Government, in the livestock industry and the meat packing industry in Saskatchewan is shared by the people in these two companies. We are particularly pleased with the fact that in the case of Intercontinental Packers Limited, their expansion in Regina will mean additional processing of meat products in the province. We know that that is certainly welcome news to the people who will be employed and to the industries which will expand as a result of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, we do congratulate the Government. It is refreshing to note that while Saskatchewan is suffering a haemorrhage of lost industrial development and industries leaving the province, with the aid of the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) they have been able to apply at least a band aid and we congratulate them for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 17 – EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR GRANTS UNDER LOAN PROGRAMS

Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the extension of the effective deadline of qualification for grants and assistance under the Provincial Local Initiatives Program and the Provincial Employment Loans Program from May 31 to June 30, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that at the conclusion of my remarks I will be moving a resolution or a motion concerning the extension of deadlines for winter works projects. The two winter works projects, Mr. Speaker

April 11, 1972

or programs, namely the Local Initiatives Program and the Employment Loans Program were, in my estimation, ill-conceived and implemented far too late. We, the Government of Saskatchewan, said at the time of the Federal Government's announcement concerning these programs that it would be impossible for Saskatchewan projects to be completed or even near completion by the deadline of May 31st. The late fall announcement, Mr. Speaker, didn't give sponsoring bodies time to even pour footings or launch their programs before the severe brunt of winter set in. By extending the deadlines in regard to these projects under the provincial schemes we show the people of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government that we fully intend to spend the budgeted amounts of grants and forgivable loans. Only then will the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, consider doing likewise and extend the deadlines in their projects. We must show the Federal Government through our actions that, indeed, it is an impossible situation on the prairies to complete enough work on the projects to use up the budgeted amounts. I invite the Opposition to support this resolution committing their Party along with ours in a united voice speaking for Saskatchewan people and communities for the Federal Government. I am sure your constituencies, as do mine, will have projects that will only be half completed this year if the deadlines are not extended.

The economies of sponsoring groups or communities is such that the feasibility of the projects totally hinged on the complete grants or loans being earned. I should just like to point out a local example in my constituency. The town of Fillmore was budgeting or applied for a grant of some \$40,500 to add improvements to their skating and curling rink. I am told by the committee in charge of these projects that within two or three days after the deadline date, work will have to stop on these projects. It is just impossible for the town and the people involved in the community to pick up the tab if we cannot complete the work necessary to earn the grants that were allocated.

I think that we as a Provincial Government cannot tell the Federal Government what to do but we can show them the way through actions that we take in this province. The time has come again, Mr. Speaker, when we prove to the people of Saskatchewan through action that our word is indeed a bond. Therefore, it is with great pleasure that I move, seconded by the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) Resolution No. 17.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in favour of this motion and I should like to add one major reason that I feel that it must be supported by all Members of this House.

With the winter works programs in effect by the Provincial Government and the Federal Government and the lateness of the season and the rough winter that we have had, I feel that if we do not extend the deadline from May 31st to June 30th, that the quality of construction on many of these winter works projects will not be of a high calibre because many of the local organizations will be pushed for time and as a result, I am sure, we will have poor quality construction in some cases. If we extend this deadline that will give a little more breathing space and I feel that this we must do.

I know in my own constituency I have three fairly major projects underway, one of them late starting, and I am sure that if we can extend the deadlines that the quality of work will be excellent. We have projects in my area like an agriculture exhibition complex which is a huge undertaking which has not yet been started and must get underway and get built. If we can do this for the people in my constituency I am sure they will be very happy about it.

Therefore, I urge all Members to support this motion today to urge that the deadline for winter works projects, Provincial programs, be extended to June 30th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) that I will support the proposed motion that he has.

It seems to be rather an odd situation that the program that the Government opposite has brought in, that the Member for Qu'Appelle is telling them, his own Government, how to handle the situation.

We have heard a great deal about the lateness of the program announced by the Federal Government. I think we all agree that it was a very worthwhile project that the Federal Government brought in. It has helped considerably all across Canada. We all regret that it couldn't have been started earlier. I think that we, in Saskatchewan, realize that in some winters the severity of winter certainly does slow down projects. We have been fortunate this winter and have not had as severe winter as we could have. However, we have heard a great deal from the Government opposite about the ineffectiveness of the program because the deadline is not long enough. We have heard this right from the beginning of the program.

The Provincial Government announced its own program. Their own Provincial Employment Loans program. There was no reason why they had to use the same deadline as the Federal Government. They didn't need to use May 31st as their deadline. It was their own program and they could have used any deadline they wished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — They condemn the Federal Government for putting in the May 31st deadline and then turn around and put in the same deadline themselves. They acknowledged the problem and then do nothing about it when they bring their program in. And to talk about the Federal program being ill-timed and announced late, the Provincial Government's scheme was even worse. We have projects that weren't approved until the middle of March. Of course, the deadline of May 31st for the Provincial program is not practical whatsoever. There should never have been a May 31st deadline. The June 30th deadline is somewhat more appropriate but I would suggest that with the applications being approved as late as the middle of March that quite frankly the June 30th deadline is ineffective also but, of course, we will support the motion.

April 11, 1972

HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few things on this. It is a matter with which I have been quite closely involved for some months now.

I think that the Hon. Members have made some very good points. I think one of the main things that we have to look at is the late start for the program. The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) indicated that this was indeed such, although for some reason we were to blame for it. This I cannot understand. I think that when the Federal Government comes out with a program in the middle of October, the first we hear of it and the first signs that we are able to get, the first pieces of paper that indicated what the program is to be, some weeks later, that it goes without saying that this will be a late program because we all know that no matter when a program is brought forward it takes some months in order to get it organized.

I think that this was a weakness of this one from the start in that it was begun by the Federal Government without prior discussion, without prior warning and started at such a late date. I think that the provinces and the municipalities especially have done remarkably well in coming forward with programs as they have under such a late, late start and a poor beginning.

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have looked back a little through the years on what was done earlier in some earlier winter works programs which the Federal Government had in co-operation with the Provincial Governments and the municipalities. As you all recall, we had an earlier winter works program where the Federal Government paid half the cost of the labor involved. The Province paid 25 per cent and the municipality paid 25 per cent. We had this program going for quite a few years.

I note, in looking back, that there is a letter under my signature written July 31, 1962 advising the municipalities that there will be a winter works program that will be starting on October 15th and that it would be closing on April 30th. Mr. Speaker, this, I think, is more along the line of how a winter works program should be operated. The date of this letter was July 31, 1962 advising the municipalities of what was going to take place the following winter and this gave them an opportunity to organize and see what they wanted to do. The program was to start on October 15th which was the approximate time that this year's program was announced. Nobody was ready to go on October 15th and it took some months before they were able to get organized and away.

I think that in view of the fact that October 15th was the starting date, that April 30th was more appropriate although at that time I wrote various letters to the Department in Ottawa asking for the extension of this date. And it was only once in the year 1963, this is the same year that it was extended to May 31st at that time but they did have an earlier start and an earlier closing. In one instance, they did close on May 31st.

I don't think that May 31st is possibly too an inappropriate closing date for a winter works program provided that you are able to get going on it as we were able to do in those years.

This one we were not and I think that the request of the Premiers at the conferences that have been held at Jasper and at Ottawa, asking that this date be extended, asking the Federal Government if they are prepared to extend their dates, have been quite in order. I think it is only logical that they should be extended.

I want to say too that not only because of the late start but of the way the programs, some of them, were handled, it has given rise to the fact that our programs were late in getting off the ground. The Hon. Member across the way has mentioned that some were started in the middle of March and I will have to admit that this is so. Especially in regard to the Local Initiatives Program, these were held on for weeks and weeks by the Department of Manpower in Winnipeg that was handling these. We could get no information as to what was happening or which way they were going and we had to wait until practically all the applications had gone through. So many had been rejected before we were able to know which way we could go on it. This set us back even later.

I have to say in regard to the loans program that we got much better co-operation from the Department of Economic Expansion than what we had with the other. The projects were approved as quickly as we passed them through. They were only a few days in our hands and as we got them from the municipalities we sent them down to Ottawa and they were approved quite quickly and we were able to get going with the loans program here earlier than what we were with the others.

But the whole thing has added up, Mr. Speaker, to a rather bad situation where the municipalities have not had the opportunity to get started on these programs as early as what they should have. I have to agree, I think, with what the Members have been saying that there is a good argument for the extension of the cut-off date in regard to the programs which we have underway.

I have taken this matter up with the people in my Department as to what they think might be the results of this. They think that due to the late start which many of the programs have had, that there will be possibly – and, of course, Mr. Speaker, these are rather ball park guesses – that some 10 per cent of the programs would not be completed by the original date of May 31st.

We have some \$1,200,000 so this would make approximately \$120,000 that would be a shortfall on what we had anticipated. And the same in regard to our Employment Loans Program where we had some \$2 million of forgiveness and grants. This shortfall would amount to some \$200,000. We feel that there has been through the weeks and especially in the latter part of this year when they get going again, that there will be quite possibly some increases in the expenses of labor on this and we think due to the extension to June 30th we would have another 20 per cent added on so that in total we would have an extension in regard to the Local Initiatives Program the sum of \$240,000 and in regard to the Employment Loans Program, possibly \$400,000. So that when you are talking about extending this from May 31st to June 30th, you are looking at a figure of possibly some \$640,000 as far as the Provincial Government is concerned.

In view of the necessity of providing work in the province and in view of the fact that employment figures are not improving

April 11, 1972

a great deal as yet, although there has been some improvement, I believe, in the Province of Saskatchewan, we feel that possibly this thing should be concurred in and that we should be prepared to make this added expenditure in regard to our programs. The Hon. Member opposite has pointed out that these are our programs and we can do as we like with them.

Therefore, I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we will at this time announce to the municipalities that the cutoff date for these programs which we are solely responsible for, the Provincial Local Initiatives Program and the Provincial Employment Loans Program of which we are entirely responsible, will be extended to the 30th of June.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Mr. Speaker, I feel that this does not in itself commit the Federal Government. I think that this is an indication of what we feel should be done. I think that we have every reason to think that the Federal Government should do the same as what we are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — If the Federal people extend their program, their Employment Loans Program (we do not have any commitment in regard to the Federal Initiative Program. Whatever they do is entirely their concern and none of ours). But if the Federal people do as we feel they should and also extend their Employment Loans Program this will mean that their forgiveness in regard to labor on these projects will be increased, we assume, by possibly another 20 per cent. As we have nearly \$2 million of matching grants committed in regard to this program, this would mean possibly close to another \$400,000 to be spent by us. So what we are looking at here when and if the Federal Government goes along with what we are suggesting here, we may be looking at an added expenditure of \$1 million so far as the Provincial Government is concerned.

But again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have up to this point committed some \$5 million to assist municipalities. We shall be expecting to receive from the Federal Government in their assistance in regard to Provincial projects nearly some \$2 million but we have committed in the neighborhood of \$5 million already on this program. I think that in view of the fact of making it worthwhile and as something of real value to the people of this province that we would be justified in making the other million dollar expenditure and if the Federal Government is prepared to go along with us it will make this thing something that is going to be of real value to the municipalities and to the people, the hospitals and the schools of this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word that I have received from Ottawa the final results of Saskatchewan. And you know we have listened to a lot of criticism opposite and in Saskatchewan with the unemployment figures as they are. I think we should be commending the Federal Government for the

job that they have done on an emergency basis. And the indication is that this was certainly not a regular winter works project that was begun and originated year by year but was a special project. The final results show that the Federal Government has approved 174 projects. The jobs that they have estimated from these 174 projects are 2,604 jobs. The approved funds are \$4,299,927. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very commendable effort on behalf of the Federal Government. I would suggest if the Provincial Government had the same kind of imagination instead of having to back up the Federal program and had been able to generate some new ideas and new concepts of their own, that perhaps Saskatchewan unemployment figures wouldn't be as bad as they are today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — So all I think is that the Hon. Members should note these figures, the number of projects, the number of jobs that have been created, the amount of funds that have been put into the capital works program in the Province of Saskatchewan on behalf of the Federal Government and give them credit where credit is due. Now we certainly agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) that we should urge that the Federal Government also consider extending the deadline. Because Saskatchewan has had a severe winter some of these projects are certainly going to have difficulty in being completed by March 31st and we certainly endorse it and without any industry coming into the province, without any new jobs being created, certainly this is a very important program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — For the information of the Member for Milestone, I should like to let him know that there was a million dollar special winter works program in the mill for the Department of Natural Resources alone before Ottawa ever thought of a winter works program.

MR. MacDONALD: — There is every year.

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take just three or four minutes to bring to the Government's attention what I think is a problem in winter works and I think it is something that they can do something about. I mean it as constructive criticism. I find that many municipalities in the province, some of which are in my own constituency, find winter works programs of a rather sporadic nature. The result of this is that not everyone is in a position to take advantage of the Federal or Provincial Local Initiatives Program or Winter Works Program. I suggest to the Department of Municipal Affairs because they are the closest Government to the local level that what is needed is a catalogue of projects which can be undertaken. Not only a catalogue which should be in the Department of Municipal Affairs but a working in co-operation with the municipalities so that an RM or a local town or village in the next few weeks get to work and have the blueprints and the plans prepared for possibly building a veterinary clinic or a new rink or new school or new hospital and these projects can be kept on file.

I can understand why the Government may not have a massive

April 11, 1972

project every year, this is quite understandable. Some years employment levels will be better than others and therefore they may not inject the same amount of money into the economy as they would in a bad year. I think it is very important that co-operation be shown with the local communities so that a local community although they may not have a plan to benefit from in the coming year, would still have that blueprint available so that a year from now if there is another program available under Federal or Provincial auspices then they have the project ready to go ahead.

I find that many communities have projects that they would like to participate in, that they haven't been able to go ahead themselves simply because they didn't have the necessary finances. When the Federal Government or the Provincial Government announces a program then the municipality doesn't have the blueprints ready, they don't have the necessary plans prepared and there is a great loss of time on the part of the municipality simply because they aren't ready to go ahead with the project. I think that with better supervision from the Department of Municipal Affairs – and I am not blaming the present administration particularly for this, this is a situation that I think needs improvement – that with better co-operation with Municipal Affairs and the local municipalities throughout the province that a good backlog of municipal projects would be developed. Hence, employment demand would be created around the province and these projects would be set ready to go ahead so that when we hit a high period of unemployment again in the province and the Federal Government is going to inject some money, that we are ready to go ahead and that way every community can have an opportunity to participate.

Right now there are some communities that are not getting the necessary financial assistance simply because it seems that they are unable to get the necessary information or possibly they are to blame themselves they don't have the expertise or managerial talent to go about these things in the proper manner and therefore there are some municipalities that are constantly losing out or missing out simply because they don't have the necessary plans laid out to go ahead with the project.

So I want to suggest to the Government that a better liaison be set up so that we can develop a good backlog of various projects. Communities would have them ready to go ahead with when there is financial assistance. Every community in Saskatchewan will benefit. Right now many of the communities that are benefitting are those that are aggressive. They have good management, they are very aggressive, they are on their toes and they are getting out and doing it. I give them full marks for doing this but it is still unfair to some communities that year after year get left out. Possibly it is part of their own doing, I admit that sometimes it is their own doing, that they get left out but that doesn't change the fact. I think the Government should work to overcome this so that all communities over a period of years will benefit from winter works projects.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 7 – BASIC HEARING AID TO BE INCLUDED IN MEDICAL INSURANCE PLAN

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that action be taken immediately to broaden the coverage of the Saskatchewan Medical Insurance Plan to include a basic hearing aid without cost to the hard of hearing.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Richards

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(a) regrets that the previous Government did not develop a program or initiate any action which would reduce the price of hearing aids to the consumer even though they were aware that a large number of hard of hearing citizens were being denied the right to achieve improved hearing because they were unable to pay the exorbitant price for a hearing aid while others were purchasing hearing aids at great personal sacrifice and;

(b) commends the Government of Saskatchewan for establishing a special committee to inquire into this situation and recommends to the Government a program which will allow hard of hearing citizens to obtain quality hearing appliances at greatly reduced cost.

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make just one or two brief comments with respect to this particular resolution related basically to the costs of hearing aids. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that the cost of hearing aids is often much higher than people realize. I am aware of a number of people in my constituency who have had and are having severe problems with hearing aids that didn't cost them up to \$300 as the Legislative Secretary to the Department of Health mentioned but cost them in excess of \$600. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in such instances as have come to my attention some of these instruments have proven to be somewhat less than satisfactory. Mr. Speaker, I may say that if an individual has expended a sum of \$600 or more for a hearing aid to assist in the improvement of a hearing problem, they should be able to anticipate reasonably good service from such an instrument. I am pleased that the Government through the Department of Public Health, Mr. Speaker, is proceeding expeditiously to complete its testing and research on hearing aids which, as the Legislative Secretary informed this House, can probably be made available to those requiring such instruments at a cost of less than \$100 per instrument supplied. As I previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, a fair number of constituents in Nutana Centre have hearing problems and have contacted me and are making inquiries about the probable availability of such hearing aid instruments. I commend the Government and the Department of Health for expeditiously proceeding with the testing and research in this program. Mr. Speaker, it was part of our New Deal for People program

April 11, 1972

which was presented to the people of Saskatchewan on June 23rd last and the progress already reported to this Assembly by the Legislative Secretary of the Department of Public Health clearly indicates that like other points in our platform we fully intend to carry them out. Mr. Speaker, it will be clearly discerned from my brief remarks on this matter that I strongly support the amendment to the motion.

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few brief comments to the matter that is before the House now. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to try and figure out what is the Legislative program of the Liberal Party. In this Session they have been advancing a lot of the New Democratic Party program and asking us to vote for it. Now that is quite all right, we are quite prepared to reiterate that we stand behind our program such as to provide hearing aids at greatly reduced cost to the people of Saskatchewan that require them. The unfortunate thing is that when the Members opposite, either through design or carelessness, offer a motion which is slightly different from the New Democratic program. The interesting part about this motion, Mr. Speaker, is that they say without cost, without cost. The New Democratic program clearly states provide hearing aids at greatly reduced costs.

I would think that the Liberal Party over the years had advanced the idea that people should participate. For example, deterrent fees. The former Minister of Health thought that people should participate in their recovery by paying deterrent fees. This is quite all right but I think that they should stick to that policy. If I go back to the speech made in the House by the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) when he was the Treasurer in 1968, Mr. Speaker, he had this to say,

We feel the vast majority of our people want these plans maintained and to do this they must be financially secure. Our Government believes that the amount people pay for such services should be related to the use they make of those services. We also feel that if those who use the service are required to pay even a small portion of the cost, their demands may be more reasonable.

That, Mr. Speaker, was directly out of the speech by the former Provincial Treasurer of this province, the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party at that time and now the Leader of the Liberal Party. Not really consistent with the motion that they offer to the House at this time. Later on, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 in his Budget Speech again, under the heading 'Health, Welfare and Education', the former Minister of the Treasury has this to say,

We do not take second place to any party or any government in our concern for the physical and social well-being of the people of the province. No government in the history of this province has given higher priority to health and education than the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, if those words were true and if that Party is now in favor of hearing aids for people who require them as they say, at no cost, then I think they owe this House an explanation. Explain why for seven years when they were in power they never brought these programs in if, as the Member for Prince Albert West stated, no government has greater concern for the people's

health than theirs.

No, Mr. Speaker, they become really progressive when they are out of office. They offer resolutions such as this kind which betray them in two ways. One, it betrays them because they, in their time in office, never implemented any programs of that nature, did very, very little to improve the health programs of the province. As a matter of fact, I think they sabotaged them a little bit. It betrays them in another way, Mr. Speaker, they have no program, they have no improvements for the health program of this province and they are forced to fall back on the New Deal for People, the program of the New Democratic Party which was heartily endorsed by the people of Saskatchewan back in June 1971. I think they are quite safe in taking refuge in the program New Deal for People because it is a good program and it has been supported by the people.

I most certainly, Mr. Speaker, will support the amendments that have been offered to this resolution. I think the Members opposite would be wise to support these amendments and then in the future try and evolve some policy of their own. We are quite willing to share our policies with them. They are good policies and the people endorse them. However, I think they should do something about getting some progressive policy of their own, it would be welcomed.

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, there are only a couple of us in this House who can talk about hearing aids at first hand and I think we are both sitting on this side of the House. What concerns me is that I was faced recently with the purchase of a hearing aid I did not suggest any limitation of price and I've got a very complicated one, Mr. Speaker. I require it to be complicated because it has to sort out some of the statements made in this House and it is a special type of hearing aid. When the Hon. Member from Saskatoon uses a figure of \$600 I think he is leaving the wrong impression because he is using it when he is making reference to the aid that the Government has in mind costing something less than \$100. I am fairly sure that he is not talking about the same type of instruments at all. Instruments such as he is referring to that the Government might assist in purchasing are relatively cheap, if we can use that word when speaking of hearing aids, as compared to the \$600 model that he is referring to. I would certainly like him to tell me about that \$600 one because mine cost less than half of that and it includes a pair of glasses. Hearing aids of the behind the ear type or the pocket type can be purchased in the neighborhood of \$75, I believe, certainly under \$100 right here in Saskatchewan and you can purchase them elsewhere in Canada for less than that. I believe you can purchase them in British Columbia for about \$50. The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we are leaving the wrong impression as so often happens in this House of using a figure of \$600 as the extreme, probably the most anyone ever had to pay for a hearing aid using that in the same discussion when speaking of a hearing aid costing less than \$100 and these are two different models. In one case you are talking about an Austin which the Hon. Member is acquainted with and in the other case you are speaking of a Cadillac.

April 11, 1972

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health): — I am very pleased to rise in support of the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) to the resolution on the provision of hearing aids to the people of Saskatchewan. I should also like to thank the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) — unfortunately he is not in his seat — for his good sense of humor in proposing a Liberal motion to introduce hearing aids for our hard of hearing. Hearing impairment is not something that has occurred since June 1971. Hearing difficulties have been around a long time and were just as severe under the former Liberal Government as they are under the NDP Government. The Hon. Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) had already stated that Liberals had seven years to do something about this problem but for some reason or other they chose to ignore it. Indeed when the Liberals were campaigning I didn't hear them recognize the need for a hearing aid program. Certainly, we didn't hear the Hon. Member from Albert Park at any time during the campaign advocate an insured hearing aid program.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Legislature when the New Democratic Party Members said in the House that an NDP Government would come to the aid of the hard of hearing we were in fact being ridiculed by the Liberal Government as promising another program which would be a drain on the taxpayers. Our Party recognized that hearing impairment was a severe handicap for many people and that the cost of paying for hearing aids was an unnecessary hardship for our people. We took positive leadership and promised the people of Saskatchewan that we would see that hearing aids were provided at greatly reduced costs.

With respect to the resolution put forward by the Member for Albert Park I should like the House to know, Mr. Speaker, and the Members opposite are quite well aware that insuring hearing aids under the Medical Care Insurance Commission does not guarantee anybody that hearing aids will be made available to them. The Medical Care Insurance Commission is a bill-paying agency and though insuring hearing aids under MCIC would remove the financial burden of purchasing a hearing aid, but MCIC could not assure that hearing aids would be made available and that qualified people would be on staff to test individuals for the type of hearing aid required and that hearing aids would be properly fitted and maintained. MCIC cannot assure accessibility to service.

The NDP Government is unwilling to initiate a program for the hard of hearing which would begin with so many deficiencies. I have explained our Government's hearing aid program several times before in the House and to the public. So that all Members are absolutely clear about our commitment, I shall, once again, repeat our program to perhaps aid those who are not listening. We propose to make hearing aids available at greatly reduced costs. We do not plan to insure hearing aids because we now feel that this method has too many difficulties built into it. It is well known that we have consistently identified the problem as one where the existing practice of providing hearing aids results in unnecessarily high costs which frequently affect a group of citizens who can least afford to pay the price of a hearing aid.

Our Government is proposing an alternative system which would make available high quality hearing aids and high quality

service without exorbitant costs to the users. This approach is one which the Government can afford and one which will remove the hardship from those who require hearing aids. Aside from the hearing aid itself we intend to see that sufficient specialists are employed in Saskatchewan to test and maintain the hearing instruments. We shall establish standards of performance and standards of quality to assure our citizens that they are getting full benefit for their expenditures. I have been told by experts that there are reports that hearing aids have been sold to individuals who could not possibly benefit from them. These people need medical attention, not a hearing aid. Obviously their medical needs were not correctly identified by the individuals who sold them the hearing aids.

In speaking during the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, I have already informed the House that we shall be establishing facilities for distributing, testing and fitting hearing aid appliances. I have also explained that we are hiring the services of a fully qualified audiologist to assume responsibility within the Department to move this program as quickly as possible. We are also negotiating to acquire the equipment and staff of Elks Lodge Hearing Centre because of the co-operation of the Elks Lodge and I hope we shall be making the program operational much sooner than I expected.

Again, let me refresh the memories of the Members opposite. I have explained to the Members on previous occasions in this House that high quality hearing aids could be purchased for as little as \$20. If one purchased an average model which has been rated as acceptable, it would cost about \$35.

The Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) made reference to prices. May I repeat what I have said during one of the other speeches that we are in possession of a hearing aid which the retail price is marked on the hearing aid at \$309.50. That very hearing aid is available to us for less than \$35. There will be other costs involved with servicing, fitting and so on and we are studying the most effective and efficient method of organizing the program in order to keep total costs to the consumer to a bare minimum. I fully expect, Mr. Speaker, that the present cost of hearing aids would be reduced by about 75 per cent. This saving will be a real saving to the people of Saskatchewan because it will not involve any hidden charges in the form of taxation or other government levies to finance this scheme. What is most important is that those who require hearing aids will be able to get them at the lowest possible cost.

Studies undertaken by the Department of Public Health have shown that many Saskatchewan farmers have noise induced hearing loss, especially those farmers over the age of 55. A random sample of some 3,800 farmers revealed that those who have been farming for many years had greater hearing problems than other groups as reported by their physicians. Mr. Speaker, it seems quite obvious that our program for the hard of hearing is far superior to the simplistic proposal put forward by the Hon. Member for Albert Park. We shall be providing a real and needed service. We will guarantee standards, we will ensure that hearing aids will be available at the lowest possible price. The taxpayer will not have to support the price of hearing aids through taxes or through premiums. Finally, we are moving with all speed to have this program operational in a few months.

April 11, 1972

Mr. Speaker, I have received literally hundreds of letters telling of cases where older citizens of this province have had to use large portions of their meagre savings simply to try to maintain a level of hearing which would keep them functioning as members of their communities. I have numerous other letters from older folks who simply cannot afford the high price of hearing aids. Not all the letters are from older citizens, many of them come from parents of afflicted children, people who can ill afford the years of expense which they see ahead of them. Yet these same people are painfully aware that they certainly cannot let a little child grow up with a hearing disability in a society where much of his learning depends on the ability to hear.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some of the communications that I have received. I must confess there have been hundreds of letters that we have received of people bringing their problems and particularly the cost problems to our attention. Here is a lady who lives in Unity, Saskatchewan. She says,

I am 82 years old, diabetic . . .

She has spent over \$600 on hearing aids and still has not got one that works satisfactorily. Another gentleman says this,

So far I have spent \$2,500 on hearing aids . . .

He also adds that he hasn't yet received any satisfaction from the hearing aids that he has purchased.

MR. GRANT: — And he never will.

MR. SMISHEK: — That may be true, but this is part of the very problem.

MR. GRANT: — You are not going to help him.

MR. SMISHEK: — That's part of the very problem that hearing aid people do sell aids to people where a hearing aid will not help them because of other problems. Therefore, if the people had the proper testing and their defects were properly identified people would not be sold on things that will not help them. Because there is no such a program, very often we find that people are led to spending money which some promoter sells them on the idea that the hearing aids will resolve their problem.

Another chap from Regina wrote this,

I suppose we should realize that no hearing aid will take the place of good ears. I think that most of us are trying to get along with an aid in one ear where we should have them in both ears. The cost in most cases prohibits this.

One lady from a small rural community wrote to me to explain that she had a six year old girl who was unable to speak until she was the age of four because hearing impairment was not diagnosed earlier. In addition, these people are farming with small incomes and find that the price of purchasing and

maintaining a hearing aid is economically difficult for them.

Mr. Speaker, another person writing, an old age pensioner from Manor, Saskatchewan, writes to say that he has spent \$350 for a hearing aid, he pays \$60 per month and after several months the company has yet to send him a warranty. Needless to say, this pensioner is worried about both the cost and the value of the guarantee of the company. Another individual writes,

I suffer loss of hearing, I am 83 years of age. I find these aids are very expensive.

This person is enquiring about what can be done about reducing the cost.

Perhaps this letter tells a much broader story. Here is a person who says,

I was approached by a representative of a hearing aid company and he was able to convince me that I needed a hearing aid for both ears. I found out that they were anything but satisfactory and after paying \$660 for the set. I called at their office and met the manager who after giving me another test stated that his agent oversold me as I did not require an aid for the right ear. He refunded me the amount of \$300 which you will note makes the price of one \$360.

I would say that \$300 error is quite a mistake, Mr. Speaker, but the gentleman pointed out an adjustment was made. However, this was not the end of the story. He goes on to say,

Later I received a card with a prayer on the back of it which suggested that they had the answer to defective hearing. Two men arrived at my house and put me through all the tests accompanied by the latest sales talk. I was not very interested so they reduced their price from \$750 by \$75.

Surely a \$750 hearing aid ought to be gold plated and studded with jewels.

And so the story about hearing aids goes on. In fact, there is hardly a day that passes by that we don't receive letters from people all over the province complaining about not being properly tested and they are either over sold or the prices are very, very exorbitant. Mr. Speaker, I do support the amendment and I would ask the Members from both sides of the House to support the amendment because I think that this is a program that is needed in the province. We are not proposing to have an insured program but a program which will provide hearing aids at greatly reduced costs and one which will provide a service to the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

April 11, 1972

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

RESOLUTION NO. 15 – LOSSES DUE TO FAMILY FARM PROTECTION ACT

He said: On the proposed Resolution No. 15, I think the House will recall the other day that a Point of Order was raised by some of the Hon. Members on this motion. At that time I asked the House for some discussion on it and asked the right to reserve my decision until I had time to consult with my staff or with the rule books and so forth and bring in a ruling at a later date which the House agreed to do. At this time I should like to read to the House what is my considered ruling on Resolution 15,

On Friday last, a Point of Order was raised regarding Resolution No. 15 which was moved by the Hon. Member from Moosomin, which reads as follows:

‘That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that a Board be established to determine the amount of financial losses suffered by various groups or individuals due to The Family Farm Protection Act and to determine what compensation should be paid to these people by the Government of Saskatchewan.’

I draw all Hon. Members’ attention to page 29 of the Final Report of the Special Committee on The Crop Insurance Program and The Family Farm Protection Act which recommends ‘That the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies do not grant financial compensation to any person claiming damages arising out of The Family Farm Protection Act.’ A reservation to that report as attached in Appendix B (See page 35) proposes the establishment of an independent board to consider compensation for possible damages arising out of The Family Farm Protection Act.

This particular situation which is now before the Assembly is covered in citation 131 of Beauchesne’s Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, page 116 which states that:

‘The anticipation rule which forbids discussion of a matter standing on the Paper being forestalled is dependent upon the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session. In applying the Anticipation Rule preference is given to the discussion which leads to the most effective result and this has established a descending scale of values for discussions – Bills, Motions, Amendments, etc.’

Erskine May’s Parliamentary Practice, Seventeenth Edition, page 396 states that:

‘A motion or amendment may not be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which is the same in substance as a question which has been decided in the affirmative or negative during the current Session.’

And further that:

‘A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House whether it be a Bill or an adjourned debate upon a motion.’ (page 399)

The rules guiding our procedures of this Assembly are very clear on the point that the same matter cannot be debated twice.

I want to draw to your attention that the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Crop Insurance Program and The Family Farm Protection Act was tabled on March 1, 1972 and was placed on the agenda for consideration by the Assembly at that time. Notice for Resolution No. 15 was submitted to the Assembly on March 22, 1972.

The question that arises is then whether Resolution No. 15 and the report in question are in fact the same. Having considered this matter in great detail, I am of the opinion that the subject matter of Resolution No. 15 and the recommendation and the reservation of the committee report are the same. For the above reasons, I rule that Resolution No. 15 is out of order.

When the said report is considered and debated by the Assembly, all Hon. Members will have the opportunity of debating the subject matter contained in Resolution No. 15. Amendments to the resolution pertaining to the report can be moved and decided upon by the Assembly at that time.

So I thereby rule Resolution No. 15 out of order at this time.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 – PUBLIC WORK PROGRAMS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for action taken in bringing forward public work programs in the early fall of 1971 and in extending and supplementing Federal Government programs for the relief of winter unemployment;

Expresses regret at the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing its 1971-72 winter employment programs and at the dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiatives Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

And further that this Assembly endorses the proposal for a joint examination of the existing programs by Federal, Provincial and local Governments to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and to prepare criteria, guidelines and contingency plans for the winter of 1972-73 under varying assumptions of unemployment levels.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):

That all the words after the word “Assembly” in the first line down to and including Department of Manpower and Immigration in the 10th line and substitute the following therefore:

April 11, 1972

Expresses its regret that the Government of Saskatchewan did not develop a public works program in the fall of 1971 sufficient to alleviate the severe unemployment problem that existed.

HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I had a few well chosen remarks on this subject the other day and I was interrupted by the clock and I should like to continue with a few remarks today, if I may.

Members opposite have been rather disparaging about the size and scope of the winter works program of the Saskatchewan Government this year and I should like to reiterate just a few figures. I won't go into them in detail because these become rather boring and confusing when you get a platter of too many figures. But as I indicated the other day, there was a public works program put forward this year of some \$8 million. This was the amount of the cost of the projects which were initiated. There was some \$5 million in other programs besides those that were put forward by the Department of Public Works for a total of some \$13 million.

Now this, Mr. Speaker is the outside cost of the projects undertaken and it's not saying that this, by any means, was accomplished this winter. But of this amount we are assuming that there must have been some \$3.5 million of work accomplished on these projects in total this winter and spring. Besides these, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Minister-in-Charge of the Power Corporation (Mr. Messer) made an announcement a few weeks ago in regard to a million dollars that was being spent by the Power Corporation which is not included in the above figures. And other work has been done by Government Telephones and other corporations of the Government. This makes in the neighborhood of \$4.5 million to \$5 million that will be spent in this way by the Government of Saskatchewan this year to do something about providing employment for the people of the province and this, Mr. Speaker, is besides the \$4.25 million that is allocated and has been promised and has been committed by the Department of Municipal Affairs in regard to winter works in the province, which makes a total of some \$9,750,000 or in the neighborhood of \$10 million which is committed for assistance in regard to winter works of various kinds in the province this winter.

Mr. Speaker, there was in the neighborhood of \$10 million that was put forward by the Province this year. I will say that there is close to \$2 million with which the Federal Government has agreed to assist in these Federal-Provincial programs. But this leaves us still with an amount of approximately in the neighborhood of \$8 million that has been put forward by the Provincial Government in regard to winter works projects this winter. Of these, the ones that I stated earlier, there's some 50,000 man-months of work in regard to the municipal winter works projects alone and these, Mr. Speaker, have had some results.

As you will have noticed in the indication from the Canada statistics in regard to unemployment figures lately, that the figures for unemployment in Canada have gone from 7.3 in the middle of February to 7.4 in March. They are up one tenth of one per cent. The situation is worsening across Canada. In Saskatchewan where we had in February of this year unemployment

Of 6.1 per cent, this had dropped to 5.9 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Now we have nothing to be complacent about. I maintain we have nothing to be complacent about, Mr. Speaker. This is a bad figure of unemployment but at least we were in the month of February and the first part of March gaining and that was just when our programs which we have been speaking about were just getting going. Now, when these projects are underway and are starting to gain momentum, you just watch that employment figure in the next few weeks and you will see that we shall be leading Canada, no doubt, in what we are doing about unemployment in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — The expenditure of this type of money is something that has never taken place in this province before that I am aware of. I might look back at the other winter works programs which we have had in other years. I could quote you a string of figures here from 1958-59 to the winter of 1968-69, the years in which the Federal-Provincial Municipal Program was carried forward. The amount that was spent by the Province in those years went all the way from \$16,000 to \$984,000 in 1965. This was the most that was spent in any year. The total over those 11 years was \$6.5 million. That was spent by the Province in 11 years on unemployment programs. We spent a good deal more than that this year, Mr. Speaker, in one year. I think this is a massive effort that we have mounted to help with the unemployment in this province this winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Back in June; April, May and June of 1971 we promised that if we were elected we would mount a mass of public works projects in order to help unemployment in this province and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have kept that promise . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — . . . to the tune of nearly \$10 million worth of Provincial money. This has gone forward. As I said, we are being reimbursed to the tune of nearly \$2 million from the Federal Government but we still have an amount of \$8 million as being put forward for unemployment relief in this province. Something that has never been done before in the history of Saskatchewan. I maintain that we are doing something. This Government is doing something that has never been undertaken before.

Now I should like to say while I am on this subject that I can't take the credit for ourselves. The Federal Government has gone forward and this I say was little and too late but they have put forward certain moneys in regard to the relief of unemployment throughout Canada and we maintain that we haven't been all that favorably dealt with in the Province of Saskatchewan. We didn't get as much under the Local Initiatives Program as we had anticipated. We got \$6.9 million under the Loan

April 11, 1972

Program out of \$160 million. We assumed that out of the other \$50 million in regard to Local Initiatives Programs for municipalities that we would, on the same ratio, get at least \$2 million. But the way it turned out we only got \$1.4 million of assistance under this program.

But I'm not gainsaying the fact that the Federal Government did assist in these ways. I also want to give full credit at this time, Mr. Speaker, to the municipalities of the province which have come forward, I think, nobly in face of the fact that this program was so late in getting off the ground, that they had many difficulties, one of the severest winters that Saskatchewan ever had, that they have mounted these programs and got them under way and whereas the Federal and Provincial Governments are picking up, say, 75 per cent in the one case of the site labor before May 31st and now June 30th and we have agreed to duplicate that in regard to loans programs. As an example, the municipal governments have had to find a large portion of material and the rest of the labor and so on and we feel that they have done wonderfully. I haven't got the figures in front of me this afternoon, in fact, the figures will not all be in until such time as these works have been completed and I think when those figures are in that you will find that the municipalities of this province have contributed a great deal in assisting with the unemployment situation in the province this winter and the \$8 million that I have spoken of will be duplicated by them across the province. I think much must be said in their behalf.

I also want to point out the assistance that we have gotten from them in regard to their assistance on the Task Force on unemployment. They have met with us some three times and have brought their people together to discuss the pros and cons of the problems that were before us and give us the benefit of their advice and their co-operation. This we appreciate very much and with this sort of thing we have been able to do as well as we have in regard to the winter works program.

I understand that tomorrow an executive group of this Winter Works Task Force is meeting here in the Legislative Building and they will be meeting with our people and endeavoring to draw plans and looking further into the projects that we can take forward to a conference in May where the Premiers will be meeting in regard to what can be done further. Oh pardon me! I guess I'm a little ahead on this. They are meeting first. We are meeting tomorrow to formulate plans and then our staff are going to be meeting with other staff from other provinces and the Federal Government to lay the framework for the Provincial-Federal Conference later on, probably in May, and at that time it is to be hoped that we can come forward with plans so that we will not be caught in the same situation as we were this year with a late start and no planning in regard to this sort of thing. I think that our Premier is very much to be complimented on his bringing forward these ideas at the conference at which these things have been discussed previously.

As I say again, I want to repeat, I much appreciate the assistance we've had from the local, municipal and other organizations in the province, the school trustees, the hospital associations, the employees' associations and the house builders and others that have been with us on these discussions and we hope that with their help and the co-operation of the provinces and the Federal Government that such a situation does not occur

again.

I'm not so happy in many ways with the program which we have been in. I think that it has been very poorly planned, but I am proud of the work that has been done by the municipalities and I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am very proud of the part that has been played by the Government of Saskatchewan in this work this winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Hon. Minister who has just taken his seat I can't help but pass a few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Hon. Member spoke on this motion.

MR. MacDONALD: — No, Sir, that's the Member for Moose Jaw.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. MacDonald) moved the amendment and the Hon. Member for Milestone spoke and adjourned the debate.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, that was on the amendment. Can I speak . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The ruling was both were concurrent because one was more or less an opposite proposition to the other.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, just on a Point of Order. Because I adjourned the debate, Sir, and was not here when the motion was brought up again, do I lose my order to speak, my right to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: — No, you don't lose your right to speak if you weren't here and I don't recall any part . . . if a Member adjourns a debate and doesn't take part, he can still take part at a later time.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, when the debate commenced, Sir, I was not in the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: — I know you adjourned the debate and didn't speak again after you had adjourned it.

MR. MacDONALD: — That's correct, Sir, and if my understanding of the rules is correct, I did not lose my right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: — No, the rules are plain that if a Member adjourns the debate, he has the right to speak at a later time unless he signifies at that time that he wants to pass up his right which sometimes happens where one Member adjourns it for another.

MR. MacDONALD: — No, Sir, I should like to exercise my right to speak.

April 11, 1972

MR. SPEAKER: — I want to remind the Member at this time that he must speak on both the amendment and the motion.

MR. MacDONALD: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I wanted to point out, Sir, that after listening to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) it certainly illustrates one of the very basic weaknesses of the Government opposite.

Here, Mr. Speaker, he has given a good illustration of the inadequacy of the public works program of the Province of Saskatchewan when the public works after a long winter should be reaching its height, it reduces unemployment two tenths of one per cent. Saskatchewan's unemployment today is, in all probability, higher than it has been at any time for the eight years in that period. It shows, Mr. Speaker, very clearly the inadequacy of the public sector to solve the unemployment problem. He talks about a massive effort. I find that very difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, when last year in the Public Works Estimates for capital, there was \$72 million and this year there is \$66 million.

Let us compare it to another province, the neighboring province, who did put a genuine effort into the public works' sector. Last year their total capital was \$194 million and this year it is \$233 million, an increase of 29 million. Whereas, we in Saskatchewan are down \$6 million. Of course, the Minister can get up and talk about millions of dollars here. They have \$66 million in the Estimates. In comparison to other provinces, in comparison to the past record in the Province of Saskatchewan, in comparison to the actual number of reduction on the unemployment list, this demonstrates, Sir, without question the inadequacy of the public sector to solve employment problems.

In the Province of Saskatchewan's Estimates this year there is \$66 million. In one project in the private sector it would have been \$117 million – double. I am not suggesting that perhaps that debate has gone on in the past, I am merely pointing out that one major private enterprise, industrial expansion in the Province of Saskatchewan would provide double the total capital works of the Province of Saskatchewan which the Minister talks about as being a massive effort on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Had Choiceland proceeded, Sir, it would have provided more jobs and more money in capital works probably than did this particular capital works budget of the Province of Saskatchewan. Certainly had Athabasca gone ahead, it would have provided double the expenditure on public works.

I want to point out, Sir, that if that is the total effort and contribution of the Province in this massive effort to put forth a public works program and it reduces unemployment two-tenths of one per cent, it demonstrates very clearly the importance and the necessity of the Government opposite in finding a new policy which will encourage private capital, which will encourage the accumulation of private capital among the hands of individuals and the willingness on their part to invest in the Province of Saskatchewan or we will continue to have a massive unemployment roll in the Province of Saskatchewan and massive welfare spending.

I merely point out that if that is the record that the Government is proud of, I say, Sir, it is a very dismal record. And if that is the massive public works program and compared to other provinces in Canada, that too, Sir, is a very dismal record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment negated on Division.

The debate continued on the motion as amended.

MR. A. MATSALLA (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I want to say that I feel satisfied that this House defeated the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald).

I must say that the amendment was deliberately designed to cover the shortcomings of the Federal Government in handling and administering of the winter works application under the program. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, let us give credit where credit is due. It is this Government that picked up many of the applications rejected by the Federal Government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — . . . a branch of a Government of which the Hon. Otto Lang was in charge. It is this Provincial Government that accommodated some 58 municipal applications to help various communities in this province which would otherwise have been left out in the cold.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) for his announcement in extending the deadline date to June 30th for municipal projects under the Provincial winter works plan. I can say that this move will be most welcome by local authorities. I certainly hope that it will prove useful in convincing the Federal Government in deciding to extend the deadline for its program. Today's announcement by the Minister is another courageous move by this Government to ease up the unemployment situation.

In closing the debate it is my intention to first reply to some of the remarks of the Members opposite particularly those of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald).

The Member for Moose Jaw North in his speech spoke mainly on the severe unemployment situation in Saskatchewan but he failed entirely to discuss with sincerity what may have created the unemployment crisis here and in the rest of Canada. He inferred that somehow or other this Government was responsible for unemployment. He said that this Government has done very little to create employment. I must say that the statements made by the Hon. Member are simply ridiculous. Ridiculous because it is made by one who you would expect should know better. Or could it be, Mr. Speaker, that he is ashamed to own up to the true reason for unemployment — ashamed of his Liberal counterparts in Ottawa, ashamed of Hon. Otto Lang's policy to fight unemployment.

I must suggest that it is the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North who has his head buried in the sand. I might further

April 11, 1972

describe his attitude and the attitude of the Members opposite as 'none are so blind as those who will not see and none are so deaf as those who will not hear'.

I want to remind the Hon. Member and other Members opposite that their late leader, Mr. Ross Thatcher had this to say about unemployment. I quote from an article in the Leader-Post May 18, 1971,

Any sensible person knows that unemployment is caused by a great many factors largely beyond the control of a Provincial Government.

When speaking on unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we cannot divorce it from inflation. I place these side by side because the Federal Liberal Government has taken the position that the only way that we can fight inflation is by slowing down the economy. But the policy of economic slowdown was ineffective. It did not check inflation and it added fuel to the fire by creating massive unemployment. So, now we have both, inflation and unemployment. The suggestion out of Ottawa by the Prime Minister and the Liberal Government that Canada should learn to live with inflation and unemployment is a false concept.

Dr. John Young, Chairman of the Federal Prices and Incomes Commission described it with a four letter word. He said and I quote,

That word is 'dumb'.

The Member indicated that a comparison should be made of last winter's Liberal crash program with this Government's winter works program. It is true that the previous Liberal administration budgeted some \$15.7 million for a public works program but of that amount, Mr. Speaker, only \$1.6 million was expended by the middle of summer and the \$5.8 million of the total amount was frozen.

From this, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of this House that \$1.6 million was pretty well the extent of the Liberal winter works program last year. This was their crash employment program.

:Now let us compare it with this Government's winter works program. First, a Provincial public works program of \$11.7 million. Then we have the Provincial winter works program which is related to the Federal program of \$1.5 million for the Local Initiatives Program and \$6.9 million for the Loan Program. This, in total, would add up to \$20.1 million in public works and employment programs plus the amount of some \$640,000 that will be required due to the extension of the date to June 30th.

This is not to say about other employment programs mentioned by the Minister of Municipal Affairs who just spoke. This is far ahead of last year's Liberal crash program of \$1.6 million spent by the middle of summer and later accelerated by this Government to the \$8.9 million figure by the end of the year.

The Member for Moose Jaw stated that Saskatchewan showed no effort to co-operate with the Federal Government on the winter works program. There is nothing further from the truth than that statement. I want to say again that upon announcement

of the Federal winter works program, this Government almost immediately established a task force including representatives of local authorities on unemployment to study the situation and make recommendations to the Government on the best ways of handling the Federal program.

This Government wanted to work with the Federal Government in every way. But it was the Federal Government that didn't co-operate. There were no consultations nor much desire to open their door to recommendations of Provincial and municipal authorities. The program had to be pretty well accepted as set out by the Federal Government. The delays in processing of project applications must be laid at the doorstep of the Federal Manpower office of which the Hon. Otto Lang was in charge.

I am certain that Members opposite will agree that a period of two months to examine and to decide on approval or rejection of an application is one of deliberate delinquency. I want to point out that this suggests a high level of inefficiency at the expense of the Province and local communities. It is likely for this reason that the Member opposite hasn't discussed this aspect of the winter works program.

I want to point out and emphasize that there is a need for appraising the disappointing experience we had with the program this year. If we are to plan a program for next winter, we must start now. I must stress that there must be co-operation and consultation on the part of our three levels of government, municipal, Provincial and Federal. Here lies the success of a meaningful program. The program will do both, relieve unemployment and at the same time provide for useful and beneficial community projects.

Now, according to the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) who just spoke, this Government is already proceeding in the direction of planning next year's program. I would ask Members on both sides of the House to give their full support to this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM AND THE FAMILY FARM PROTECTION ACT

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville) moved, seconded by Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) that the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Crop Insurance Program and the Family Farm Protection Act be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I appreciate very much the ruling that you brought down in regard to one other motion today because along with that, had we discussed The Family Farm Protection Act and the Crop Insurance Program as we did the other in a sub-vote in Agriculture, there wouldn't have been much left to discuss or debate here today. Therefore, I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

When the First Session of this 17th Legislature met in July of 1971, Sir, it legislated that a special Committee be set up to work between sessions to hear and study the effectiveness of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program and The Family

April 11, 1972

Farm Protection Act.

Now, there was a good deal of doubt expressed by some Members of the Opposition as to whether such a committee was practical and of any value. The Members of this side of the House expressed strong affirmative feelings that very often there is a great need for this type of research and investigation.

After our experience with this Special Committee, Sir and I am sure that I speak for most of, if not all, the committee members, that indeed such studies and hearings are a very important way to find out what the people directly related to the problems have to say regarding these problems and suggest grassroot suggestions as to how improvement should be made. From this type of relationship, Mr. Speaker, direct personal contact, you not only find out what people think, what is right or wrong and the possible remedies to the problems, but you also find out how much the public in general doesn't know about a particular subject matter and how ineffective the line of communication has been with the people most vitally concerned with that particular problem. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, from my viewpoint, these public hearings are of a tremendous public value, not only at the time of the hearings and immediately after the hearings but when the Committee reports its findings. Immediate action should be taken by the Government to implement the majority of the recommendations. It is obviously of utmost importance that the Committee reports the study and that it is acted upon or the report is of no value.

Mr. Speaker, the great value of Committee work is that people recognize that they are being considered, that their problems are the problems of the democratically elected Members. That, indeed, people are the most important factors where all problems are concerned, that they, the people, have had a chance to say in their own words – and believe me, Mr. Speaker, for many of the people who stood up in public at these meetings, it wasn't easy for them to express their viewpoints. Sometimes, as Chairman of that Committee, Sir, and I am sure other members of the Committee suffered along with the plain, country folk, but at the same time we were very proud that they dared stand up and state their case as best they could.

This is the kind of working relationship we must keep with the people of Saskatchewan, all people who have problems that must be dealt with by governments. I can't say that every problem is going to be dealt with by a committee but major problems certainly have a place in being dealt with by a committee such as the one that we are talking about.

I want to report to this Assembly that I was certainly pleased with the Committee of which I had the honor of being Chairman. The Special Committee composed of eight Members, two of whom were from the Opposition, worked harmoniously, co-operatively, with a purpose in mind to listen, to get facts and evaluate the effectiveness of the Crop Insurance Program and The Family Farm Protection Act as we were directed to do, Sir.

Every member of the Committee worked hard and diligently towards meeting a deadline of January 15th, a deadline that we set for ourselves, but we set it up so that the report would be available when the Second Session convened sometime in February. I think, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties as a Chairman of that Committee if I did not make some comments

on the fine work done by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Gordon Barnhart, who so ably set up the whole procedure of meetings, advertising and publicity after our itinerary was agreed upon.

Norman Bray, the Research Assistant from the Department of Agriculture was a very valuable assistant as well, outlining the basic concepts and workings of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program as it was up until this fall.

It was a good Committee, Mr. Speaker. It took its work seriously. I am sure that the mutual respect and friendliness generated throughout the province, though not always in agreement, served to prove that serious discussions and dialogue can take place between people, that confidence and respect can take place even though there is an area of disagreement at one time or another. It was felt by our Committee, Mr. Speaker, some major agricultural problems could have been added to the workload of the Committee and handled efficiently. Also, the terms of reference probably could have been widened. Nevertheless, in all probability this made it possible, in fact, it gave the Committee ample time to consider all briefs fully. Even letters with no sponsors were discussed and it gave the Committee and myself as Chairman, as I mentioned a moment ago, ample time to permit full oral participation in the hearings by the many interested parties from the audience.

I am convinced that Committees such as this one have enormous potential to probe and analyze the strength and reliability or the failings and weaknesses of much past legislation and the positive research for future legislation, Mr. Speaker. This potential to research the needs of people being conducted by a committee from all political parties lessens political agitations and friction and this total involvement is geared and directed in doing a good job to which it was directed to do.

As Chairman of this Committee I want to thank the Members for their fine spirit and their sincere efforts in the work they did. For the length of time that was allotted for this Committee and we agreed unanimously that to be of any benefit the report had to be ready for this Session and Committee members deserve full credit.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good, sound, positive report. By this time the Members of this Legislature will have had a chance to study it and review it. Some have even had trial runs debating portions of it already, Mr. Speaker. Today, each one of us will be given the opportunity to voice our praise or condemnation and objections to the recommendations of either the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance or The Family Farm Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, the preface in the final report is a preamble to the recommendations worthwhile putting into the records of this House. It is here that the problem areas are exposed, the door is fully opened on the agricultural problems. I am going to quote the preface as it is written in the report, beginning on page 12,

The Committee wishes to indicate at the outset that they are in favor of a Crop Insurance Program for Saskatchewan administered under the Saskatchewan Government.

April 11, 1972

Fluctuations in yield and narrow margins of return in farming make it desirable that farmers have replacement income available in any year in which they fail to meet production expenses because of a short crop. The Committee feels that the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program should offer the farmer this protection.

It should be noted, however, that some persons appearing before the Committee were of the opinion that crop insurance is not a worthwhile program or felt strongly that it should be improved if it was to provide a useful service to farmers. Some indicated that they would accept a crop insurance program only as a second choice to a total income guarantee plan. Several persons at the hearings pointed out that a crop insurance program cannot ensure adequate income when sales are severely limited even though crop production is satisfactory. They felt that co-ordination of the Crop Insurance Program with sales stabilization or income guarantee plans could provide much more complete income protection.

At the hearings, the farmers had diverse opinions as to the level of guarantee a crop insurance program should provide. There was much support for a guarantee of the full value of a normal crop. It is the opinion of the Committee that the insurance program should primarily attempt to ensure that normal production costs are covered.

The discontinuing of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act (PFAA) has major influences upon the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program. In areas where crop insurance has been available, a large number of contract holders formerly purchased crop insurance in order to opt out of PFAA. Without this incentive it may be more difficult to sell crop insurance in 1972.

In other areas of the province where crop insurance has not been available, the discontinuing of PFAA means that farmers are currently without any protection of this nature and their need for a crop insurance program has increased. Steps should be taken to make crop insurance more attractive beginning with the 1972 season.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the recommendations as are outlined in the report point to many of the problem areas that were pointed out to us by the farmers of Saskatchewan. From our eight meetings held in different parts of Saskatchewan, from the many briefs and oral reports, the Committee came up with 24 specific recommendations for improving the Crop Insurance Program and recommendations that consider future possible trends in crop insurance and ways and measures that it could be strengthened and made workable.

I won't take the time of this House to enumerate all 24 recommendations but I will note the number that I think are of importance, including those that the Crop Insurance Board has acted on.

1. That the Crop Insurance Program be made available to all farmers in Saskatchewan. We placed that at the very top of our list of important recommendations, Mr. Speaker.

2. That all major crops recommended for the area including forage crops be included in the Crop Insurance Program. Specific reference was made to include flax and rape and now this has been included in the 1972 Insurance Program.
3. The third recommendation by our Committee is that crop insurance subscribers be offered an optional basis, a higher bushel coverage than is now available and this is in the process of becoming a reality. The Board will be offering a 70 per cent crop yield instead of 60 per cent on spring wheat, durum wheat, barley and wheat.
4. Next we have the recommendation that the farmers' crop insurance protection be based on the individual farmer's production performance and that the Crop Insurance board examine the possibility of increasing the insurance coverage for individual farmers carrying out superior farm practices as reflected in average yield. Again, this recommendation was also acted upon as individual, good experience and continuous participation will be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue to discuss the other 20 recommendations but I am sure that other Members will want to take part in the debate and will emphasize other recommendations brought forth in this report. I want to make reference to one more recommendation that we agreed to unanimously and that is the recommendation that existing protection against wildlife damage be removed from crop insurance and that farmers be provided complete coverage against wildlife damage at no cost to themselves but supported on a cost-sharing basis by the Provincial Government, the Federal Government and the sportsmen.

As I understand, Mr. Speaker, this problem has been tackled by people involving the provinces and the Federal Government, including our participation with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer). This had already borne fruit in that the Federal Government has recognized its responsibilities in this area and has allotted money to this end.

I am sure that the Minister of Natural Resources or some other Member of this House will have some comments to make as to what this effect will have on the part of crop insurance protection in our Crop Insurance Program.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that in making recommendations to any Government program it isn't good enough to patch and gloss over makeshift partial solutions. Recommendations must be practical and positive and far-reaching. These recommendations must be of benefit to remedy immediate problems as well as future ones. Mr. Speaker, if the Committee is to do its work properly it has to look somewhat into the immediate future to anticipate problem areas that may arise in spite of all the good recommendations made. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, recommendation No. 4 states explicitly,

That, for the immediate future, participation in the Crop Insurance Program be on a voluntary basis.

But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the positive benefits envisaged in the Crop Insurance Program, in spite of all the incentives, the program may for many reasons not be accepted by the farmer. What then, Mr. Speaker? If in the opinion of the majority of the Committee members the most obvious reason being that the

April 11, 1972

farmer needing the protection the most may not be able to afford to carry this insurance probably because of the cost of production factor, Mr. Speaker, Therefore, Sir, the Committee made recommendation No. 5 and has stated in the report,

That the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board undertake an intensive study of a compulsory Crop Insurance Program that would provide a basic minimum coverage and that if the study suggests the approach is feasible, the compulsory program should be undertaken experimentally on a regional basis and that consideration be given to providing a Provincial subsidy on such coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons given here and I am going to read them as well,

The Committee feels there is a need to provide some form of protection to smaller farmers who might not otherwise purchase crop insurance. A compulsory program might make available savings in administration that could result in lower cost protection.

Such a compulsory program could replace any ad hoc emergency program for farmers suffering crop loss.

Several persons indicated they might favor a minimum level of compulsory protection if rates were favorable. Most of these persons indicated a farmer should then have additional amounts of insurance available on an optional basis. It remains to be proven that a fully voluntary crop insurance program is attractive to most farmers in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the recommendation says (No. 5),

That the Crop Insurance Board undertake an intensive study . . .

Nothing else, Sir. Mr. Speaker, two members of this Committee objected to this recommendation. Not only did they object to this recommendation but a number of other areas as well, a number of which pertain to crop insurance and to The Family Farm Protection Act as well.

May I be granted permission, Mr. Speaker, to say that I am very pleased that the two Liberal Members have objected. That's what I had hoped for, really. That's what makes the difference between Liberals and New Democrats. The Liberal believe firmly in a 'dog eat dog' free enterprise philosophy. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have said this before in the House this year and I intend to keep saying it again, that free enterprise isn't free, Mr. Speaker, as we are finding out every day. You and I have to pay for that freedom with money, with sweat and toil so that the so-called free enterprise may continue to suck the life blood out of working people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats believe in the concept that together, in the spirit of co-operation, by pooling our resources, money and efforts we can achieve that certain freedom and equality without sacrificing an individual's worthiness.

The Liberals object to a study of the Crop Insurance Program because they really don't want to protect the family

farm, Mr. Speaker. They don't want to protect the small farmer, a man who may need the protection the most but cannot get it. This is the way they look at it.

Mr. Speaker, it is all the more amazing because the recommendation plainly states 'to study compulsory crop insurance.' In other words, you are looking towards the future. Surely, that is not asking for too much in view of the many other compulsory programs, Federal and Provincial, that have been hoisted and foisted upon us for centuries. I can think of many. I can think of our own that were brought in by the CCF and I say, thank Heaven for that – compulsory hospitalization, compulsory Medicare. I can think further back to the Liberal days when they brought in compulsory property taxation, Mr. Speaker. Yes, and compulsory education, compulsory income tax. I think I could go on for a full hour if I had the time to table in this House the number of compulsory taxes and compulsory features of ever so many things that are accepted today as facts of life.

The Committee felt that in this quick, dynamic, technical, automated world, Mr. Speaker, we have to probe the future now, to be prepared for the eventualities of tomorrow. Planning today is a must, Mr. Speaker. Planning today is not even a dirty word in the eyes of Liberals. We must plan not just for today but for tomorrow, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, all we asked for in the report is a study in case the situation which exists in the Crop Insurance Program today may worsen instead of getting better. I think we should look, as I said before, to all eventualities. I am certain that Members on this side of the House will have more to say on this report and the reservations made by the two Opposition Members that were on the Committee.

On closing my comments on the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Report, I am asking, Mr. Speaker, for an unanimous vote in approval of this report by all Members in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn to The Family Farm Protection Act as it was studied along with the Crop Insurance Program. I want to read the details of the preface as well because it, too, opens the door wide to what the problems really are in the debt control and debt legislation in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Committee concluded and I quote from page 26 of the report,

The Committee concluded that the cash situation for farmers in Saskatchewan continues to be serious and that farmers who are in arrears on debts for land, livestock and/or machinery will continue to require consideration by the Saskatchewan Government. While The Family Farm Protection Act (FFPA) has provided a necessary postponement, it will remain difficult for many farmers to bring their debts into current position on July 31, 1972.

The Committee feels that it is not sufficient for the Legislature to now withdraw from the field leaving farmers to face double payments on July 31, 1972.

The Committee believes that legislation such as the FFPA which allows for postponement of payments of interest and principal for debtors is not required after July 31, 1972 but that a procedure must be available on a more selective basis for cases in which non-payment of debts may cause

April 11, 1972

financial hardship to debtors or creditors.

Existing debt legislation and debt negotiation procedure should be adequate to deal with the above problems provided necessary steps are taken to amend legislation and to guarantee negotiation when an aggrieved party takes steps to request it.

To enable such procedure to be workable, satisfactory steps must be taken to strengthen negotiation facilities. It must be the aim of the Provincial Mediation Board to make debt negotiation machinery fully available to debtors and creditors. This requires the necessary complement of staff and facilities. The public at large must be made much more aware of protection and remedies provided debtors and creditors by effective Saskatchewan and Canadian debt legislation.

In summary, normal procedures can deal with the debt situation for Saskatchewan farmers only if machinery is available and procedures established to negotiate debts quickly, fairly and on reasonable terms. The procedures recommended should apply not only to debts remaining as problems at July 31, 1972 but should set out more recognized and clear procedures for any future debt problems in farming or in the urban community.

The Committee notes that numerous persons appearing before it stressed that basic action was required to alleviate the farm income situation which resulted in the necessity for debt legislation such as the FFPA. The Committee agrees that the Saskatchewan and Canadian Governments should be made aware of this need and action to resolve the basic farm cash income problem should be taken.

While representations from some creditors were received, there was no representation from some major lenders. It is therefore not possible to estimate the effect that the FFPA is having upon these lenders.

Even after hearings, the use made by farmers of the FFPA is not accurately known. While there are clearly some cases which have come to public notice, farmers in arrears are not required to indicate if they are taking protection of the Act and those who are benefitting from the Act might be reluctant to declare their position. There can be no doubt that passage of the Act has reduced pressure by lenders to collect from farmers.

Farmers prefer to keep debts current to avoid the difficulty of making both current and arrears payments later and to maintain a satisfactory credit rating for the future. While representations to the Committee indicated that farmers who sought protection of this Act might experience difficulty in securing future credit, it was also evident that in several cases where farmers were taking protection of the Act, loans were of marginal safety when granted.

Farmers expressed concern that local implement dealers continue to operate and provide services and that legislation should not endanger the financial position of the dealers.

Many persons recognizing the need for additional protection were dissatisfied with temporary legislation that would result in two payments coming due at July 31, 1972 and requested more long run approaches to the debt problem.

To facilitate all debt procedure, it appears necessary to clarify fields of jurisdiction in debt legislation between Federal and Provincial Governments.

This is briefly what the people of Saskatchewan have indicated to us and this is what we prefaced our recommendation on.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as you may have gathered from the remarks I have just read, the great concern of the majority of the Committee was what happens to the hard-pressed debtors, the farmers, after July 31st. In spite of the better grain sales and cattle sales, by far the greatest majority of farmers have not been able to keep up with their debts. They have not been able to reduce their debts because, Mr. Speaker, of the need for new and second-hand machinery or more cattle and payment of high operating costs which are forever on the increase. Their debt picture is getting grimmer by the day, Sir. According to our Liberal critics we should be looking to crop insurance as a fairly sound measure of stabilizing income. Well, I don't buy that, Mr. Speaker. If we are looking forward to stabilizing our farm economy by the use of the Crop Insurance Program then we are in deep trouble indeed.

Some two weeks ago when the first sub-item on Agriculture was discussed, the Liberals stood up time and time again, Mr. Speaker, repeatedly stating the case of the implement dealer. As I stated briefly then in answer to that, no one is more aware of the situation than the New Democratic Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. Not once though, did they bring out the fact that it is the corporate machine companies forcing the implement dealers to the dastardly commitments and agreements possible, forcing them to build monumental palaces to house those machines, forcing them to the most outrageous financial arrangements ever heard of. And in this way, they have forced hundreds of good, local, implement dealers out of the local community. Not once did these Liberals to your left, Mr. Speaker, bring this nefarious, stinky mess to the public attention.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated then, speaker after speaker got up on the Opposition side, yet no one voiced concern about what is going to happen to the family farm and the small farmer after July 31st. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Opposition Members stated in public their reservations because once again it reaffirms their position that they care less what happens to the family farm and the smaller farmer. Their interest was basically what it has been before, a solid support for big business and big, corporate enterprises. Their philosophy says, 'Let the devil take the hindmost, I come first.'

Mr. Speaker, what amazes me and it really shouldn't amaze me, is the gall that they have all of a sudden to preach their sanctimonious regard to small implement dealers and some not so small, Mr. Speaker, when for seven years and especially in the last four years of Liberal administration, hundreds of implement dealers went broke and left Saskatchewan. What did the Liberal Government do to help them? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing at all. I remember that some of the implement dealers

April 11, 1972

came to me and I said, "I can't help you but you go and see Mr. Heald or go and see Mr. Thatcher, maybe they can help." But none of them got any help.

As I stated on previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, eight big machinery sales and garages went belly-up in those last three years of Liberal administration in my area of the province. That is about 100 miles in any direction from Melville. Was help given, Mr. Speaker? None! I should like to name some of these because they ring a bell – Greenfield Motors in Balcarres, a half a million dollar business went broke. It seems to me that name should ring a familiar tune in this House. Caras Motors in Yorkton, Mr. Speaker. Walters' Garage in Melville. I know some will say, 'Oh yes, but they declared bankruptcy only three months ago.' Right. They may have declared bankruptcy three months ago but they went broke during the three Liberal years of disaster in Saskatchewan.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that a number of implement dealers have had real difficulty and some portion of this can be definitely attributed to the corporate machine companies doing just what they felt like and no one stopped them. Those of you who have had contact with business people in the last few months know that filling stations handling fuel for these big, corporate companies, Gulf and many others, are being disposed of fast and ruthlessly. These small garage operators are going broke because of these big, business giants which adds to the loss of garages and implement dealers throughout the province.

Again, Mr. Speaker, you don't hear the Liberals say one thing about it. Check back in your community and ask your local dealer whether he is Liberal, New Democrat or whatever he is, and he will tell you that he is being pushed out by the big companies. There are going to be hundreds of them going broke on the basis of that fact alone.

MR. McPHERSON: — In Neudorf, John?

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Yes, there are even dealers in Neudorf who went broke. Some of them just sold out the other day. The benefits of Liberal administration.

There is no way of knowing how many people have benefitted from The Family Farm Protection Act but we do know that many did. The Committee, in its discussions and deliberations with the public, recognizing lawyers like Mr. Friesen and Mr. Goldenberg, sheriffs and other knowledgeable people, made the recommendation that The Family Farm Protection Act be allowed to run its course until July 31st. Not that the majority of the members of the Committee felt that the people of Saskatchewan didn't need the protection, Mr. Speaker. They will be needing protection, mark my words. We suggest the implementation of a strong, reoriented, fully staffed and viable mediation board. In spite of what the Liberal Opposition Members say, that there is enough legislation to protect the debtor in the Acts already on the statute books of Saskatchewan and Federal legislation. These Acts and legislation, Mr. Speaker, are inadequate, unworkable to be used quickly enough and far too cumbersome and they place the total initiative of action on the debtor.

The fact that The Family Farm Protection Act made it

mandatory for the creditor to take action was a strong point for the thousands of debtors who were in most cases in a difficult financial position through no fault of their own. And, therefore, The Family Farm Protection Act was a real meaningful bit of legislation to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The major reasons for suggesting the dropping of The Family Farm Protection Act was, Mr. Speaker, that it was brought in on a temporary basis to protect the debtor at a very critical time and, secondly, that in all probability the Act would be declared ultra vires if taken for a test case to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Committee feels strong, very strongly, that some other form of protection must be given to the debtors who increase daily in their numbers. This is the way that it is done in this modern world. There are going to be more debts and more debtors than ever before because they tell you, '\$1 down and two years to pay'. This is the kind of philosophy that we people are subjected to and some fall for it. We are going to need debt legislation, Mr. Speaker. And this, I am sure, will make the need for a debtor to receive a minimum of protection against undue pressure by the creditor and possible repossession and closure all the more necessary.

This, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the majority of the Committee, this principle of debt mediation should not only apply to debts on land, cattle and farm machinery but to all debts incurred by the Saskatchewan citizens. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the principles outlined in this report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, as one of the Committee members on this report, I should like to express my view that the Chairman of the Committee did a very good job, a very fair and honest job. I am sure that all members of the Committee found that working with him and working with each other, the Committee work went in a very satisfactory manner and a harmonious relationship existed during the entire proceedings.

I think that we on this side should like to compliment the Chairman for the fair manner in which he conducted the hearings and the fair manner in which the evidence was put to the Committee and on which the report was written.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — I want now to go at some length, Mr. Speaker, into the report itself. I might say that having complimented the Chairman, I thought it was somewhat unfortunate that he decided rather than dealing in his speech today with the basic recommendations he went into great length on what is mostly political propaganda. I think saying that the Members of the Opposition were particularly interested in big business and so on really wasn't relevant to the report at all and I think it was unfortunate in itself because I think the people that came and gave

April 11, 1972

their testimony to the Committee weren't particularly interested in those types of political views.

I might say that after listening I had to look down at my desk and look at the copy and it is certainly no wonder that we are getting headlines such as this. I hold it up – "The Chamber Of Commerce To Rake Premier Over the Exodus Of Oil Men", and it goes into a lengthy article in the April 6th issue of the Swift Current paper about so many people leaving Saskatchewan because of the anti-business attitude which exists here.

Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to talk about the Crop Insurance Program. I should like to deal with a number of the recommendations in it and comment on some of them of a particular nature which I think are important and which I hope are not lost. It is my understanding that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has incorporated some of the recommendations and I think this is good. The Committee attempted to speed up its work in an effort to get these recommendations to him so that they could be acted upon in the coming summer. In that regard, all Committee members co-operated and I think the Minister is putting some of them into operation. We attempted to assist him as much as we could in getting our report written.

In the first instance, Mr. Speaker, the voluntary crop insurance aspect, the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) went into this in some length, regarding free enterprise and so forth. I might add that in my view the manner of voluntary crop insurance or compulsory crop insurance is neither a matter of socialism or free enterprise. It is simply a matter of what was reported to the Committee. I can assure you that in the Committee report, what was presented to the report, that if a person looks through the testimony given to us, a person would find that at no time was there any particular desire expressed by those appearing before the Committee for a compulsory crop insurance program. And yet, the Government Members of their own volition decided to recommend a study into the compulsory crop insurance aspect. It was obvious from the testimony presented to us and I would be surprised if there were even one or two people who testified to the Committee that they had a desire for a compulsory crop insurance program. But I don't have the statistical evidence before me.

I do notice that the Committee itself observed that there was no particular desire for a compulsory crop insurance program expressed. As for the aspect of being a study, I might assure the Members opposite that they will recall very well, I think, that in the June 23rd election they campaigned long and hard for a long period of time against what was just such a study, the Task Force Report on Agriculture, of which they were assured that it was a study. It wasn't the Government's policy. Unfortunately, they didn't take that attitude, or fortunately they didn't take that advice whichever way you would care to look at it. But today, they find nothing wrong with such a study and apparently while they object to some studies being undertaken, they are completely in favor of other undertaken by themselves.

I would just suggest that the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and I feel that very frequently where a study is undertaken there is a little bit of fire underneath it or a little bit of support in the background. I think that the Member today in his speech, when he threw the words 'free enterprise' and 'socialism' around, indicated probably a desire on his part and

certainly it was expressed during our meetings, that there was some desire of Committee members for the possibility of a compulsory program which we did not share.

I might say on this aspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is not to me a matter of free enterprise, it is a matter of observations which were taken at the Committee meetings in this regard. And it was observed by us and by many farmers and people who testified that there were a number of farmers in Saskatchewan who had grain on hand or they were livestock farmers or they were in a reasonably good financial position and, therefore, they did not require crop insurance. This I accept is a valid reason for not being in a crop insurance program and if a person is mostly a livestock farmer or if he may have several thousand bushels of grain which is really his own insurance then if it is his desire not to be in a crop insurance program, I do not feel, personally, that the Government should force him to take part in such a plan. Therefore, we did not think it necessary to study such a program.

Mr. Speaker, having mentioned the compulsory aspect of a possible plan, I want to go on to the recommendation of excluding hail from the Crop Insurance Program. A successful crop insurance plan requires the lowest premiums possible to attract clients. This is certainly a basic requirement of any insurance program. The lower the premium the more clients you are likely to obtain. With a low premium and high benefits you are certainly going to attract more clients. Hail included in an all-risk crop insurance program has not been that successful. The basic reason, Mr. Speaker, being that a 50 per cent hail storm under present crop insurance, the farmer would collect no payments whatsoever. This is simply because of the basis on which crop insurance operates, that you have to get down to a very low yield to be able to collect anything under crop insurance. Now, it is obvious that when a hail storm hits the best half of your crop, you would collect nothing from the Crop Insurance Program. We believe that there are many farmers who would prefer to put on hail insurance of their own and therefore they could obtain coverage for the top part of their crop. This would also have the net benefit of the lower crop insurance rate because hail insurance would not be included and would have the benefit for those farmers who particularly want hail insurance and putting it in without forcing anyone to. In my opinion it would be better to remove the hail factor from crop insurance resulting in lower premiums. There are some farmers in Saskatchewan who don't need hail insurance, they only experience maybe one hail storm in 50 years or maybe none at all. It is foolish therefore to force them into paying a hail insurance premium that they do not feel is necessary for themselves. The farmer with the hail insurance being separate would have a lower rate and could apply whatever insurance he wished for. Mr. Speaker, this at present is not available to the farmer and I think it is a worthwhile suggestion for change.

I want to talk for a moment about the aspect of wildlife damage mentioned by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk). I think it is very encouraging to see that the Federal Government in conjunction with the provinces may well step into this area and bring about the recommendation which we have suggested. Our wildlife, both animals and birds, are a national asset to all citizens and the farmer should not be the person who has to pay the cost of supporting them. Farmers should be compensated to near the total damage done by such animals and birds without having to carry insurance himself. It does seem unfair to me

April 11, 1972

and I believe to all members of the Committee that the farmer should be required to pay the cost of maintaining wildlife and bird life in the Province of Saskatchewan which is a national asset. This was the basic reason for our recommendation. I think it is a sound recommendation and as I mentioned previously, I do see some hopeful signs that the Federal Government will in the coming year be putting up a substantial amount of money so this can be brought about.

I want to deal a little while, Mr. Speaker, with what I felt was a fairly important recommendation and that is the recommendation that we have the minimum crop insurance of up to \$4,000. It is very important, I believe, from a farmer's point of view, that each year you have a certain amount of income. Now, in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking of net income, I'm talking about income or dollars coming in. It is important that every farmer have a certain amount of money coming into his operation even if it is only sufficient to cover his expenses. It certainly is more desirable to have enough income to produce a net profit but it may well be that over a period of years you can average out and be able to have a satisfactory living. It is important, therefore, that we felt that low premiums be encouraged to allow for every farmer to have a basic minimum participation if he desires on a voluntary basis. Essentially, this I should think of as similar to low-cost life insurance. We suggested the amount of up to \$4,000 but I personally felt, Mr. Speaker, that this was just an arbitrary figure. I don't think there was any particular basis for arriving at it, but we felt that it is reasonable that we should try and develop a voluntary program to be so beneficial to the farmer or so attractive to him that he would want to participate. Essentially, we get all farmers to participate in a minimum amount of moneys up to this amount of \$4,000. The net result would certainly be that every farmer would have a guarantee of \$4,000 income for crops per year. I think that this would be a step in the right direction and I think if the plan is made attractive enough with premiums at a very low rate that this can be done. I say this, however, with the feeling that it should not again be compulsory simply because there are some individuals who don't want to participate and they have very valid reasons for not having to participate. However, the low premium would certainly encourage participation and guarantee a certain income for every farmer and over a period of time we thought that farmers starting into a plan such as this would likely continue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come now to The Family Farm Protection Act which was debated at length under the Agriculture Estimates. I should like to say a few words on it. I do not wish to promote or prolong the debate particularly but it is certainly of concern to us in the Opposition and I believe the reason it is is because there was a lack of attention given by Committee members on the Government side as to what was, we believe, excellent testimony regarding the working of this Act. The Chairman today apparently felt that he would muddy the water considerably by attempting to blame the Members opposite for attempting to take the side of what were essentially big companies and saying that most of the troubles of the implement dealers had to do with the big companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure him that some of the dealers' problems are due to the big companies unquestionably but the Members opposite know that when we were the Government we passed one of the Acts, The Implement Dealers' Act which did more for implement dealers than anything that has ever happened to them in 25 years in the Province of Saskatchewan. Checking with the

Implement Dealers' Organization, the Act is working very, very well. Many dealers that have been forced to retire because of ill health are now hitting retirement age and have been able to take advantage of this Act. They are able to return their parts and they have been able to get their assets back again. I can assure him there is no group of people who are more delighted with what the Government did when they passed The Implement Dealers' Act. I can assure the Members opposite there was no group of people including the implement dealers who were more happy than when we passed The Implement Dealers' Act last year. The net result, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that we certainly do have implement dealers who are in financial difficulty. I concur that there are some people who were in implement dealerships who have gone out of business in the last number of years but this was certainly not because of legislation passed by the Liberal Government that put them out of business. They went out of business for various reasons, for economic reasons, for many valid reasons and this was unfortunate. But I can assure the Members opposite that The Implement Dealers' Act did more for the implement dealer in the Province in Saskatchewan than any other piece of legislation we have seen for some time. So, for the Members opposite to suggest that we were particularly trying to take the side of the large companies was totally wrong simply because it is not the large companies that stand to lose under The Family Farm Protection Act.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the implement dealers when this Act expires. As the Chairman of the Committee mentioned, he said that there is no one in Saskatchewan who knows how many people are taking advantage of it. The Attorney General's testimony is given in the written report saying that he does not know how many people are taking advantage of it. It's obvious then that when this Act, expires, at least until this Act expires, the implement dealers are going to be in a very nervous state and may well suffer severe financial loss. I want to point out that while we passed The Implement Dealers' Act, Mr. Speaker, that this was an Act good for them, we can contrast that now with The Family Farm Protection Act which certainly isn't good for the implement dealer in any sense of the word.

I want to talk about what Mr. Johnson said in his quotation in the Weyburn testimony and these were his words. Mr. Johnson was representing the Manufacturers' Association who are the wholesalers, I might add and represent the companies producing machinery.

The most important person that is really affected is the dealer. He stands to take the brunt of the whole thing.

On page 76 of the Weyburn submission of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers' Association it says,

Farm implement dealers are placed in a position under the terms of the Act where they are liable to stand considerable loss. This is in respect to accrued interest appreciation and repair costs involved in machinery voluntarily returned or repossessed after July 31, 1972 or later for further relief to the debtors authorized under The Limitations of Civil Rights Act.

The quotation continues to say,

April 11, 1972

Farm implement dealers are responsible entirely for any of the above losses accrued as major company financial subsidiaries and finance companies that took over the original notes on this machinery charge all losses to the dealer. These notes are without recourse in respect to the dealer. The dealer alone is faced with any loss accrued in above costs and charters.

I might point out to the Members opposite that while they may talk about how many dealers went out under a Liberal administration, I can assure them that the legislation we passed helped the dealer. We didn't pass legislation that put him in the position he is in today.

Mr. Speaker, the dealers go on to say,

We believe under existing conditions that only five per cent will renege on their obligations. However, it is this percentage that is of concern to the dealer. It is a fact that farm machinery depreciates while farm land normally appreciates.

Again a quotation from the dealers' submission held at Weyburn which goes on to say,

It is for this reason the Act is not fair to the implement dealer.

I can suggest to all Members here, Mr. Speaker, that if they read the submission presented at Weyburn by the implement dealers, they will find the words that I have just given to be in the written report.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee meetings heard similar testimony from some farmers, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, it had the representative at the Gull Lake testimony and individual people at the meetings. I am not going to elaborate on that particular testimony, it is all available in the records. But what is disturbing to me, Mr. Speaker, as a member of that Committee, is that the Committee chose to ignore all of this testimony and, in fact, passed a resolution not supported by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and myself. The resolution essentially reads,

That the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies do not grant financial compensation to any person claiming damages arising under The Family Farm Protection Act.

I find this most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because it simply was not in accordance with the testimony which was given to the Committee hearings. One can only conclude that the Members opposite did not follow and listen to the testimony which was presented to our Committee in this particular regard. It would certainly appear that the Committee deliberately chose to ignore valid criticism of The Family Farm Protection Act and it was just such problems which I understood the Committee was set up to listen to. In actual fact, the recommendation was that the Mediation Board be given the necessary procedure to delay or allow negotiation and after The Family Farm Protection Act expires it will further worsen the situation for most dealers.

Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this recommendation if put into operation which I think could be very disturbing.

It simply is that the recommendation to the Government is that the Mediation Board would be allowed to negotiate all debts under The Family Farm Protection Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, my understanding would be that there are debts which come under The Family Farm Protection Act that account for more debts than were incurred in the years of its existence. In other words, a debt incurred two or three years ago would now be held up for payment simply because of The Family Farm Protection Act. We may have three or four or five years of debts which would be subject to renegotiation by the Mediation Board if this recommendation was put into operation. We believe that this recommendation would apply not particularly to the debts which were incurred during The Family Farm Protection Act year but would also apply to debts of a year or so previous to it simply because they are all actually coming under The Family Farm Protection Act as of now. Now to suggest renegotiation take place for a substantial length of time and the recommendation is to allow or delay negotiation, Mr. Speaker, you can see that what this really amounts to is an extension of The Family Farm Protection Act for a substantial longer period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to deal with what I think is important points given in the testimony. I think that the Committee did very valuable work and I thought the co-operation of all Members was good, regardless of what opinions finally arrived at may be. I do suggest though, it was somewhat of a disappointment to me. In my opinion the Committee did not totally follow the testimony which was presented to us in regard to The Family Farm Protection Act. That, to my way of thinking, was a disappointment. I think it will be a disappointment to anyone reading the report and anyone finding the testimony given. Mr. Speaker, there was excellent testimony given. Many people came to the hearings and put forward their views and I think all of us as members received a substantial amount of information, I'm sure all members of the Committee, regardless of individual views, are indebted to the participation which we received and in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks in regard to the Committee on The Family Farm Protection Act and the Crop Insurance Program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.W. ENGEL (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with regard to the work of the Committee on agriculture and its report. First of all, I would like to say that I appreciated working with the Chairman, the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) and I would particularly like to congratulate him on his presentation today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Just a few remarks regarding what the Member said from Cannington at the outset. He didn't hear anything about compulsory crop insurance at these meetings. When he was finalizing his comments he talked about the presentation that was made at Gull Lake on behalf of SARM, he wasn't going to go into that. Is it possible that these two go hand in hand? I wonder why he wouldn't want to go into that presentation. I wonder if it's possibly because the person who was giving that report mentioned that compulsory insurance would make it very much cheaper and

April 11, 1972

that he thinks it would be worth a study. Did he forget what the Member who made his report on behalf of the Farmers' Union was talking about, how much cheaper this might be if it were compulsory and his recommendation that we should study this aspect? I suggest that he listen to everything not just what he wants to hear.

I should like to comment, Mr. Speaker, on the aspect that we covered as far as this Committee was concerned in our area where crop insurance hasn't been available. I should like to report that this recommendation that has been accepted by the Crop Insurance Board to make this insurance available has been generally accepted in our area. The sales are going very well and I appreciate the fact that this is one recommendation that was covered. I have already touched on the feeling of compulsory insurance and I am confident that this kind of study should be made. Our Chairman covered this very ably in his report. Insurance that is compulsory, Medicare, SGIO and many others have shown us that this kind of a thing can give cheap insurance and can give us a good insurance. There are so many improvements that we could add to the list that has been made by the Crop Insurance Board because of the work of the Committee. The inclusion of recognized crops in various areas is a very good point, Mr. Speaker. Better coverage for all kinds of risks, fire that could be caused during harvest, not able to seed because of flooding, better rates or a higher percentage of coverage. If the crop is so poor that it doesn't warrant or doesn't cover the cost of harvesting they consider this a 100 per cent loss and wildlife protection which has already been mentioned. I think these are some very good changes that have been made and improvements that have been made because of the study that was made.

I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to devote some time of my remarks to the aspect of The Family Farm Protection Act. At a time when farmers were reaping the benefits of a Liberal administration both in Saskatchewan and the Federal field, these benefits left the farmer in a dire need, Mr. Speaker. The new Government after the June election decided that we had to launch some kind of a relief program. Many farmers last June were facing insurmountable problems and difficulties, the financial crunch was really on them. This Government decided to throw these farmers a lifeline to help them in this severe difficulty. The lifeline wasn't considered to be a long-term measure. If someone is drowning you don't throw him a life raft and leave him there, you help him in. This was the idea of it. There were programs implemented.

For Members opposite to agree with it, Mr. Speaker, would be to admit to failure on their part to implement agricultural policies that would have guaranteed the survival of the family farm. They would have had to admit to the failure in their ability in getting their counterparts in Ottawa to come across with program that would help the farmers in Saskatchewan.

What kind of programs did the planning of these two Governments come up with? We won't forget LIFT, Mr. Speaker, farmers are still suffering from this program. For those Members that are sitting on this side of the House that aren't farmers and for some of them on the other side of the House, I should like to tell them why we are still suffering because of this program that they came up with and the planning that they had that left the farmers, particularly in my area, in so much trouble. We believe in a practice down in our country of

half-cropping. We strip farm, then we seed this portion and we summerfallow that. When they came around with the program LIFT, every other strip or quite a percentage of it was left fallow and we summerfallowed twice in a row. Last year a new quota system was announced, you could seed what you wanted to and it wouldn't penalize you as far as what you sold. You declare what you are going to sell. So many farmers seeded the strips back down that we summerfallowed twice in a row. This leaves us in quite a predicament this spring, Mr. Speaker. Very many farmers have three-quarters of their land in stubble and one-quarter summerfallowed this spring. Last fall we had a very dry fall, very poor moisture conditions and we had a tremendous crop for the amount of moisture we had last summer. This spring I should like to report that our area is exceptionally dry. We see and hear of reports of heavy snowfalls farther north and I hope conditions will improve. The southern portions of the province are noted for the extreme lack of water. Many dugouts which were dug last fall under another program are empty this spring as there wasn't enough snow or spring runoff to fill them. To go out this spring and seed stubble to get back to half and half on a dry year is really a bad risk. This is one of the reasons why crop insurance is selling so well. But when the day of reckoning comes and there is just a little secret I should like to tell the Members opposite if they want to put a plug in to their senior Government's ear as to when to call an election, I would suggest that they better do it now because if we have to wait until fall, I am afraid Mr. Lang is really going to have to give an account for his LIFT. His credibility will be questioned after hearing pre-election promises. We looked with anticipation and great hope towards a program of the two-price system for wheat, we wanted more than just token promises. The idea of a two-price system is a good one but a token payment will never cover the expenses and the cost that LIFT has created. I suggest to the Member opposite when he suggests that our Government should finance and pay for the programs and mistakes were made, I suggest he start cleaning house at home before he tells somebody else to do that.

I have given some reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I felt we had to introduce The Family Farm Protection Act and what the results were of the study. I would concur with the report submitted by the Committee.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — I think we are a bit outnumbered on this side but I think it is about an even split as far as debating ability is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the report on the Crop Insurance Program and The Family Farm Protection Act Committee, I want to say just a very few words on the crop insurance portion. I might point out that the two Members on this side of the House that were on the Committee, the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and myself had only two reservations. We had quite a bit of discussion on the various aspects of crop insurance, we had a good number of people at the hearings, they brought very important aspects to us. But there were two points that we didn't agree on. Now, crop insurance, of course, is relatively new in the province and in Canada. The former Liberal Government improved the plan with the assistance from the Government at Ottawa and, as you know, almost every year, improvements were made and a larger portion of the province was included in the

April 11, 1972

program. The recommendations that were suggested by the Committee are mostly a natural evolution of the plan and I am sure would have been taken by any Government in this province. However, the two recommendations that we objected to were something else. We saw little evidence, Mr. Speaker, that farmers wanted a compulsory plan, in fact, we did see a great deal of evidence to indicate that they did not want a compulsory plan. Now the only indication that anyone wanted a compulsory plan, I believe, occasionally when some farmer was being questioned, one of the members would say to him, "Do you think a compulsory plan would be satisfactory?" The fellow would think for a moment and occasionally, on the spur of the moment, he might say, "Well, it might be all right," or something of this nature. No one came prepared to ask for a compulsory plan, no indication that this is what farmers wanted.

The compulsory aspect, of course, is the major point of the whole crop insurance report, this is the meat of the report, the key to the whole report. As I said, nothing else in the report on crop insurance is particularly new or important because it is a natural evolution of any good crop insurance plan. Some farmers, of course, have good reasons for not wanting crop insurance and many of them mentioned this to us. A farmer, for example, may be a grain farmer with several bins of wheat but he is short of cash and therefore he objects to paying several hundred dollars as a cash premium for crop insurance that he really doesn't want. The grain in the bin is his crop insurance. If he doesn't grow anything next year, he can sell the grain that he has on hand. This is insurance and it doesn't cost him a cash premium. He may also be a cattle farmer who cuts a great deal of his crop for feed and he again has good reasons for not wanting crop insurance. We are in favor of a crop insurance that is as effective as possible, that most people would want and it would be available to them on a voluntary basis. We are not in favor of forcing him into paying for something that he really doesn't want in the first place.

The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) mentioned that a study was proposed on compulsory crop insurance. Now, we know from experience that in the minds of the NDP a study means the same thing as an accomplished fact. I can give you a very good example of this and it has been mentioned before. An independent study a few years ago in Eastern Canada apparently suggested that two out of three farmers should leave the land. Now, in spite of the fact that this didn't refer to Saskatchewan at all and was not in any way backed by the Federal Government, the NDP apparently believe this was Government policy and I am sure all of the Members opposite believe this because they said this many times during the election campaign. Therefore, we can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that a study on a compulsory crop insurance plan by the NDP would certainly lead to compulsory crop insurance. We as Opposition Members are opposed to this recommendation and we make no apology for it. Simply a basic difference in philosophy between the NDP Members and the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and myself. The NDP feel that compulsory crop insurance should be rammed down the throats of farmers in a compulsory manner. We feel that farmers should have the freedom to choose whether they want crop insurance or whether they don't want crop insurance. We believe in as much freedom as possible for farmers and as little compulsion as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to refer to one other reservation that we had. This has to do with The Family Farm Protection Act.

This is the recommendation that debts under the protection of The Family Farm Protection Act be referred to the Provincial Mediation Board with the necessary procedure to delay or allow negotiation and so on. We objected to this recommendation. The reasons we did were the debts under the protection of The Family Farm Protection Act are very, very far-reaching. This was any debt incurred in the past that a farmer hadn't yet paid, he didn't have to liquidate it this year. We feel that people, both the debtor and the creditor, whoever they are in this case, expected that July 31st next year, somehow a settlement would be made and they would have to account for this debt and that they were making plans on this basis. In putting this recommendation in, we felt that this did away with this implied agreement between the creditor and the debtor to have a settlement on July 31st. In other words, it has the effect of extending The Family Farm Protection Act and we have had assurances from the Attorney General and others that The Family Farm Protection Act would lapse on July 31st. If this recommendation was followed, it would simply be an extension because it says that debt and this means all debts, of course, under the protection of The Family Farm Protection Act be referred to the Mediation Board and so on. This means that as of July 31st, the Credit Union, the implement dealer, the neighbour farmer whoever it is, has no assurance that he is going to get paid. Also the person who owes the money doesn't have to make the necessary arrangements to look after this debt. This leaves the matter up in the air as far as they are both concerned and I think to the disadvantage of both parties.

There is also some ramification to this recommendation that may not be realized and this happens I suppose with an Act like The Family Farm Protection Act. It refers, as I mentioned, to all debts. I had a farmer come to me about three weeks or a month ago and he had a title to a quarter section and there was caveat against it put on by a windmill company some 30 years ago or more. He went in to borrow the money on this title and, of course, the title was not clear. He ran into great difficulty getting this caveat off because under The Family Farm Protection Act, all debts were in abeyance for this year and he had a bit of a problem. There are cases such as this where the intent of the Act certainly didn't mean to cover this type of thing but it has put farmers in an awkward position.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are other Members who wish to speak on the report of the Committee and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.