

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
48th Day

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING IN THE COMMONWEALTH

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. I have a copy in my hand of that fiercely independent journal, The Commonwealth . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— . . . and one of the pages, Mr. Speaker, I find practically the entire page filled up with Government advertising from the Public Service Commission and the Saskatchewan Government Office. I should like to ask the Premier if he considers this is not a conflict of interest and how much this has cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to support the New Democratic Party?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— With respect to the second one, I frankly cannot tell him the cost of those advertisements, but that information can be obtained if the Member would like to put a question on the Order Paper.

With respect to the first one, I think the answer is that there is no conflict of interest. That newspaper has a circulation of over 20,000 throughout the entire Province of Saskatchewan. It goes to people who are interested in political affairs and who might make very excellent employees for the Government of Saskatchewan. I may say that we will similarly offer advertisements to any other political newspaper which has any regular publication date. As I recall it, Mr. Speaker, a similar offer has been made to another journal known as the Saskatchewan Liberal.

MR. MacDONALD:— On a supplementary question. I should like to advise the Premier that the Saskatchewan Liberal Party does believe it is a conflict of interest and will have nothing to do with Government advertising whether they are in Government or out of Government.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 19 - EXCESSIVE PROFITS EARNED BY DRUG INDUSTRY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):

That this Assembly expresses its serious concern at the

excessive profits being earned by the drug manufacturing industry, and urges the Saskatchewan Government to implement at an early date, a program to reduce the price of pharmaceutical drugs to the Saskatchewan public. Such a program should be administered by an agency capable of:

(a) Working in co-operation with representatives of the pharmacists and physicians in preparing a formulary of core drugs, and in assuring the quality of drugs handled; (b) Issuing tenders for core drugs on a bulk basis; (c) Distributing, if necessary, drugs to retail pharmacies and hospitals throughout the province; (d) Securing alternative sources of supply of certain pharmaceutical preparations if bulk tendering does not result in significant savings to the public.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health):— Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) introduced a motion expressing the concern of the New Democratic Party over the high cost of prescription drugs. I hope that all Members of this House recall that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University suggested that what we might do here in Saskatchewan to control the cost of prescription drugs could well lead to further action by provincial governments throughout Canada. Saskatchewan is likely to set the pace for Canada in helping people to obtain their prescription drugs at reasonable costs. I too should like to add my voice to the mounting chorus of concern over the question of the high cost of prescription drugs. This burden falls particularly heavy on our older citizens and on those with young families, yet no individual in our society is exempt. No individual knows what bills for prescription drugs he might face in the near future. No individual knows how large these bills might be. It is with this in mind that the New Democratic Party has set its objectives clearly. We shall take steps to make prescription drugs available at reasonable costs to our citizens.

Members should recall how the Member for Saskatoon University related the steady process of takeover bids by American interests within the Canadian pharmaceutical industry. Recall the fantastic price differentials which were quoted between products of the same nature. These price differentials are astonishing and should never be forgotten by this House.

In case some Members of the House overlooked an article in the Leader-Post of April 27th of this year, I should like to read parts of the Canadian Press news release headlined, "Drug List for Doctors shows Price Variances." This news release is taken from an article in the April issue of RX Bulletin which is published by the National Health and Welfare Department. The Bulletin's editor is Dr. Carl Boyd, Chief of the Drug Information Division. The article states that for a routinely prescribed antibiotic drug, the manufacturers' suggested price to doctors and druggists for the same quality drug can vary from less than two cents a capsule to more than 16 cents a capsule. This is a differential of 800 per cent for the same drug. The article further states, and I quote:

This month's list shows doctors and pharmacists that approved drugs are available from manufacturers at prices ranging from \$1.75 for 100 capsules

May 2, 1972

(1.8 cents each) to \$16.80 for 100 capsules or (16.8 cents each). If druggists buy in lots of less than 100, the cost per capsule may be still higher, with one brand coming in lots of 30 costing 18.8 cents each.

Druggists who buy in large quantities get slightly better prices for every brand of Tetracycline, the list showed. For example, one capsule was available for 1.1 cent each if ordered in lots of 10,000.

From another source we discovered that for a commonly used tranquillizer in Canada, the price from one source of supply was \$40 per 1,000 pills, while another source of supply could provide a similar product at \$2 per 1,000 pills. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that this is a differential of 2,000 per cent for similar products.

Members may wish to study at their leisure the bar charts that I have had distributed just a few minutes ago. These bar charts illustrate the range in price of certain prescription drugs in Canada for the years 1971 and 1972. These bar charts were prepared from the costs listed in the latest edition of the Parcost Manual made available to us by the Ontario Government. This is the manual comparative drug index and Parcost prescriptions at reasonable costs. This is a publication that is issued by the Government of Ontario.

If you examine the charts you will find that a common number of frequently prescribed prescription drugs have considerable variations in their prices. I should point out, one illustration from these bar charts. If you look at the drug Chlordiazepoxide with a 25 milligram strength, the price per capsule varies from two cents to 9.9 cents. And yet all of these preparations accepted by the Ontario Government have been subject to the uniform tests of quality.

Mr. Speaker, our Government places very heavy emphasis on assuring that drugs of the highest possible quality are provided to the people. With this in mind, I draw your attention to a number of other interesting features in the drug industry.

The drug industry has increasingly stressed its concern over the quality, equivalence and bio-availability. The implication is that the drug industry is the best able group to guarantee these characteristics in the public interest.

I should like to quote an example of how two major drug companies approach the public interest question. The example that I am quoting concerns the toxic drug called Phenacetin. The Frosst Company some time ago changed the formulation of this very wide selling tablet 222s. The toxic component Phenacetin was dropped from this preparation because it had been noted to have toxic effects upon the kidneys. While the Frosst Company is removing Phenacetin from their preparation for safety's sake, the Bristol Company continues to promote this preparation in their drug Tetrex APC, in which an antibiotic is combined with Phenacetin. Here we have a major corporation which, on its own promotion literature that I am holding here, there is no indication or reference to the toxic side effects of Phenacetin which has been recognized by another drug company. Surely there is an inconsistency in this regard.

Incidentally the complimentary promotional package of 100

tablets of 222s which, again I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House and I am holding it in my hand, has been distributed to the profession by this particular manufacturer. It is my understanding that the distribution list would be somewhere in the order of 40,000, one wonders who pays this promotional gimmick that the company is using and which you and I have to pay a \$2.85 retail price.

Much stress has been laid on the cost of promotion of products in the drug industry. Consider this particular advertising gimmick of the Roche Company in their promotion of their preparation Dalmane. I have the particular pill with me here. Their literature that accompanied this particular drug was sent out to all the people in the drug distribution industry and I presume as well all physicians. You will notice the glossy illustrations and the fancy paper that has been used. The literature sent to the profession by the Roche Company states that prior to treatment with Dalmane the group of people classified as insomniacs, require between 20 and 35 minutes before they get to sleep. The use of the drug is to improve upon this unusual length of time it takes to fall asleep. Normal sleepers require 15 to 20 minutes before they can get to sleep. While Dalmane may speed up the possibility of some people going to sleep, the promotional literature does not make very clear the difference between normal sleeping and abnormal sleeping. Personally I find this type of promotional literature misleading to say the least.

There is certainly a lesson here. The medical profession and the pharmacy profession, no less than any other individuals like you and I must closely study the glossy promotional literature it receives about drugs. Anyone who takes the time to closely study the promotional literature will develop a great uneasiness about the reality of the benefits attributed to many other drugs.

Mr. Speaker, look at this other piece of literature that I have with me. a list of 359 drugs where the Food and Drug Administration in the United States has found lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness or it has found an unfavorable benefit-to-risk ratio. Here is an article which exposes that some 359 drugs that have been on the market for a number of years are virtually ineffective. Yet, for many years drug companies who are making these particular drugs have exploited the people and have promoted the use of these particular drugs. You may say that these are only a few companies. You may also say that the tendency of the pharmaceutical industry to consolidate power in the hands of fewer and fewer American corporations is not something that affects the average citizen. Let me give you another example of how wrong this thinking may be.

I have here with me a container of baby powder, I have also here a package of birth control pills. It may be of interest to the members of the House that Johnson and Johnson, the company which produces the baby powder also controls the company which produces the pills. I wonder if this is not a real conflict of interest.

I should also not like the Members opposite to believe that the pharmaceutical industry believes in free competition. The Members opposite are very strong supporters of the so-called free enterprise and free competition. I should like to refer them to a recent judgment in the United States where companies

May 2, 1972

like Pfizer, American Cyanamid, Bristol Myers, Squibb and Upjohn were fined \$100 million for price fixing in the drug Tetracycline. The Supreme Court of the United States refused to hear the case. Obviously there was no doubt about the evidence that price fixing had occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned that although The Saskatchewan Pharmacy Act was amended to permit substitution of prescribed preparation, the use of this method to reduce drug costs seems to be inadequate. Physicians and pharmacists must realize that they can play an effective part in the cost saving to the public. I believe that those physicians must make a greater effort to pass the cost advantages to the consumer through the means which has been made available to them. If this does not occur then we shall have to examine other alternatives. I must commend the former Minister for bringing in amendments to The Pharmaceutical Act to permit drug substitution. However, to this date, it does not appear that there has been very much change made in the province in as far as reducing the price of drugs even through the substitution process because while it is permitted and legal under the Act, it does not seem to have reached the people. May I remind the people of Saskatchewan that they can request their physicians to indicate that substitution is permitted on their prescriptions.

Mr. Speaker, what is to be done. The steps we shall take have been outlined in the Resolution pressed to this House by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). Let no one doubt that we shall proceed to implement the program which is briefly outlined in the Resolution. We hope that this plan will be carried out in close liaison with health professionals in the field of medicine and pharmacy within our province. We hope these professionals will co-operate with us in bringing to our citizens the advantages which we feel will flow from the rationalization of the price inequities in the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry.

I should like to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, the co-operation we have received from the Saskatchewan Medical Associations and the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association. I hope this co-operation will continue. I have had discussions also with the Hon. John Munro on this particular matter of the high cost of drugs. The Government of Canada, according to Mr. Munro, is also interested in drug costs. We shall, in the months ahead, develop a liaison with them on the quality drug assurance program. We shall also explore the possibility of bulk purchasing with the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. Of course, a very effective and speedy way to reduce the price of drugs to the people of Saskatchewan, would be for the pharmaceutical industry itself to take positive steps to reduce the cost of their preparations. Such action by the pharmaceutical industry would be welcomed by the people of Saskatchewan and I am sure the people of Canada. However, in Saskatchewan we shall take whatever steps are necessary to insure that we can bring to our citizens quality pharmaceutical preparations which will place at their disposal a key core of essential drugs at reasonable costs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Hon. Member from Saskatoon for introducing the Resolution and for so ably and eloquently describing to this House the other day the high costs and the problems that exist with the drug industry and the kind of control that the drug manufacturing industry has, and how price

fixing does exist. I hope that through the program that we are trying to introduce, as discreetly defined in the Resolution, we shall be able substantially to reduce the price of drugs. I call on the medical profession and the pharmaceutical profession to co-operate with the Government of Saskatchewan. I also invite the Government of Canada to join us in the program that we are proposing to establish which I hope will be another first for the Province of Saskatchewan and which will be of great benefit to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do wholeheartedly support the Resolution and I trust all the Members of this House will join us in supporting this particular Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park):— Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member making mention of the fact that the previous Government did make a start in this particular field. He was referring particularly to the legislation brought in a year ago permitting the substitution of generic type drugs. But in addition to that there was a start made in bulk purchasing. I don't think any Opposition could oppose the Resolution that is before us because it really is an extension of what we felt was necessary. Although I do think that some of the comparisons made by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and the Hon. Minister (Mr. Smishek) are similar to the comparisons made by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon when speaking of hearing aids. Once again we are comparing Cadillacs with Austins. I notice he was very careful though to use the word 'similar' type drugs which leaves a bit of a loophole because I think it is quite evident that there is a considerable variation in the quality of these drugs. I would doubt that a drug costing \$2 would be of the same quality as one costing \$40, but such may be the case and if it is the case then we are even more justified in moving in this direction.

I think one of the big difficulties encountered by other governments that have tried to make inroads in this area, this problem area, is the question of the quality control and I heard no mention made by the Government to your right suggesting that they were going to enter this field. I believe there is a suggestion that the Government in Ottawa stands ready to move in this direction. Ontario has a very worthwhile setup in this regard. Unless there is a policing of the quality of these drugs I fear that there could be difficulties.

I gather from the comments made by the Hon. Members opposite that if one was going to point the finger at those responsible for the situation it would be graded up from the retailer. I gather that most people do not blame the corner druggist for the high cost of drugs but the distributor certainly is suggested as a guilty one, certainly in the Resolution and generally speaking the finger is pointed at the manufacturer. As long as the manufacturing of drugs is limited by the decreasing number of manufacturers, I doubt whether any government is going to adequately overcome the problem and it would seem that the only other approach would be for the governments or a government to get into the manufacturing business. I think this would involve probably as many headaches as we have currently.

May 2, 1972

Mr. Speaker, there is one reference made in here in Section (c) of distributing, if necessary, drugs to retail pharmacies. I would gather from that the distribution within our own province is questioned as a contributor to the high costs of drugs otherwise this wouldn't be necessary. It would seem to me that the druggist should be able to do as well in their bulk purchasing from the distributors currently in existence as they could by purchasing from a government. I would regret to see the Government get into this particular field unless it was absolutely necessary and the advantages of so doing were really worthwhile.

Section (d) suggests securing alternative sources of supply. I notice the two speakers did not dwell on this point particularly and if they wish to so do in closing debate I should like to have them suggest where these alternative sources are other than the possibility of the Government getting into the manufacturing business.

Mr. Speaker, with these slight reservations the Opposition will be supporting the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie):— Mr. Speaker, just a very few brief words on this particular Resolution. The minister of Health earlier in his remarks referred to the Rx tests as being tests to insure uniform quality of drugs. I should just like to say a brief word or two on this particular point. It certainly isn't my intention to defend the major drug manufacturers. I think first of all they perhaps don't deserve all the criticism levelled against them in this debate and on other occasions when this question has been discussed. On the other hand there is no doubt they are very far from being lily white in the matter of drug costs, particularly the major firms which do a good deal of the research work which eventually result in many of the new products we see on the drug market. But to compare prices alone on some of these drugs is not really a complete and fair comparison. Drugs can be identical chemically, they can measure up to all of the food and drug tests that are demanded of them as far as chemical formulation is concerned and as far as purity of product is concerned, but their actual action in the live creature, be it human or animal or whatever, may vary and vary quite considerably. The rate at which you will get a blood level of drug, the maintenance of that blood level, and how the drug will behave once taken, can vary quite considerably. We certainly have this experience with respect to many of the drugs we use in cattle practice and hog practice and they are identical to the ones we use in humans, and there is very definitely a variation. In other words this drug is not necessarily the comparable drug or the best drug and again I don't say that it is true that the highest one is necessarily that much better. But while they will measure up all of them to the food and drug tests and the requirements of them as far as the Food and Drug Director is concerned, there is on occasion a wide variation in how these drugs perform once given. I think this point should be borne in mind by the Government when they proceed to implement some of the recommendations of this Resolution. I certainly have no quarrel with the broad, general intent of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I will be supporting the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. K.R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park):— Mr. Speaker, I have just a few remarks on this Resolution. I could preface my remarks by reminding myself and the Members that Mr. George Orwell was a socialist and he spent his life criticizing and demonstrating flaws in the socialist argument. As a result he was not much loved by some socialists because they are not happy about people who point out defects in their argument. And they somehow feel that any pinpointing of defects or flaws is in fact a total opposition to the position, and that's the kind of thing that we have generally seen in this House during this entire Session. At the risk of clouding the issue I should like to say that in many cases I support positions taken by the NDP Government except in two or three areas: for one, the way they carry things out. They have generally been sloppy and excessive in the things they have done. They have been poorly motivated and in some cases they have attributed to use support of interests which we do not support, support for persons we do not support, and I have to tell the Members opposite that we do not, I do not support oil companies and I am sure that that isn't the position of our party. We are not here to represent the mortgage companies.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! I think the Member is getting away from the motion that is before us.

MR. MacLEOD:— We do not support the drug companies, as was indicated by the Hon. Minister when speaking to this motion. Mr. Speaker, what I am doing is demonstrating that this is an extension of what we have heard throughout this whole Legislature. I can assure the Hon. Minister that I was not elected for the purpose of supporting free enterprise among the drug companies where it involves price fixing which results in fines of any \$100 million. I have totally opposed that kind of conduct in the past and will do so in the future.

MR. ROMANOW:— . . . oppose the consumer.

MR. MacLEOD:— I assume that when these things are attributed to us, they are through either dishonesty in politics or ignorance of our true position.

MR. ROMANOW:— You are hurting my feelings now.

MR. MacLEOD:— In speaking, however, in support of the Resolution, if we could get by the politics, I should like to suggest that when the Government does not have any real plans, or their plans are hazy or ill defined, but nonetheless desires to have credit for doing something when nothing is in fact being done, it puts a resolution on the Order Paper. I have learned, particularly having regard to the hearing aid type of resolution, that what the NDP puts in a resolution in the Order Paper does not always reflect itself in their policies when they actually put it into effect. My purpose in speaking today is to assure the Government that I should like to see them do two things, perhaps three . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— Resign.

MR. MACLEOD:— Well, resign would be a good forward step. The first thing I should like them to do is to proceed as early as possible with the kind of thing set forth in the Resolution. Secondly, co-operate as they have indicated they are doing with the Federal Government in the two plans mentioned by the Hon. Minister (Mr. Smishek). Thirdly, co-operate with other governments in a total study of the drug picture. I have not heard them tell us where the studies, where the experiments are done or produced that produces new drugs. Where do most of the new drugs come from? Do they come from the profits of the drug companies? Or do they come from universities paid for and supported by tax dollars. If in fact most of the new drugs come from the profits of drug companies, then we must be careful that we do not eliminate the profits of the drug company. On the other hand, if in fact the majority of the new drugs are produced by universities and government sponsored agencies then we can take a far harder line when it comes to the purchase of drugs at low rates. Now I encourage the Minister to carry on with the program. He will receive our total support, hopefully we can get this out of the political arena and do something good for the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. J. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University):— Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). The Member is advising us to rise above the crass level of politics, I'm sure that this Hon. Member will remember his resolution on hearing aids which was introduced into the House approximately two months ago. Just to refresh the memory of the House might I remind them that it was a resolution taken verbatim from a resolution introduced in 1970 by the New Democratic Party when in opposition, and it might be said that there was some small element of politics . . .

MR. GARDNER:— Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, has the Member the right to be referring as he is to a previous debate that has been finished in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:— The point is well raised and that's a point that I raised with the Member who previously spoke, that he was getting away from the motion and bringing in subject matter when he referred to other motions and I hope the Hon. Member who is now speaking will stay strictly to the motion and in closing the debate he cannot introduce new topics he can only reply to what has been said by others.

MR. RICHARDS:— Precisely, Mr. Speaker, I was merely replying to the remarks that were introduced by the Hon. Member from Albert Park. I think the point is sufficiently well made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me refer to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). The Hon. Member alleged that in introducing this Resolution, showing the New Democratic Party's concern to act on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan in lowering the price of drugs, that there was a certain analogy with hearing aids, because both instances involved the use of the Government as public entrepreneur. As a small personal contribution to the Member for Whitmore Park, I

should like to advise him of a hearing aid which the Saskatchewan Government has recently obtained via the good services of Mr. A.M. Nicholson on his recent trip to the Republic of China. This hearing aid in China retailing for the price of \$25 has performed, according to the tests by experts whom we have consulted, as well as models which market for \$125 to \$150. Should the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park ever need to replace his hearing aid at a slightly more economical cost, Mr. Speaker, we'll be delighted to put him on to some more economical, alternative sources of supply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that Bill No. 109 - An Act relating to the Payment of Succession Duty be now read a second time.

MR. G.B. GRANT (Whitmore Park):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly on this Succession Duty Bill.

Listening to some of the debate that has gone on in the House I sometimes wonder if the Bill shouldn't be renamed and called the Succession Act rather than the Succession Duty Act.

I mentioned earlier when speaking in the House, I suggested that businesses and people were getting a little tired of the Governments taking larger and larger bites of the income dollar and one must remember that when the Members of this House leave in this particular

Session that governments of various levels will take about \$3,300 of your \$9,000 if one can believe the rate of 37 per cent tax bite by various levels of government which exists today.

The Premier admitted that this was discriminatory legislation because he said that the Bill would only hit less than 5 per cent of the people. In other words, it would hit the more successful people in the province, and looking at the economy of the province at the present time it is my feeling that we need more of these 5 per cent people rather than less. In many cases they have been the job makers in the province and the producers of employment, which is pretty important for the economy of this Province. I question whether now is the time we should be making Saskatchewan less attractive for not only people to stay here, but for people to come to Saskatchewan. We don't have many of the amenities that other places have. Our winters are a little too severe for the older types anyway. The other day, I know, when the wind was blowing viciously that even the Members on the other side had some reservations about the climate of this country. We are so dependent on agriculture that that is another feature which makes Saskatchewan a little less attractive than elsewhere. The isolation of our small population and the lack of scenery particularly in the southern part of the province, doesn't make Saskatchewan that attractive as compared to some other places in Canada. The Premier suggested that we would be following the example of other provinces, with the exception of Alberta. I think this is a pretty poor excuse

May 2, 1972

to use for such a piece of legislation. This is a good opportunity to be a leader rather than a follower and help to make Saskatchewan a little more attractive.

In case the Members opposite don't feel that a feeling is developing in Saskatchewan, I don't think it is particularly restricted to Saskatchewan, but it is certainly quite evident here, among people with, I maintain, modest businesses, a business doing a million dollars a year are representing an investment of \$200,000 or \$300,000, to me is a very modest business because there are a good many of them around.

But I'm reminded of a business of this calibre that had been in existence in Saskatchewan for 50 years, I guess. Started by an individual employing some 20 odd people, and the present owner a short time ago decided that for various reasons he wanted to dispose of the business. The local people involved in this type of business, when I say local I'm speaking of provincially involved, were either not willing to pay the price that he was asking, or not able to pay it, I'm not sure which, but I do know the business was disposed of to a non-Canadian, non-American company. The staff of 20 is now reduced to 4, largely because of transfer of various activities of the business to Winnipeg, and I'm speaking of bookkeeping, statistical records and the likes and the profits from that business are now not only leaving Saskatchewan but they are leaving Canada and they are not going to the United States. This was brought about I'd say largely because of the lack of an attractive economic climate in Saskatchewan and this particular individual decided to dispose of the company.

I suppose it could be argued that with or without succession duty taxes he would have done exactly what he did. I think this is right because it occurred when the succession duty tax wasn't on, but certainly the addition of the succession duty tax is not going to lessen this tendency and I think that anyone in his older bracket anyway, particularly, who wants to get his estate in a more liquid form in preparation for death duties, that more and more the tendency will be to sell out to the larger corporations or to off-shore corporations as happened in this case.

The Government, opposite, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier particularly, seem to have adopted the role of playing Robin Hood and their endeavors seem to be directed against the ambitious, the thrifty. Their attitude is to leave your savings to the Government, they know how to spend it more wisely than your beneficiaries. One thing that I think it is going to do and this is certainly evident already, is that it may produce a temporary prosperity because a lot of people are taking the attitude, and I don't think the Members opposite can deny it, that every day in every way people are saying let's spend it before the Government takes it. And the Government will look after us in our later years if we find that we overspent.

I don't think that there is any doubt that the Members opposite will feel that I came up in the old school, and I certainly did. I was brought up to believe that it paid to be thrifty and provide for your old age and hopefully provide for your children, help them get started. But that doesn't seem to be the attitude nowadays and it applies to a lot of people, not just restricted to the Members opposite, that the attitude seems to be drink and be merry for tomorrow the Government is

is going to look after us.

The Governments continue to take a larger and larger bite to the point where recently the Executive Director of the Canadian Manufacturers Association was urging Ottawa to get busy and reduce the corporate tax as Mr. Benson suggested. A recent article coming from the MacMillan Bloedel Corporation in British Columbia pointed out that even a corporation the size of that one isn't a bottomless pit for Government bites to be increasing in size. One only has to look at the total tax bite of Governments in 1968 which was 34 per cent, 1971 - 37 per cent, and increase of some 3 per cent in three years and the 37 per cent doesn't include the capital gains tax which is now in force, which are higher than United States, are higher than Australia, are higher than Japan, only Sweden and the United Kingdom seem to outrank us by a few percentage points and at the rate we're going it won't be too long before we catch up to them.

Governments, in general, and this Government in particular seem to be hell-bent to make people more and more dependent on the government. The Premier went back to the stone-age to justify the Succession Duty Act. He mentioned the Hon. Walter Scott back in 1905 when tax on estates was acceptable, but one must remember, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1905 we certainly lacked in multiplicity of taxes that we have at the present time and I believe income tax only came in in the '20s. There certainly was no capital gains tax and there was no sales tax and all the other multiplicity of taxes that we have at the present time.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that you can look on any tax, including the proposed succession duty tax, in isolation. It's the total tax that counts and in this particular case, in spite of what the Premier says, it is a duplication of the capital gains tax, because it's another bite by government.

If the total tax take of governments was not at such a high level, I suppose one could justify an estate tax. But when one realizes that the concentration of wealth in Saskatchewan is pretty small compared to other provinces, that actually the income from that succession duty tax is going to be pretty infinitesimal compared to the total revenue of the Provincial Government, then it should be reconsidered.

We are sitting in this position with a vacuum created in Alberta right next door to us and governments seem to be so quick to rush into these vacuums. One of the arguments used is that the Federal Government has vacated the estate tax deal, therefore, we must rush in to fill this vacuum. Well one must remember that capital can very easily rush into that vacuum in Alberta where there is no impact by this particular tax. The bulk of the discussion in the House has been directed to the farm establishment and that \$200,000 would probably look after the average farm in Saskatchewan, but one must remember that this also is going to hit the businessman and a \$200,000 investment in a business is not in my opinion, high. It's below the . . . a good many . . . I would say it's below the average of the province, but the type of business that is an employer of labor, generally speaking, has a larger investment than this.

The Premier suggested that any business worth \$350,000 which might be taxed to the tune of about \$50,000 and have six years

May 2, 1972

to pay, if they weren't able to pay \$6,000 to \$8,000 a year to pay off that succession duty tax it was a pretty poor business. Well, I can tell him that there are quite a few businesses in Regina right now, particularly those involved in real estate, I doubt very much whether the owner of some buildings on Broad and on 11th Avenue and on Scarth Street in Regina, are realizing a profit of \$6,000 to \$8,000 on \$300,000 investment, in those buildings, because at the present time they're largely vacant and they are not revenue producing at all. In fact, they are liabilities because of the heavy increase that has taken place in municipal taxation.

The Premier also suggested that the Government's tax share of the capital gains tax would be considerably less because of the different formula than the share of the estate tax and this is questionable too because I don't think anyone knows as yet what the income to Ottawa is going to be on the capital gains tax and 30 per cent of that capital gains tax to the Province may be well worthwhile. I visualize that this is going to be a large source of revenue to the Federal Government replacing the revenue that was formerly gained through the Estate Tax. But this doesn't indicate to me that there is a vacuum or vacating of the area that should be so quickly filled by the provinces.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's impossible to estimate the potential value to the economy of the province on investment spin-off of capital funds kept here in the province for investment. It is a source of potential job creating and one that we certainly need in Saskatchewan and we should certainly be encouraging it. It has been suggested that most of the estates in Saskatchewan are in the agricultural area and with all the present farming problems I wonder why we want to give that industry any additional headaches by making them provide for succession duty taxes when the arm has to be sold or disposed of at the death of the owner.

I mentioned earlier that the Succession Duty Tax will certainly encourage sales of individually owned businesses in order to pay the tax or to make the estate more easily portable to the Province of Alberta and the purchasers will be large corporations and in all likelihood foreign to Saskatchewan.

One thing that it is going to do is certainly step up the employment of lawyers and tax experts and auditors and accountants, because for every tax that is imposed there is always somebody willing to try to find ways and means of avoiding it. I predict that this is exactly what is going to happen in this particular case. And when one considers the potential revenue at about \$2.5 million I question the wisdom of that when one considers the administrative costs plus the possible impact on investments here in Saskatchewan.

Why is it so bad to have this wealth passed on? Generally speaking it is employed, it is producing, and if it is not producing in Saskatchewan it is invested in shares of companies that are employers of labor. A great portion of it might even be invested in Government bonds. But for some queer reason the Government seem to feel that they could do a lot better with your money than you can yourself. Even though they have taken 50 per cent of the corporation profits, while you have been earning the money, they are now suggesting that when you pass on the remainder of those profits they have to take another

bite still.

It is quite evident that governments across the country are a little nervous about the estate tax or the succession duty tax. In Manitoba there is a great shuffling around of exemptions several times. In New Brunswick it is up to, I believe, half a million dollars now and in Nova Scotia they are talking about withdrawing the tax in 1975. Here in Saskatchewan it has been raised before the Bill was even dealt with - that is the exemptions were raised. As soon as you raise the exemptions, of course, you are defeating the purpose of the Bill. I strongly feel that the tax is not warranted in light of all circumstances affecting Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't run away with the thought that anything I have to say is going to deter the Government in its headlong endeavors to try and level out the haves and the have nots in the province. This is another move on their part to do this. I would strongly suggest that the transfer of estates should at least be exempt for one generation. Pensions savings should certainly be excluded if we are bound and determined to have this type of tax. One might also suggest that insurance against the succession duty tax should also be considered exempt. For those reasons I cannot support the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. OWENS (Elrose):— Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few comments in support of this legislation and also to point out the inconsistency of the Opposition regarding the taxing of estates.

This method of raising revenue is not new as the Members opposite would want the people of Saskatchewan to believe, but only a new method of application in a field that has been vacated by the Federal Government.

This tax is levied not on the dead, but on the living, beneficiaries receiving the proceeds of the estate. The tax on beneficiaries of estates under \$150,000 to \$200,000 as the case may be is more moderate than was the case under the previous administration. The fears expressed by the Opposition that business firms will flock, in large numbers, to the tax haven of Alberta is really a reply of the old record that we hear and have heard so often about what would happen to Saskatchewan under a New Democratic Government.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you or this House of the records over the past few years. May I also point out that the move of business from one location to another is a fairly costly operation, so before sliding across the border to the loving arms of a Conservative Government, who have budgeted for a heavy deficit, it might be a clever exercise to obtain from that administration a signed and sealed document that the future governments of our sister province would continue to vacate the succession duty field.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that once embraced in the loving arms of lady Alberta, the rest of her bosom could prove to be not only an ancillary (sic) experience but also a bit exhausting, without her prior commitment that financial compensation would be forever waived.

May 2, 1972

I warn my friends opposite that the old slogan of "Look before you leap" would be a good policy before bedding down with the strange lady, if they are concerned about their estate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OWENS:— Mr. Speaker, the number of estates in Saskatchewan that will be subjected to the succession duty tax is very small and the few that are taxed were most likely those of fairly brilliant business executives.

If these people were brilliant executives, and I am prepared to admit that most of them are, they would surely know that estate planning is a very essential part of life for themselves and for their heirs. And they will have used their knowledge and expertise to distribute their investments - that is the highly taxable holdings - to their beneficiaries and others to avoid a serious succession duty.

And just how serious is the succession duty on beneficiaries of an estate of over \$150,000 or \$200,000? Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to see a survey of the beneficiaries of estates over \$200,000 as I feel sure that it would reveal that likely most of these would be in a fairly stable financial situation, simply due to the fact that they are connected to a family in such affluent circumstances. Therefore, the paying of estate tax for them would not necessarily be a burden upon them.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are strenuously opposing the succession duty legislation by pointing out the loss of revenue that could possibly result to the Province of Saskatchewan and the beneficiaries of taxable estates when this Act becomes law.

Well, Mr. Speaker, who enjoys paying a tax? I would suggest that no one does, Mr. Speaker, but let's take a look at how some estates were treated when the Liberals were the Government and I refer to the estates of the mentally ill. During their regime in office, they saw fit in their wisdom to assess charges against the estates of the mentally ill for the stay of the unfortunate person in a public institution. This practice was discontinued by the first CCF Government and again discontinued by the New Democratic Party elected last June.

Mr. Speaker, the exemptions that the Liberal Party allowed to the beneficiaries of those estates were dismally small and a really dirty disgrace to the beneficiaries and a bigger disgrace to the Liberal Party.

Their concern about the beneficiaries of the helpless and the hopeless and the unfortunate in comparison to their concern for the more affluent sector of our society really shows where their true love lies. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it clearly shows their callous, inhuman feeling for the poor, the ill, the unfortunate. Mr. Speaker, just how can anyone support a charge on the estates of those unable to protect themselves and also oppose a modest duty on the beneficiaries of taxable estates?

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party have a different set of rules, a different philosophy, a different feeling for people. The people of Saskatchewan told us last June that they agreed

with our proposals and our approaches. Mr. Speaker, the Succession Duty Act when passed will be one more step toward the fulfilling of our New Deal. I will be happy to support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):— Mr. Speaker, this Bill probably illustrates in the debate contribution by the Members opposite, probably illustrates more than anything else the total lack of understanding of the economic system in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Members opposite talk about a tax on the rich, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a tax on the rich but a tax on the ordinary average working man in the Province of Saskatchewan. This tax will not raise a sufficient amount of revenue to be worth the problems that it will create for many hard-working individuals in our province who are farmers and small business people.

This is a tax which is discriminatory. It is discriminatory because it is a tax upon people who earn their income because they are forced to own property. There is no such thing, Mr. Speaker, as being a farmer or a small businessman without owning property. I can assure you, from practical experience of all of my lifetime as a farmer, that it takes a substantial amount of investment in property to be able to earn an income which is at least remotely comparable to an income that would be earned from a good education.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have totally and completely failed to recognize the difference in this aspect of the succession duties as applied to our province. What the Members opposite are telling us is that if you are a road contractor and you have to have \$400,000 investment in order to make \$10,000 income a year, that when you die we will tax you. We will tax the heck right out of you because you have all that property and money invested in property and on the day of your death then a substantial amount of succession duties will be levied against you. They say this to the motel owners of the province, they say this to the small manufacturers, they say this to the farmers and to small business people.

Mr. Speaker, some of these people do not make large incomes. These people make incomes in the range of \$4,000 to \$9,000 per year. Sometimes in two or three years passed, for farmers, it was even less than that or possibly a break even point, and yet on their death their sons or family who have inherited the business and continue to operate it will be forced to pay substantial succession duty taxes, forced to sell parts of their farms and in many cases will find the enterprise unattractive and will likely move out.

Mr. Speaker, let's take the other side of the coin of the people in Saskatchewan that earn substantial and large incomes. This tax will not hurt those people. This tax will not hurt them one single bit. Let's take a person who puts in a substantial number of years to gain a university degree. In all likelihood he will make a very good and worthwhile income for most of his lifetime. He will have a high standard of living and he will live relatively well and produce a pension plan for when he reaches his retirement age of 60 to 65 years. Then if he has any savings, Mr. Speaker, and it is under \$50,000,

May 2, 1972

this will be exempt. If he has one son it is \$150,000 cash in the bank, this will be exempt. And then when he dies he will pay no succession duties.

If he has managed to save more than that of \$300,000, then the likelihood of moving to another province is very great. In which case he will. He may move to one of the provinces with a half a million exemption and then on his death he will again pay no succession duties.

Essentially what the Government opposite says is through succession duty tax if you make your earnings through owning property, as a farmer or small businessman or a highway contractor, we are going to tax you. But if you make a very good living all of your life through wages or salary and then decide to move out of the province, we won't bother you at all because that is all right.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is probably the odd individual in the Province of Saskatchewan who is making \$50,000 to \$75,000 by salary, wages or in a profession. This person will have an excellent standard of living, far beyond that of any farmer who likely exists in the Province of Saskatchewan. That person will pay no taxes in all likelihood. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this tax is not against the rich. This tax is against the man who may live on a very meagre income but requires property to produce that type of income.

MR. LARSON:— How did you figure that out?

MR. WEATHERALD:— Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Pelly can't figure that out he is worse than I think he is.

Mr. Speaker, I will read to you what a copy of a newspaper says about what the situation of the farmer will be in some instances. It was the Western Producer if you would care to look it up:

The irony of the situation comes more sharply into focus when one considers the example of the less sophisticated people who were too busy to get around to tax planning. These are the people . . .

And many of them, I add, Mr. Speaker, will be farmers, I am sure.

. . . who actually pay the death taxes.

Let's take an example of a farmer who works hard. He denies himself many things during his lifetime. He fits the old adage, Mr. Speaker, that many farmers live poorly and die wealthy. He lives poorly because he has been forced to save. He's been forced to invest in land and livestock and forced to invest in buildings. He dies and he has \$25,000 in property. He leaves it to his brother. And, Mr. Speaker, I might add here that under this succession duty tax that it will be a very, very severe tax on people who work in partnerships be they professional people, be they farmers, be they any type of person, that this succession duty will have a very, very substantial and difficult effect on all partnerships in our province. This person who has been forced to save, he will pay succession duty tax and yet has lived badly most of his life relative

to other people.

But we can take the example of the professional person who has a substantial income, as I mentioned earlier, he lives, very, very well. On his retirement he moves away from Saskatchewan and he pays no taxes whatsoever.

This tax is one of the worst taxes that the Government opposite could have ever dreamed of because it is not a tax against the rich. It is a tax against the ordinary, average, working type person. It is a tax which will lose jobs for the Province of Saskatchewan because the net effect of this tax will simply be an emphasis of an individual to earn his income through a salary or wages and not through property.

Mr. Speaker, the ordinary individual is not going to invest his money in property in the Province of Saskatchewan. He is going to keep, as my colleague from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) said, he's going to keep his money liquid in the bank so that he can move to another province and escape succession duty tax. If he stays in the Province of Saskatchewan, then he will have the cash available to pay those taxes with. In other words, the type of investments that we see in motel, in hotels, in highway construction, in farming, in small business manufacturing, is going to decrease. Those people are not going to invest their money in businesses on which there will be a substantial succession duty tax on their death. The net effect will be a decrease of investment in our province, decrease in jobs and a loss of work wages for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. This tax would not be as severe if the exemption would have been substantially higher as it is in other provinces. But the exemption as applied to here will hit many people in the Province of Saskatchewan. If we add up the cost of land, livestock today are worth a substantial amount as far as investment is concerned, buildings, car, any type of insurance, there will be many people in the Province of Saskatchewan who will pay some taxes when the member of the family takes it over and will not have the cash on hand to make the payment to cover the taxation required.

So, Mr. Speaker, in summary I would just simply say that there is one more move by the party opposite to supposedly get at the rich people but in their haste to try and equalize everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan they aren't getting at the rich people. They are just getting at the ordinary, average individual who has helped build up the Province of Saskatchewan. I think it's unfortunate, I think it's unwise, but I think the net effects are already being seen around the Province of Saskatchewan regarding jobs and employment and I think that there will be many more cases brought to attention of people who are not willing any more to invest the necessary capital to provide the necessary jobs and employment and economic activity in Saskatchewan that it so badly needs. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that I will not be supporting this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to this particular Bill. The remarks of the Member who just sat down are hardly worthy of comment. He proved conclusively that he hasn't read the Bill and if he has he didn't

May 2, 1972

understand it.

I should like to make one or two comments with respect to the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) and I repeat again that I have always had a considerable amount of respect for the Member for Whitmore Park but I can't say that for his arithmetic. He made the comment that the Members' indemnity of \$9,000 would attract a tax of about \$3,300. He ignores the fact that \$3,000 of that is exempt. He also ignores the fact that there are exemptions related to every individual in relation to income tax and I would be surprised if any Member in this House on his MLA indemnity paid more than \$1,000 in income tax. He is at least three times too high.

The fear psychology is what the Liberal Party uses, of course, in relation to this particular Bill. It works in other ways as well. I should just like to make reference to a letter that appeared in the Leader-Post on April 27th, and I should like to refer to this briefly for a few minutes. I am going to read and quote from it:

Saskatchewan has a Bill before this House . . .

Incidentally this individual is a Mr. Richardson, I don't know him and he lives at Semans, Saskatchewan. He calls it a bad Bill.

. . . which proposes a sliding scale including provisions that no estate of less than \$10,000 will be taxed.

That's wrong, it's not in the Bill.

But on an estate of an estimated net value of between \$10,000 and \$20,000 the tax will be 12 per cent . . .

Wrong again.

. . . rising to 45 per cent for estates valued between \$250,000 and \$300,000.

Wrong for the third time.

Who would invest \$250,000 in Saskatchewan knowing that in case of death the Government would take \$112,500 in estate tax?

Wrong for the fourth time.

And this is not the worst of it. If a farmer values his land at \$10,000 per quarter section, he would have only one quarter exempt from estate tax.

Wrong again, that's the fifth error.

His second quarter section would have an estate tax of \$1,200 . . .

Wrong again, that's the sixth error.

. . . rising with each additional quarter. Even a half section farm with unsold grain, along with equipment would be taxable for nearly \$2,000.

That's the seventh error in the letter.

Estate taxes on five or six quarters could be around \$7,000.

That's the eighth error.

Add to this the estate tax on unsold grain, livestock, equipment and personal estate, each rising in rate.

Then he makes a very significant comment.

You can make your own estimate on what the tax would be.

Obviously that's what he's doing. He concludes and he says:

I know of no other province so far that has changed exemption below \$50,000.

Well, neither has Saskatchewan. The letter is completely irrational from beginning to end and has nine errors in it in relation to estate tax.

AN HON. MEMBER:— And no editorial comment.

MR. ROBBINS:— The Star-Phoenix had a editorial called "Estate Tax Fallacy", in which they make some very irrational statements. They point out, as Members opposite continuously point out that this is going to drive people out of the Province of Saskatchewan. Drive them where? British Columbia? It has an estate tax. To Ontario? It has an estate tax. Quebec? It has an estate tax. To any of the Maritime Provinces? They have estate taxes. Admittedly Alberta creates a problem for Saskatchewan in this regard because they do not have an estate tax but I suggest any person who moves to Alberta should take into consideration the fact that they had a \$199 million deficit in their budget this year and that they are going to be looking for some revenue very shortly. I suggest estate taxes may well be one of the approaches that the Government of Alberta may take in the next two or three years.

Anyone who has studied economics at all knows perfectly well that businesses do not move basically because of taxation. Obviously it is a factor in the operation of any organization. A study of economics, however, clearly indicates that a business moving because of taxation levies, real or imagined, is highly overrated. Industries move because of diminuation of raw materials, changing markets, labor costs, technology, freight rate alterations but economic texts state flatly that taxation is not a major factor in terms of moving an industry from one province to another or from one location to another. And if they move, where would they move to? Obviously the answer of the Members opposite would be to Alberta.

Now let's take a brief look at the Succession Duty Act in relation to the rates that will be applicable. \$50,000 estates and below, no tax. Up to \$250,000, assuming it is left to a spouse, the tax works out to roughly 5½ per cent or \$13,800. If you take an estate of say \$250,000 left to preferred beneficiaries which would include sons, daughters, sons-in-law, daughters-in-law, grandchildren, grandparents, etc., the tax works out to 8.8 per cent. There isn't anyone working on a job

May 2, 1972

above the minimum tax rate in that range in relation to income tax rate. Members opposite should keep this clearly in their minds. My argument is basically that the psychology of fear is used in relation to comments on this particular Bill. After the Star-Phoenix and its editorial entitled "Estate Tax Fallacy", it had a second editorial entitled, "An Unreasonable Tax", and I am going to quote directly from it. It was the issue of April 27th. Listen to this one:

One section defines a spouse as a person who has lived with the deceased for at least five consecutive years prior to death and has been represented as spouse of the deceased. That would seem overly harsh on the recently married since the exemption for a spouse would not apply.

This is a complete misrepresentation. Now I am convinced that the person who wrote it must have known that it was a misrepresentation. Obviously the rule with regard to the five year clause is in relation to common-law relationships and this is not a moral judgment on whether the common-law relationship should apply or not but obviously the individual left after a death in that instance would suffer very severely. It has no effect whatsoever on the recently married and I suggest that the editorial writer knew that. It was simply a case of creating the fear psychology. It is the same old approach of the Liberal party opposite to try to frighten people, on the basic premise that if they are frightened badly enough they will not reason and they will do irrational things; irrational like voting for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I will very strongly support the Succession Duty Bill and I suggest to the Members opposite that I have an estate and will probably pay estate taxes, as my deskmate has as he is a successful businessman in this Province, but we have no intention of moving out of the province on that basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River):— Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition wants to remove all estate taxes or succession duties. What would be the results of that? Dr. John Bossons speaking to the Canadian Tax Foundation in Vancouver estimated that tax losses in Canada by completely removing estate taxes would be \$12.5 billion. This would mean a windfall gain to the current wealth holders equivalent to a lump sum transfer of approximately \$4.5 billion. \$4.5 billion to the wealthiest people in Canada! If we assume that Saskatchewan has only 3 per cent of the wealth of Canada, the liberals are asking us to forgive \$375 million in future taxes or give the wealthiest 2 per cent of the population a windfall gain of \$135 million. The basis for this calculation can all be found in the conference reports from the Canada Tax Foundation.

Ninety-eight per cent of us will never have to pay succession duties but Davey Steuart wants us to remove them and thereby hand \$135 million over to the wealthiest 2 per cent. Only a Liberal could have the gall to ask us to do that. They even have the gall to attack our exemptions of \$200,000 when they taxed the estates of mental patients leaving only \$10,000. However, Mr. Speaker, the wealthiest 2 per cent of the Saskatchewan population have found a champion in the House, the White Knight from Prince Albert and his courtly crew of bourbon

princes are valiantly fighting to protect them from paying taxes when they hand their wealth on to their privileged offspring. The over privileged wealthy always seem to be able to find friends in the political parties they own and in the Press they control to fight their battles for them. From one end of Canada to the other they issue the same warnings. In the Halifax Chronicle Herald of April 4th, we read concerning succession duties:

Millionaire developer Charles McCullagh of Halifax and supermarket magnate Frank Sobey of New Glasgow warned that there would be an exodus of capital from the region as a result of the taxes.

The report goes on to say:

Although none resulted New Brunswick industrialist K.C. Irving moved to the Bahamas late last year, apparently as a result of Federal capital gains taxes.

Note, Federal capital gains taxes. So it seems that the wealthy across Canada play the game of issuing warnings and that whether it be capital gains or income taxes or succession duties there are always some whose loyalty to the country or the province in which they made their money is exceeded by their refusal to pay their fair share of taxes. Why should the wealthiest 2 per cent hesitate to pay succession duties? Because they are not used to paying their fair share of any kind of tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Canadian tax laws on both corporations and individuals bear far too heavily on the lower income groups. Eric Kierans, a former Liberal Cabinet Minister, revealed that the different tax concessions granted to various types of business had the following results from 1965 to 1968: Retail merchants paid taxes on 90 per cent of their book profits; manufacturing industries paid taxes on 63 per cent of their book profits; non-metal mining paid taxes on 32 per cent of their book profits; metal mining paid taxes on 13 per cent of their book profits; the oil and gas industry paid taxes on 5.7 per cent of their book profits. This means that your small town merchant pays taxes on 90 per cent of his book profits while the giant oil and gas companies pay taxes on only 5.7 per cent of their book profits. Taking all industries together Kierans showed that the larger the corporation's assets, the lower percentage tax they paid on profits. Corporations with assets of less than \$1 million paid taxes on 76 per cent of their book profits, those with assets of \$1 million to \$5 million paid taxes on 70 per cent of their book profits, those with assets from \$5 million to \$25 million paid profits on 64 per cent of their book profits, and those with assets of \$25 million and over on only 47 per cent. We must ask ourselves this question, is it any accident that the corporate giants benefit from the Liberal tax system? Perhaps the answer lies in the complaint of the Liberal fund raisers in Ontario who earlier this year complained that it was not enough to finance on the contributions from the major 95 corporations in Canada. It is no accident that wealthy corporations receive favorite treatment from Liberal tax laws. So do wealthy individuals. The Carter Report showed that families with an income of around \$6,000 paid about 33 per cent of it in all forms of taxes. Those families with an income over \$10,000

May 2, 1972

paid only 38 per cent. But the very lowest income group, those with a family income of \$2,000 a year and less paid 60 per cent of it in taxes.

Someone may argue, but that was before Benson brought in the new income tax laws. Let's look at how those new Liberal laws will work. Let us take three men, each single with no dependents with an annual income of \$10,000 derived from different sources. The results will be as follows: The man who derived his \$10,000 from salaries and wages will pay \$2,285 in taxes; the man whose \$10,000 came from capital gains will pay \$844 in taxes; the man whose \$10,000 came from dividends from Canadian registered corporations will receive a tax credit and pay only \$193 in taxes.

The point is this, that if tax revenue does not come from succession duties then it must come from those taxes which the Liberals love, they must come from the hotdog tax, they must come from deterrent fees, they must come from the taxation of cancer patients, they must come from the taxation of the estates of the mentally ill. We have removed those taxes and instead intend to tax the wealthiest 2 per cent. Let the people of Saskatchewan know this, the Liberals oppose taxing the wealthy and it can therefore be expected that should they be re-elected they will ease the tax burden on their wealthy friends. They have promised to do it and they will place it once again on the sick and on the poor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. FLASCH (Maple Creek):— Mr. Speaker, I was a little slow getting up because I wanted to chase out another Liberal across the way. I think maybe they have given up on the Bill.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a Bill or a resolution come before this House this year, or this Session at least, that points out as acutely the fundamental difference in philosophy between the Government on this side and the Liberal Members opposite. We on this side feel that a succession duty is a just tax because it is imposed on those who are most able to pay. We realize that 90 per cent of the people will never be subjected to this tax and only a few will. While we too believe in protecting minorities, I don't think we are concerned with the same minorities as the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) is. He looks after the ones who are capable of looking after themselves.

We have plans for example such as medicare, hospitalization, certain insurance plans in which the ordinary people subsidize the rich and we don't think that there is anything wrong with reversing the process once in awhile.

MR. STEUART:— Not those . . .

MR. FLASCH:— The Members over there are very vocal and very ready to protect the elite, the 2 per cent, as I said before, whose estates at death will be subjected to the tax in question. We hope that they get their message across to the people of this Province and that at the polls next time, the people will remember who they are really protecting and will vote accordingly.

The revenue to this Province, Mr. Speaker, through succession duties isn't going to be all that great. I don't know what it will be, \$1 million or two. Certainly I think we could have increased the education and hospitalization tax a bit, maybe by one per cent, and collected seven times as much as we can this way and we wouldn't have had to take any more flack over it either. But we believe it is a just tax and it is the principle of the thing that we are worried about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART:— Not too good on . . .

MR. FLASCH:— There's little David playing on his harp again, Mr. Speaker.

The Opposition tried to whip up hysteria among the people of this Province some time back by creating a great hullabaloo concerning what they termed "the exodus of industry from this Province", because they said we were imposing succession duties. They even requested an emergency debate over the Smith-Roles Company threatening to move to Alberta. I think the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) had Degelman on the road too if I'm not mistaken. Well, Mr. Speaker, that ruckus they raised was only the old story of Chicken Little in a modern version. The sky in this case, if you know the story over there, boys, was the purported exodus of industry from the province and the leaf was the fact, if it is a fact, that one particular individual took up residence in Alberta.

I suggest that there must be certain degrees of riches on the other side, if I might say that. I imagine if you have 15 Members there are certainly going to be the rich and the poor. I think we have that on this side too. I don't blame a true, blue Liberal, if I can take a phrase that it used to describe the Tories, I don't blame a real Liberal for opposing this Bill because it would disappoint me very much, Mr. Speaker, if the real Liberals all of a sudden were in favor of splitting up what they had with somebody else. I should hate to think that I have been in politics for this long and finally elected to the Legislature and didn't know what a real Liberal was. A Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLASCH:— But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are people over there who aren't all that wealthy, there must be. And these people are just the mouthpieces for some of their friends who elected them up to this Legislature. They won't have to pay succession duties either, Mr. Speaker. They remind me, Mr. Speaker, of the dog who tries to water a tree that he can't get close enough to bark at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLASCH:— And I'll tell you as the Member before mentioned, we have some people on this side of the House who will be 'victimized' by this tax as well, but as I said before, it's the difference in philosophy.

May 2, 1972

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLASCH:— Some of the Members say that a man who has no money in the bank and who has amassed a large amount of property shouldn't be subjected to the tax or can't pay the tax for some reason. Well if a man is interested only in grabbing more and more and never putting any money aside, I can't have any sympathy for that kind.

The Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said, for example, a man with \$400,000 worth of construction machinery is going to reap a profit of only \$10,000. I wonder how many businessmen over there would be satisfied with that kind of profit? Not very many of them, I'll tell you. If we look at the amount of tax that will be paid by a family, for example, in which an estate of \$300,000 is to be divided equally among a wife and three sons, we see that the total tax on that estate will be something like less than \$46,000. That's less than 15 per cent of the total! I think many of us would be satisfied paying only that percentage of income tax.

Now, the Liberals are very concerned about leaving a legacy to their children whether they worked for it or not and they say that they oppose the tax - that they shouldn't be taxed. Fine and dandy. But how concerned were you people when it came to leaving a legacy of our resources to the future generations of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Yes, where were you?

MR. FLASCH:— They didn't mind giving away things then, inviting people in to reap the riches and go away. That was fine. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I find some of the arguments of the Opposition inconsistent and illogical and that I will support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin):— Mr. Speaker, I suppose one of the most oft quoted phrases is that I didn't intend to get into this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER:— However, under severe provocation from the last two or three speakers, I felt compelled to make my contribution. I'm not going into the basic reasons for opposing this particular Bill. I think my colleagues have made it clear that it will result in an exodus of industry from this Province. It is going to destroy initiative and has destroyed initiative. It breaks up family farms and businesses. It's a distasteful form of double taxation. But in all of this we have missed one key point in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact that you can't really tax the deceased and from the debate some of the people seem to have that impression. Fortunately, the deceased is beyond the clutches of even the socialist grave robbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER:— Mr. Speaker, it's a tax on heirs, not a tax on the deceased and it's basically a tax on women and children because they are most often the heirs. And they have also overlooked the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the heirs may have little or no assets. He or she may be living in poverty, maybe on welfare. It may be a brother or a sister or a niece or a nephew of the deceased who has no assets at all. The rates for this type of an heir are staggering, no one over there has denied this. They keep quoting what happens if it goes to the wife. There are many other types of heirs. The deceased has made his choice. He wants to leave some of his assets to them. Regardless of their financial position they are paying a staggering cost in taxes to this NDP Government. It is also, Mr. Speaker, a tax at a time when the bereaved family are ill prepared either financially or emotionally to cope with these staggering estate taxes. In many cases, they simply have no cash available to look after this. The person who has accumulated the estate, looked after it over the years, is not there to guide them at this time and they are just unable to cope with this type of a tax. It's a typical, socialist tax, Mr. Speaker. They watch a successful man all his life, tax him in every way they can. And, of course, they are not too concerned with that aspect because there are few successful socialists. They can hardly wait for a successful man to die to take some further steps to tax his heirs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious from what I have said that I am not supporting this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.L. COWLEY (Biggar):— Mr. Speaker, I have found this a very interesting debate. I watched the Liberal Opposition, if I might use the word, waffle, as they desperately searched for some kind of a basic reason to oppose this Bill and not finding one, simply said, "Well, I won't give you any basic reasons, just a couple of comments as to why I oppose it." I was interested in listening to the last speaker who said that "the socialists opposite watch a successful man and they tax him all they can all the way through his life, then when he dies they tax him again when they tax his estate." Well, we watched the Liberal and Conservative parties in Canada for years and years as they tried to help out their friends as they became successful and taxed them as little as they could. Now they want to pass on their estates without any taxation at all, directly the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) he thought he had an excellent rationale as to why we didn't need succession duties in Saskatchewan. He said, you've got to do what your neighbors do. He just happened to look to the West, he didn't bother looking to the East and he only looked at one province to the West. He didn't look at the other eight provinces which have brought in succession duties.

The Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) was somewhat contradictory. He said the NDP say we should have a succession duty because it's in eight other provinces and that's not a good reason, but the Member for Albert Park thought that because it wasn't in one other province, that was a good reason for not having it. One of them has got to be wrong. I suggest that they caucus and decide which one of them is right.

May 2, 1972

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) when he was speaking mentioned what he claimed to be a fact that the Federal tax reform was accepted on the basis of no estate taxes. Now how he read that into the scenario of events that went on when the Federal tax legislation was introduced, I don't know, because the Federal Government fairly clearly indicated that they were vacating the estate tax field in favor of the provinces and they offered - and the offer still stands - to keep collecting the gift tax and the sales tax on behalf of some of the provinces.

The other point that the Leader of the Opposition made was that the NDP will drive people away. I think all we need to do is to look at the Liberal record in the last seven years and that will answer itself.

I was interested in some of the comments also of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). He always does a good job of putting some words together with not too much substance to them. He said that the NDP say it is a terrible thing to accumulate wealth. I don't know where he found that quote. He said farmers starve all their lives to build up their assets. Now we have farmers in Saskatchewan who aren't too well off, but we don't have too many of them, I would suggest, that are starving. He says, that we want to raise up the poor by pulling down the rich.

MR. MacDONALD:— Right!

MR. COWLEY:— And he goes on and on with these kinds of statements trying to make a point which he never gets around to making.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) was also somewhat enlightening. He suggested that for the road contractor with an investment of \$400,000, making only \$10,000 in income, this would be a real problem when he passed away with his estate, because they would sell it to some American and give up. Well if he has a \$400,000 net investment I should like to suggest to the Member for Cannington, that if that fellow is any kind of a businessman he is likely to get out of there long before he dies and put his \$400,000 somewhere else.

MR. MacDONALD:— Go to Alberta . . .

MR. COWLEY:— I think the Member from Milestone has chosen to interpret that in his own way. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it 12:30.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 to 2:30 o'clock.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. M. FESCHUK (Prince Albert East):— Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Legislature, 41 students in Grade Nine and Ten from the High School at Meath Park. Accompanying them is their teacher, Mr. Georget. Mr. Speaker, these students are to be highly commended for their interest and their enthusiasm. They left Meath Park at 6:45 this morning and have travelled approximately 300 miles to the Capital

City and this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FESCHUK:— Mr. Speaker, they had experienced a problem a week ago when they were unable to obtain the use of school unit buses. They are here today by chartered Prince Albert bus and are paying their own way. I trust that their experience and their stay will be educational and enjoyable and that they will have a safe journey home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 109 - An Act relating to the Payment of Succession Duty.

MR. COWLEY:— Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words in closing. I want briefly to deal with the questions of double taxation which the Opposition has raised several times.

I think that they should bear in mind that this is a succession duty, not an estate tax. The succession duty is paid by the person who inherits the money.

MR. STEUART:— Who pays for it?

MR. COWLEY:— The other is paid for through the estate. That person has not paid any tax on the money which he inherits. To suggest that that person is being doubly taxed, I suggest, simply doesn't hold up when one examines the facts.

I was interested in listening to the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) when he said that the succession duties that are being brought in are a tax on the ordinary working man. A tax on estates of over \$150,000 are taxes on the ordinary working man, and I am sure . . .

MR. MacDONALD (Milestone):— You just said that.

MR. COWLEY:— You said it was a tax on the ordinary working man. To suggest that it is a tax on the ordinary working man, Mr. Speaker, I think is just stretching a little far and it is carrying on in the same line as the arguments that the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) quoted in reading from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party believe that income should be taxed and that people should pay taxes on the basis of their ability to pay. People who inherit large estates are better able to pay taxes than people who earn \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year and have to pay income taxes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I do not think that much new material has been raised in this debate. Accordingly I think that not many

May 2, 1972

remarks are required to close the debate.

I want to comment on one or two of the points raised. I want first to remind Hon. Members that the Act provides that taxes can be paid over a period of six years. I want to make this point clear, because there seems to be some thought in the minds of some people that the estate would necessarily have to be liquidated. It is clear that if the estate is such, the asset is such, be it a small business or farm, that it can over six years generate enough to pay the estate tax, or generate enough to pay a portion of the estate tax and be security for the balance, in a six-year period, it would not have to be liquidated.

There can, I think, be very, very few business enterprises or farming enterprises which will not, over a six-year period, generate sufficient income to pay the succession duty which is likely to be levied.

There were also some suggestions to the effect that the value of the assets would be added on to the Canada Pension Plan and other items. May I make one small point. The Bill provides that payments under the Canada Pension Plan to widows and children shall not be part of the estate. They are totally excluded for the purpose of calculating succession duties.

If, in fact, it appears that a six year period for the payment of taxes is too short - and I think it will not be - our Government and I am sure every other government - any of the other nine governments in Canada which is levying a succession duty - will look at that period.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that somehow the removal of the estate taxes by the Federal Government was part of a coherent tax reform program which did not envisage the Provincial Government entering this succession duty field. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the way it was explained time after time by the Minister of Finance of Canada. He made it clear that he did not regard the entry by the provinces into the succession duty field as any breach of faith. It is indeed difficult to see how it could be conceived of as a breach of faith when it was clear that at the time that he made that decision, three provinces were already in the field, namely, Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia and they had given no single indication that they proposed to withdraw from the field. It was clear that those three provinces intended to stay in the field and that other provinces were invited to enter the field. As the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and others have suggested, surely if this was not the case the Federal Government would not have undertaken to enter into collection agreements on behalf of the provinces. Surely the Federal Government would not in this way have been a party to an act which they would have labelled a breach of faith. The facts are that the field was vacated by the Federal Government in anticipation of the provincial governments entering the field.

It may be that the total tax collections will be modest. It seems to me that while we are asking people of very low incomes, the poor referred to by the Member for Cannington and others, to pay taxes, as we are, and we ask people with very low incomes to pay the medical and hospital family tax of \$72 a year, if they are under 65 years of age, we ask people with low incomes to pay sales taxes - while we are doing that,

Mr. Speaker, it seems to be wholly inappropriate for a Government to say to people with low incomes and with no assets, that they should pay \$72 a year or they should pay sales tax on children's clothing or other taxes that have been levied by the Provincial Government, which will no doubt, in some cases, be continued to be levied, and at the same time say to people who inherit \$150,000 or \$200,000 that they should pay no tax. It seems to me that this cannot possibly be justified on any basis of equity and any Government which believes that it has a responsibility to bring the principles of equity to a taxation system, cannot, I think, in good conscience, tax people with incomes of \$2,000 or \$3,000 a year and no assets and allow to go tax free people who inherit a quarter of a million dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Now I know that the argument presented by Members opposite is that somehow this destroys pools of capital and, therefore, it destroys the ability of Saskatchewan people and Canadian people to own business enterprises. And that argument, of course, has some validity. It is an equally valid argument against progressive income tax. It's an equally valid argument against saying that anybody should pay 50 or 60 or 70 per cent of his income as an income tax. And if the Liberal Party believes that we should not have a progressive income tax, we should not have progressive rates, that people with high income should not pay a greater percentage of their income than people with low incomes, they should say so. Because certainly this destroys pools of capital. This prevents people from becoming the owners of assets. But it seems to me that just as we believe that income tax rates should be progressive we must believe that estate taxes and succession duty taxes should be progressive in the sense that people who inherit large sums of money, half a million dollars, a million dollars, should pay substantial taxes and people who inherit \$5,000 or \$10,000 should probably pay none. It seems to me that these principles of taxation are well known and cannot be abandoned simply because it appears that in one particular instance it will work what is alleged to be hardship on someone who wants to build a fortune.

Certainly we don't object to seeing business enterprises grow but the purpose of a taxation system cannot be primarily to facilitate the accumulation of fortunes. That cannot be the principle upon which any fair taxation system is built.

And when pressed for arguments, Members opposite conjured up - and I can only use that term - conjured up instances where people who had \$400,000 in assets were getting \$8,000, \$9,000 a year return on that. I'm sure that could happen one year, or perhaps even two years. But it's simply not credible that anyone with assets of a sale value of \$400,000 with interest rates at 8 or 9 per cent so that he can readily obtain \$32,000 or \$38,000 or \$40,000 a year, if he wished, would long keep those assets in a state where they would earn only \$7,000 or \$8,000 or \$9,000 or \$10,000. The facts are that anyone who has assets with a cash value, a market value - and that's what we tax under succession duties, not any value projected into the future, but present cash or market value at the date of death - anyone who has an estate with a net market value at the date of death of \$400,000 has an earning capacity, whether he wishes to use it or not, of \$30,000, \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year each and every year into perpetuity.

May 2, 1972

The arguments with respect to double taxation are equally difficult to understand. In a sense all taxation is double taxation. Suppose I am a practising lawyer and suppose I do some legal work for Mr. Jones and I charge him \$1,000 and he pays me \$1,000 and suppose six months later he dies and he leaves me \$1,000, out of his accumulated capital gains. Somehow it is argued that one of the thousand dollar amounts - the one that I earned as a lawyer - I should certainly pay tax on, nobody argues that, but somehow on the other one they say that if I paid any tax on that it is somehow double taxation. It's a baffling argument. It's an argument which says that a man who works and earns income should pay tax on it and that's single taxation no matter where he got the money but a man who inherits from an estate shouldn't pay any tax on that because somehow it becomes double taxation. That's a totally baffling argument and one which I had hoped Hon. Members would clarify during the course of the debate. I hoped in vain.

No, Mr. Speaker, I think that the debate has shown that any fair taxation system has as a part of it succession duties or estate taxes and that we in Saskatchewan hope to have a fair and equitable tax system. That we have fully taken into account the peculiar circumstances of Saskatchewan where there are, on occasion, fairly substantial values tied up in land or in small businesses, which is difficult to liquidate, and perhaps undesirable to liquidate. We have fully taken that into account with very large exemptions of \$150,000 and \$200,000 and having, Mr. Speaker, fully taken into account the peculiar circumstances of Saskatchewan and having adopted, as I think, the appropriate stance of having an equitable tax system which has not only progressive succession duties levied by governments of every political stripe in Canada, since we believe in those principles, we are happy to support the second reading of this Bill, this Succession Duty Bill and I do so with a good deal of pride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

YEAS - 44

Messieurs

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

NAYS - 11

MESSIEURS

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Lane
Coupland	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Guy	Gardner	Grant

McPherson

Wiebe

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER:— Before the next Order is called I should like to bring to the attention of the Members that in our Press Gallery, from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is one by the name of John Warren. Today in the Speaker's Gallery, we have visiting the Legislature, his wife Mary Ann and their four children, a daughter Arlene, and the sons Greg, Stephen and Ken. On behalf of the Members I wish to welcome to the Gallery the wife and the family of one of the members of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 105 - An act respecting Trade Unions and the Right of Employees to organize in Trade Unions of their own choosing for the Purpose of Bargaining Collectively with their Employers be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are just a few remarks that I wish to make prior to moving second reading of the amendments to The Trade Union Act that is before us.

I think it is well recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the vote on second reading constitutes a vote on the principle involved and I think in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of the Trade Union Act is, I believe, lost sight of in a great number of cases, it is worthwhile to remind the Members opposite particularly, that the heart and the soul and the guts of the Trade Union Act are to be found in the third clause which says in essence:

Employees have the right to organize in and to form, join or assist Trade Unions and to bargain collectively through a Trade Union of their own choosing, and the Trade Union designated or selected for the purpose of bargaining collectively by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for that purpose shall be the exclusive representative of all employees in that unit for the purpose of bargaining collectively.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a sentiment that is shared by the vast majority of Saskatchewan people. Certainly it's a principle which is widely acknowledged by all progressive and legitimate employers in the Province of Saskatchewan and elsewhere.

I was something more than disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) who purports to be the Opposition critic for the Department of Labour in this Legislature. I think this says something about

May 2, 1972

the Party opposite when they have not been able to muster a single Member within the elected group who has had even so much as a brief flirtation with wage earners generally and the Trade Union movement in particular, when he is chosen to serve in this particular capacity.

When he spoke on second reading the other day, Mr. Speaker, he said that there was nothing new in the Trade Union Act. He said it wasn't new at all and then he went on to say that one of the major shortcomings of the Bill was the fact that it had no provision in it to deal with the most serious and the most depressing problem of all, the problem of automation. Almost immediately I informed him by note that he should be patient, that first reading or notice of motion for first reading was to be given almost immediately. This was done only to have the Member from Moose Jaw North emerge from his seat and take the position in a rather insincere harangue about the war that was being waged on business by Government, as a result of the introduction of the very thing that he complained about not being incorporated in the Trade Union Act in the first place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a Member who has displayed the most remarkable degree of irresponsibility of any Member that I think we have seen in the House and this is the Member as I indicated yesterday who holds his seat in this House under the most questionable of circumstances in the first place.

When he entered this House for the short summer session he attempted to convince us that he was attempting to rise above partisan political debate. His performance on this matter, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, has been cheap and it's been shoddy. He's indicated clearly that he has had no wish whatsoever to understand the legislation that's before him or to contribute in any way to the debate on the Bill which is before us in any kind of a knowledgeable way.

The Liberal caucus, Mr. Speaker, concluded that they were going to buck this Bill. They concluded before they had a look at this legislation that they were going to oppose it, without knowing the intent of the legislation, without having any understanding whatsoever on the contents of this Bill. The party opposite learned nothing by their experience on June 23rd last, they are still mired in the morass of the defeat on June 23rd. Chances are they will remain where they are for a very long time.

I was appalled too, Mr. Speaker, by the performance of the Leader of the Opposition in his rather belated concern for Saskatchewan's working people. I just ask you to reflect in this House for a moment on the matter of Bill 2 and the contempt which the Members opposite when they were the Government showed for working people in the Province of Saskatchewan. So I say that this latter day concern by the Leader of the Opposition just doesn't wash. There isn't a trade unionist, there isn't a teacher, there isn't a working person in Saskatchewan who hasn't become aware of the hostility of the Liberal Party towards working people generally. It was this attitude that caused the former Member for Elrose to break away as it were from his old colleagues his former colleagues and to suggest that the Liberal Party had about it a very distinct and anti-labor bias. No doubt this led to the formation of the 171 Group which I understand the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) was supposed to support, at least was reported

to have been supporting. If the Member for Moose Jaw North has had any flashes of progressive thought they certainly didn't manifest themselves when he was on his feet the other day.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) opposed a method of conducting a strike vote which he suggested was somehow unfair because that strike vote provides that a majority of those voting shall make that democratic decision. I know a few situations where this is not the case, Mr. Speaker, the majority of those voting make the determination of the action that is to be taken. If Members opposite know of particular circumstances where majority rule is not the true indication of the democratic process then I would be more than happy to hear from them. Furthermore, I want to point out that any trade union which would be so foolhardy as to call a work stoppage without the solid support of the membership would be ineffective and they would not survive for very long. I think that has to be recognized clearly.

A good deal has been said, Mr. Speaker, about consultation or the lack of consultation as it relates to the introduction of the piece of legislation that's before us. I just want to indicate that the door on my office swings inward, Mr. Speaker. I am a very available person to the extent that I have had the opportunity of meeting at least on three occasions even with Ralph Purdy in the last nine months. I have had the opportunity to consult with a large number people. I want to point out too in this same connection, Mr. Speaker, that the previous administration takes a great deal of pride, or at least they mention with regularity that they established the Murchison Committee on labor relations in the construction industry. It will be remembered that the Murchison Committee met in July, 1968 and that Committee was instructed to study all aspects of labor relations and to make recommendations concerning such legislative changes as were indicated. The Committee was made up of three union representatives, three management representatives, under the chairmanship of C.K. Murchison who had been a former Deputy Minister of Labour. The Committee held a number of hearings considering points of view of labor and management and of a number of public organizations concerned with the vital and sensitive question of labour relations. Formal briefs were invited in a series of widely publicized advertisements in order to provide individual associations with an opportunity to suggest course of action which should be followed by the Committee in reaching its conclusions. As a result, Mr. Speaker, nine organizations submitted briefs to the Murchison Committee, four of which were management groups, the Employers' Association of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Construction Association, the Saskatchewan Mining Association, and a large private employer also. Strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, neither the Chamber of Commerce or the Saskatoon Personnel Association appeared to be interested enough to prepare a brief for this particular purpose at that time. And I mention this fact, Mr. Speaker, because a number of recommendations of the Murchison Committee Report are incorporated in this piece of legislation that is under discussion today. Accordingly it is apparent that management groups were given a clearly defined opportunity to make their comments known when the Committee was engaged in its deliberations as late as 1968. One is inclined to wonder, Mr. Speaker, why anyone should suggest that these hearings should be duplicated again.

MR. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw No.):— . . . four years ago.

MR. SNYDER:— I would wonder why anyone would suggest that these hearings should be duplicated again with the waste of time and the waste of public money in this connection when we have had recent reports. On the subject of the Murchison Committee, Mr. Speaker, of particular significance is the fact that the recommendation of the Committee were completely ignored by the previous administration despite having been created by that administration, by the Members who sit opposite when they were the Government. Moreover some of the ill advised and restrictive amendments to the Trade Union Act which were passed in 1966 and in 1969 were criticized by the Murchison Committee. Until now the provisions in question remained unchanged. They ignored the findings of the Murchison Committee. So don't talk to me about consultation. Consultation is a pretty hollow and a pretty impossible undertaking if no more attention is paid to a committee report than you people paid to the Murchison Committee. After it was filed it was put on a shelf in order that it could gather dust.

Just let me highlight a few of the provisions of the new Act which were advocated by the Murchison Committee. The Committee urged that the number of the members of the Labour Relations Board be reduced to five from seven members. A number of these recommendations are achieved in the amendments to the Trade Union Act which is before us at this present time. These objectives are achieved by Bill 105. The Committee proposed that an executive officer to the Labour Relations Board be appointed with the authority to issue interim certification orders to speed up the certification procedure. This will be done. This is embodied in the Bill which is before us. The report of the Committee also suggest that an adjudication mechanism be developed to accommodate the investigation and mediation of unfair labor practice allegations without the necessity of waiting for Labour Relations Board hearings. This is provided in the Bill, complete with an appeal process, Mr. Speaker. In addition a number of legislative changes are included in the Bill which are consistent with the recommendations of the Murchison Committee that compulsion of any kind should be avoided in the bargaining process and that no legislative obstacles to free collective bargaining should be imposed. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the present Bill embodies the suggestion by the Murchison Committee that the more restrictive of the 1966 and the 1969 amendments to the Act should be repealed. This would include such clauses as the hot cargo section and the 30-day strike provision.

It seems reasonable to suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the Trade Union Act was not amended following the submission of the report of the Murchison Committee because a more viable alternative was available. That alternative in the eyes of Liberals opposite was evidently supposed to be Bill 2, which was extended to the construction industry in 1970 and to all employment at the first session of the Legislature in 1971. The legislation represented a new hard-line approach which was going unilaterally to produce industrial peace according to Liberal spokesmen.

Let me ask you just how effective was Bill 2 in accomplishing that particular objective? Did its iron-fisted methods abolish work stoppages in accordance with its announced intent? I hardly think that, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact the number of man days lost in strikes under provincial jurisdiction in Saskatchewan reached approximately 55,000, the highest in

the history of the province. During that year, Mr. Speaker, 111 working minutes were lost in strikes for every single wage and salary earner in the Province of Saskatchewan. Time lost in strikes in Saskatchewan in 1970 increased by 68 per cent over the 1969 total. Over the same period, man days lost in strikes in Canada as a whole actually declined by 16 per cent. I think for a Liberal to look back on that performance it resembles the worst kind of a possible performance that can be imagined. During the last six complete years in office the previous New Democratic Party, prior to 1964, the average annual time loss attributable to strikes in Saskatchewan amounted to just under 6,000 man working days. During the last six complete years when the former Liberal Government was in power the average annual time lost was more than five times greater, reaching the staggering level of 32,000 man days. These statistics, I submit, Mr. Speaker, cause any statement that the Trade Union Act will lead to a worsening of industrial relations climate to have somewhat of a hollow ring. The truth of the matter, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Labour will be continuing to extend the process of consultation with management groups as well as with other sectors of the community as part of the on-going review and assessment of labor legislation. We are ready and willing to meet with management representatives at any time to assist in any way possible to smooth out the paths of industrial relations.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that we in the New Democratic Party have another method by which we consult with people. We laid before the people of Saskatchewan a very precise indication of what we proposed to do in terms of the election platform which we presented for the people of Saskatchewan to judge us on prior to June 23rd of 1971. We said among other things and we spelled this out in a precise way that we would enact a new Trade Union Act to guarantee free collective bargaining, repeal Bill 2, remove political interference, strengthen conciliation and mediation, and this we have done. We make no apologies for the legislation that we place before you today, Mr. Speaker. We have had a number of representations since the introduction of this Bill. As the result of those representations from the Saskatoon Personnel association and others, the Department is having a look at present at some of the recommendations which were raised by this group in particular. We are anxious and willing, Mr. Chairman, to accommodate all groups to the extent that this is feasible. We will consider some of the suggestions made by Members opposite, one in particular, as it relates to the decertification process. We are more than willing to have a look at this because I think perhaps the legislation means something other than what it was originally intended to mean. It is our intention to assure that any trade unionist who is unhappy, or if a majority of his colleagues are unhappy with the trade union to which they presently belong, that they be afforded the opportunity to take action to replace it. We want to assure members that their job will not be placed in jeopardy by having taken action against that particular union in that way. I am having the Department people look very closely at this feature to determine whether the Act says what we had intended that it say. With this in mind and keeping in mind the willingness of the Department to review from time to time the features of The Trade Union Act we feel that a climate of responsibility and maturity can be reached between the principles in the collective bargaining agreement. We will be more than happy to consult with all interested groups on an on-going basis. With these ideas in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to move

May 2, 1972

second reading to a piece of legislation which I think is fundamentally a good piece of legislation and removes many of the regressive features that were inserted during 1966 and 1969 which I think led to anything other than harmonious relations in the whole field of industrial relations in the Province of Saskatchewan. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

YEAS - 42

Messieurs

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

NAYS - 11

MESSIEURS

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Lane
Coupland	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Grant	McPherson	

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 134 - An Act respecting Technological Changes and their Effects on Employees be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words that I want to add in moving second reading of this Bill, a Bill which I regard as being an exceedingly important Bill and one which is recognized as one of the initial steps that will be taken by many jurisdictions across the country in light of the advancing age of technology and scientific change. Once again I must draw attention to some of the remarks by the labor critic for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) and the arguments which he seemed to base his premise upon indicating first of all that there was no provision in The Trade Union Act and then finally discovering that there was a provision in an upcoming Bill, a Bill that was to follow later. Then he discovered that he was seriously and strenuously opposed to this particular piece of legislation.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is presented as a separate piece of legislation for two very specific reasons. It is of sufficient importance to justify setting it apart, setting it before this House by itself in order that it may have the attention that it

properly deserves. Secondly, it gives Members opposite the very rare privilege of voting yes or no without providing any artificial shield for them to hide behind. Liberals, Mr. Speaker, have not been noted in the past for their political courage and it strikes me as a rare opportunity for them to stand in their place and indicate where their sentiments really lie with respect to this very important matter.

First of all of the two principles that are involved in this particular Bill, I want to ask Liberals if they are for or against the requirement that the employer must give 90 days notice before the introduction of technological changes which deprives workers of their livelihood. How do Liberals stand on this particular principle issue of the Bill that is before us?

Secondly when these changes are introduced are Liberals for or against the requirement that the terms and conditions of this technological change be the subject of bargaining between employer and employee. That is the second basic principle contained in this Bill and I ask Liberals opposite where do Liberals stand in connection with this very basic question? These are the two main principles, 90 days notice, the requirement to bargain the terms surrounding technological change. Liberals are going to be counted and they are going to be judged by the manner in which they vote on this very important Bill.

The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) while he was groping around blindly on second reading said that the Bill was and I quote, "One of the worst pieces of legislation brought into this House during this Session". I think this is a rather remarkable position for the Member to assume, Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the lost jobs in the city which he purports to represent. It is a position and a statement which we will not be allowed to forget. Former Robin Hood Flour employees, unemployed Husky and Gulf and Imperial Oil employees will be reminded of his indifference and his lack of concern in this connection. This labor expert from Moose Jaw North also claims, I quote, "Collective bargaining will be nullified." He went on to say, "The Bill would discourage negotiation on technological change during regular collective bargaining." He said, "The two sides would lock horns later when technological changes are planned."

I put this to you as indicating the kind of absolute and patent nonsense that the Member put forward when he spoke on second reading. There is not a clause, there is not a phrase in the Bill which could lead a person to that conclusion. In fact, if the union neglects to bargain the terms of technological change they in effect sacrifice the right to bargain that technological change. I just invite the Member in case he hasn't read it, to read subsection (9) of Section 2 and see what it says, because it indicates quite clearly that if notice of technological change was given prior to the signing of the collective bargaining agreement that the union may very well have sacrificed their right to bargain the terms and conditions of the Act. How anyone could read anything else in it, I don't know. It nullifies any argument that the Members opposite have in connection with this Bill. This is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, it was carefully studied prior to introduction, and the suggestion by the Member for Moose Jaw North that it was "hastily conceived", indicates that he really doesn't understand how things happen in a legislative way. The New Democratic Party just doesn't operate in that way. Our

May 2, 1972

legislation originates with a department of Government, it has a series of hurdles to negotiate before it enters this Legislature. It passes through Cabinet, it passes through our caucus, it passes through Legislative Counsel and then it arrives in this Legislature. If Members opposite think for a minute that legislation is somehow hastily conceived over the weekend, then I say that they are laboring under a very wild illusion about how things happen in government circles.

Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite somehow prided himself with discovering a typographical error on page 3. Half a dozen people identified the typographical error prior to his revelation which will be corrected by a House amendment. It appears that the Opposition was so enchanted with this feature that they failed to see that this Bill, this very vital and very important Bill, will become of increasing importance and it will be of more importance as we are drawn more deeply into the age of technology and scientific change. I take a very great deal of pride in moving, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be now read a second time. I invite all Hon. Members to support this very important piece of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

YEAS - 41
Messieurs

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

NAYS - 11
MESSIEURS

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Lane
Coupland	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Grant	McPherson	

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 110 - An Act to facilitate the Acquisition and Disposition of Farm Land in Saskatchewan be now read a second time.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education):— Mr. Speaker, I believe it is

important that the present Member for Last Mountain speak on this debate, because as the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) pointed out, one of the first discussions in this Legislature of a land bank proposal took place in 1934 when a former CCF Member for Last Mountain, Jacob Benson, moved a resolution on the idea.

The idea of a new method of land tenure has matured a lot since then. The present proposal is flexible and can be either a means of land transfer or of land tenure whichever the farmer wishes it to be. The initial advantage of the Land Bank is that it is going to give many older farmers a chance to sell and to retire, something they can't do easily at the present time. During the first few years, the Land Bank could very well be a vehicle for moving people out of farming, as there will probably be more people wanting to sell than there will be buyers. However, this situation will change, Mr. Speaker, after the initial period. The Land Bank's chief long-term advantage in my opinion is that it will make it much easier for new farmers to enter the business. It will do this by removing the need for a young farmer to put up a large sum of money at the outset for the land. Second, it will reduce his costs in the first years at least by whatever amount he would normally have to find to meet repayment of principal. By reducing costs the Land Bank offers hope for bringing new people into the occupation of farming, this alone should make it worthy of acceptance by anyone who is interested in the rural life of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has attacked this Bill on a number of counts. I suggest to you that none of them are valid. In my opinion, the Liberals have not suggested any real problems that could arise in the Land Bank. Instead, they have wasted the time of this Legislature with talk about socialism, about communism, about commissars, superficial criticism that doesn't touch the real issues. The criticism offered by the Liberals shows how much they are still under the influence of their former Leader, who used the same kind of tactics between 1959 and 1964. Mr. Speaker, what worked as an issue in that period from 1959-64 is not going to work today. Conditions have changed. I say the people are seriously interested in the Land Bank idea and they are looking for a sensible discussion of the issues. This Liberal 'spook show' about communism can only be a disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the chief criticisms of the Land Bank is that the rental rates are too expensive. The Liberals have attacked the Bill on this point. They say the rates per acre are too high, but they don't seem to be prepared to say that the Provincial Treasury should subsidize those rates. This is irresponsible criticism it seems to me. Either the rental rates reflect actual cost or they do not reflect it, in which case there must be a subsidy. The Liberals stand to lose public credibility unless they offer realistic alternatives and on this point they have nothing to offer, but opposition for its own sake.

There are some good grounds for questioning the rental structure. In normal years the cash rental should pose no problems. A farmer might rent a quarter of land of moderate productivity for \$5 an acre, or \$800 in total. If he harvests some moderate crop of 20 bushels per acre, he will have 3,200 bushels of wheat, which should bring him at least \$1 a bushel or \$3,200. After paying the rent of \$800 he will have \$2,400

May 2, 1972

left. Now if he leased the same quarter on a one-third, two-third crop share, he would have to turn over one-third of his 3,200 bushels to the owner. One third of \$3,200 is over \$1,000 bushels, at a \$1 per bushel for a minimum cost of \$1,000, compared to \$800 on a cash rental scheme. This example is deliberately on the conservative side, wheat is bringing more than \$1 a bushel at present, and a 20 bushel crop is a pretty conservative crop.

If there are to be problems in the cash rental, they will come in years of low yield, or in years of low quota. Both of these can be covered by crop share leases, but not by cash rental. These are legitimate questions to ask about the Land Bank and they are not going to be easy to answer. The simple fact is that the Land Bank cannot be regarded as a cure-all. It has problems and we will have to cross those bridges when we come to them. This is one of the reasons there must be leeway for Government to adjust to the plan's operation. One of the reasons why everything isn't spelled out in detail. The Liberal Members criticize the Land Bank because it isn't perfect, but then they turn around and say there should be no allowance for adjustment to correct for the imperfections. This type of talk it seems to me is irresponsible. Sooner or later the Members opposite will have to face the question of what stand to take on the real issues of this proposal, the sooner they do that the better off they will be. It seems to me at present the Liberals are still in the wilderness and that fact is more and more obvious to the voters in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest difficulty in keeping people on the land is the low income available to them. Therefore, if we want to stop rural decline we must increase net income. This can be done by two means, by raising cash receipts or by lowering costs. The farmers' cash receipts are influenced far more by Federal policy than by provincial policy. The Ottawa Government sells farm products and the Ottawa Government sets the prices to pay. The level of cash income is therefore almost entirely outside the scope of a Provincial administration. Provincial authorities are far from powerless, however, they have the power to influence costs of farm inputs, land, machinery, fuel and so on. If the province is going to assist its farmers it can make the most headway by working toward lower costs. Essentially the Land Bank idea is a means of cutting costs. Land is a major drain on cash receipts, it is obvious that if a farmer does not have to make payments on the principal cost he can reduce the outflow of his receipts by that amount. In this respect, the Land Bank can only be successful. Cost reduction alone will not save many family farms, if at the same time cash receipts are declining too. All the efforts of the Provincial Government will be wasted if Ottawa continues to ignore its responsibility to improve cash receipts. I suggest to the Liberal Members that instead of attacking the Land Bank, they should be using what influence they have with the Prime Minister, with Otto Lang, to get farmers a realistic income program. Despite anything else that may be done, I doubt that our rural areas are going to survive unless we get a national policy commitment to divert a fair share of total income to the farmer and to the small town resident. There is an election coming up and the Liberal Party is going to have a tough fight on its hands. Now is the time to get the word to Ottawa. Our farmers must have a good basic income guarantee, not a poverty stabilization like Otto Lang has put forward. This will only come if the pressure is exerted where Ottawa can feel it.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Government is taking action to do what it can to raise net incomes. The Land Bank is one example. It will have a substantial beneficial effect, but it doesn't represent instant salvation. It has some problems which can only be resolved through income guarantees. I believe Saskatchewan people are prepared to give this proposal a chance. I believe they would rather try, make a few mistakes in doing so, than not to try at all. If Saskatchewan is prepared to do its job, we expect Ottawa to follow suit and so do the voters.

Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals opposite have the interests of rural Saskatchewan at heart, if they want to develop any credibility with the public, they will stop their opposition for opposition's sake and join us in seeking a better deal for agriculture by supporting this Land Bank proposal. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. GROSS (Gravelbourg):— Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter this debate. It has been a custom to congratulate and thank certain Ministers who have gone all out to introduce aggressive and dynamic legislation at certain vital economic times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS:— At this time I do want to convey that message to the Minister of Agriculture, not only do I want to congratulate him for his work and the Cabinet for theirs, but I would also like to thank the innovators of North America, possibly the true innovators of the world. I refer to only one group of people, the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS:— Mr. Speaker, it was this group of people who said before 1944 that it can be better provided we share the wealth. For it was this group of people who introduced a new and completely revolutionary program, revolutionary to the understanding of the people of North America. For it was these people who introduced programs such as Crown corporations and made them work. For it was these people who said, if we pool our resources to build a first rate service we can then offset a probable and possible public function. Yet, Mr. Speaker, our reactionary friends opposite said it could not work. Was this true? No, we proved different. Crown corporations are now in existence and have proven to be the envy of every province in Canada and North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS:— It is the same group of innovative New Democratic Party people who said, we should provide a comprehensive and compulsory automobile insurance plan. And what did the Members opposite say to this program, Mr. Speaker? They said no way. They deliberately tried everything in their power to protect their private entrepreneurs. They somehow rationalized that it is in the public interest to have the private entrepreneurs exploit the public. Mr. Speaker, these are the same innovative

May 2, 1972

New Democratic people who said that all people, white, black, yellow, whatever with no respect to color or creed should all be given the highest possible quality of medical attention. And that it is the public's right to have this attention. A totally and new revolutionary idea. Yet what did our reactionary friends opposite say to this. No way, and immediately set out to destroy that program. They cast shadows of death and fear into the hearts of every Saskatchewan citizen.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Sounds terrible.

MR. GROSS:— That's right. They said it was the first step to communism and that it was a hopeless farce, a kooky socialist plan. They even went further, Mr. Speaker, they even organized and sponsored that pressure group called 'KOD', Keep Our Doctors Committee. A pressure group well organized by the Liberal Party marched on the Legislature on the day of its inception, July 1st of '62. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is this the same reactionary group of people that plan to introduce a 'KOF'. Mr. Speaker, what happened on July 2nd of 1962? Everything was quiet in the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan. Everyone seemed to be happy and contented. For the first time the Government recognized that it had a right to protect and guarantee the standard of health and that it carried out its duties. Truly, Mr. Speaker, a great day for social planning for the people of Saskatchewan. This makes one wonder if the Liberal Party has any credibility left at all with the people of Saskatchewan. Evidently on June 23rd there was none. Perhaps the Liberal Government which once said they were going to support this program but now are violently objecting to it, have confused the people of Saskatchewan to a point where the people of Saskatchewan will never support a Liberal Party ever again.

I suggest that another great day will lie ahead for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that those same innovative New Democratic people are now on the verge of another aggressive, dynamic and revolutionary program. A program that has recognized that rural Saskatchewan is dying and that rural Saskatchewan needs every form of help possible. What did our friends opposite do in their seven years to promote agriculture, to prevent this destruction of rural Saskatchewan. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate that they had no over-all plan that was geared to save or even help rural Saskatchewan. Let us look at what that Government did about agriculture. Nothing. They had a federal counterpart. They had a federal counterpart that is under the leadership of none other than Otto Lang. And who is Otto Lang? Well some people have named him salesman of the year, with all due respect to Otto Lang, it is a most appropriate title for if anyone call sell deepfreezes to Eskimos, no one other than Otto Lang can. I suggest that if anyone could sell a plan such as the Liberals introduced and tried to attempt to convince the farmers that two out of three should leave, then he indeed is the true winner of the title, 'salesman of the year'.

The people of Saskatchewan totally rejected his plan as well as, Mr. Speaker, did the people of Assiniboia on November 9th. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the next Federal election is announced, again the people of the Prairie Provinces will reject it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS:— Yes, Mr. Speaker, with friends like that the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan needs no enemies. This is a plan Liberals have for the salvation of rural Saskatchewan and if Liberals of Saskatchewan are part of any part of Liberals in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, they have no right in any way, manner or form to try to object to any program that may help one, or two or three or four hundred people in Saskatchewan. It is plain to see, Mr. Speaker, that we differ on a basic philosophy. A Liberal Government which is placed in this situation would place its priorities on big corporate business. We, the NDP placed in this position, have placed our priorities on the small business, the small farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS:— As this Act exhibits, Mr. Speaker, governments must place their priorities in this fashion if there is any help to be derived to the rural or the small operators. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the basics of Land Bank, the basic proposed program that says we must allow young people to enter into a viable farming operation without requiring large sums of security to buy parcels of land so that they are put into a position to enter farming. Once they are in farming they automatically face signing their lives away with no guarantee of a salable product. Let us examine the proposals that have been put forth by my Hon. colleagues and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). The first thing we must look at, is that the trends say population in rural Saskatchewan is dropping. Population is dropping in the order of 1941 of some 138,000 number of farms to 1966 of only 85,000 farms. As well the population on those farms have dropped by some 230,000 people. Trends say that young people are no longer allowed to start farming or even continue. People under the age of 25 in Saskatchewan is presently standing at 2,634 while people at the ages of 45 to 54 stand anywhere from 24,000 and 60 to 64 drop to 10,000 people. It is obvious that a land tenure program must be established to help save the small farmer and the family farm.

If we examine some realistic prices, Mr. Speaker, we find that for example, if a person who is to purchase a \$75 per acre farm on a base of half section of land and his cash purchase price would total \$24,000, how would this compare to Farm Credit Corporation or the Land Bank program? One, under Farm Credit Corporation, the annual payment would be \$2,052. Under Land Bank it would be \$1,680. Based on 29 years we find that the total of Farm Credit Corporation would total \$59,507 while Land Bank would total \$48,720, making an annual difference every year of \$372. Under the Land Bank program if the farmer would invest his money at 7 per cent for 29 years he would accumulate a balance of some \$32,492, a sum of some \$8,494 more than the original purchase price of the land. If we take into consideration inflation, we find the difference to be some \$5,092, the farmer would be ahead under Land Bank over the Farm Credit Corporation. Not only would he be ahead financially, Mr. Speaker, but it is important to note that the farmer with Land Bank needs no security and will be able to hand over the land to his son without having his son sign his life away. I must add, Mr. Speaker, our farmers have been waiting for a long time for this program, yet I wonder what the Opposition will do about this one. I am sure they are prepared to stick their nose into the Act and as they did on June 23rd, once again they will have

May 2, 1972

it flattened. Mr. Speaker, the last point I make on this program, is that the New Democratic Party has seriously looked at this problem, they have evaluated and proposed a solution. This Bill carries out the promise that was made back on June 23rd, Mr. Speaker, one that is a worthy one and I urge Members on this side of the House and especially Members opposite to support this one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.M. McPHERSON (Regina Lakeview):— Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words about the Land Bank. I should like to say to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) you know in baseball when you have three strikes you are out. First you introduce the Farm Protection Bill and you fan on that, then the Foreign Ownership that was your second one, you want to have your third strike and we have for the Land Bank, so I would say to the Minister of Agriculture, three strikes and he is out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McPHERSON:— Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the Land Bank idea was hatched at an NDP convention and at the convention participants were mostly urban people and young people who have a very limited knowledge of the problems confronting the farmer today. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture policy should be formulated by the farmers in their farm organizations. A wise government would listen to the advice given to them by responsible farm organizations. The Bill is over optimistic, Mr. Speaker, and could be called unworkable. For instance, the capital owing on the land is not the major problem affecting the farmer, interest on capital is a cost item but the Land Bank proposals do not eliminate interest as the Minister well knows. The tenant still has to pay it. The major cause of the farmers' problems of today are the high costs of production and the resulting high cost of what he has to buy. Now from whom is the Land Bank going to buy all their land? Mr. Speaker, when you read this in the Bill it certainly reads well. Farmers between the ages 55 and 65 years old I imagine due to financial problems wish to liquidate their investment in land and to utilize the capital to improve the standard of living of their families. Farmers in this category will be given the opportunity to lease the land back from the Land Bank until they reach retirement age. The context in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is too optimistic and perhaps misleading. It is hard to follow the reasoning how a farmer can improve his standard of living by selling his land to the Government and leasing it back on the proposed terms of an impractical lease whereby he has to pay taxes. Mr. Speaker, he will be losing the title to his land and any potential value it may have. He will have no chance of making a living under the lease terms. The earning stream of his capital will have to be paid as rental and there will be no return to him from the rent.

Now for farmers who wish to retire and transfer their farms to their sons. What is meant by this, Mr. Speaker, I presume is to have the farmer transfer the title to the Government and they in turn will lease the land to the son. The son would earn nothing, the farmer would be well advised to retain the title

to his land and lease the land to his son on a more realistic crop share basis. This would provide income for both the farmer and his son. The farmer still has the right to transfer to his son and the son would have the assurance that he was going to get the land. Once the title is transferred to the Government the son has no assurance, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to get that land. The NDP Independent Land Bank Commission as you would imagine, I am sure will see that if you are close to the party you will get the land.

Farmers may wish to enhance the family living standard by transferring to some alternative occupation. This has been said many times by the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier. This, Mr. Speaker, is a loose, misleading, sugar coated proposal for the purpose of obtaining title to the land. If the farmer wishes to seek other employment, which the Provincial Government cannot guarantee him, he should retain his farm as a supplementary income, contact the proper employment agencies and if successful in getting a job he can always lease his land to a neighbor and this would be a very, very good scheme. This, Mr. Speaker, would be much more realistic and much more satisfactory. Farm operators who have substantial arrears of debts on land and are unable to continue farming without reorganizing the farm unit, this again, Mr. Speaker, shows a lack of understanding of the problem, Mr. Speaker, and is another dubious and unrealistic promise. How is he put into a position to reorganize when he won't receive much for his equity, if any, on this farm. Transferring title to the Government in exchange for a non-operative lease sounds like a debt consolidating advertisement. If a farmer is so badly indebted that he has no equity left in his farm selling it to the Government is not going to provide him with any money. He would be better off to come to some understanding with his creditor by virtue of a collateral lease whereby he would rent on a share basis and at the same time retain title to the land or take advantage of some debt legislation transferring title to the Government and this may cost him his land.

What type of lease have we got in the Bill, Mr. Speaker? It is proposed that leases will be granted on a life-time basis. I presume by that is meant a youth holding title. They offer such a lease in exchange for title to the land. Their basic assumption must therefore be that the farmer is not interested in owning his farm as such as his own home but merely in its production. This I would interpret as a false conception and so would most farmers. Such a theory to be workable would require the total socialization of not only the land but also the production and the marketing. If this is a long term range, Mr. Speaker, it would never work on a narrow provincial basis.

But let us bypass political theories and philosophies and go into the demerits of the proposed terms of the life-time lease. The term of life-time is being contradicted and avoided by the inclusion of a cancellation proviso which will beyond any doubt favor only the landlord. The Minister and the Premier have made promises to the farmer that they will be given the opportunity to purchase these rented farms. These were unconditional promises as reported by the Press in the different meetings held around the province. Under certain conditions tenants will have the opportunity to eventually purchase their land. Yes, Mr. Speaker, not at the price of the farm's economic worth nor for the price the Government has paid for the farm but at a market price then existing and not on the time

May 2, 1972

basis but for cash. It is very doubtful, Mr. Speaker, whether they even intend to do that. It again appears as an ambiguous dream promise. If it will be a father-son arrangement the son should if he wishes to purchase insist on being given an option for the price the land is being sold at on the same day that he enters into a lease arrangement and not at a future eventual time.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is also going to reserve the right to tell the tenant what use the land shall be put to. This is not a customary proviso, Mr. Speaker, in cash rental leases the Government is going to charge the maximum rent at the same time reserve the right to dictate the operations of the tenant. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that this is a bad Bill as I said at the outset. The scheme will never work on a rental basis. There is not a single farmer who will come out ahead on a rental basis under this Bill. I support a scheme, Mr. Speaker, as many on this side of the House do that will allow a farmer who wants to retire and sell out, his family has moved away or his sons have moved, that he will be given a chance to sell his land. This, Mr. Speaker, makes sense, not the basis of the present Land Bank scheme. Mr. Speaker, I will not support the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much time of the House nor repeat the arguments of my colleagues on this side. But there are a few comments I want to make. First of all I can't help but say that the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) got up and thanked all the Members on that side of the House, including himself, for this great new idea. The mutual admiration society is not shared by the farmers of Saskatchewan I want to tell the Member for Gravelbourg. I should also like to tell the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) you know he said, I should get up and speak on this Bill because the idea of a land bank originated in Last Mountain in 1934 by Mr. Benson. I want to tell him that Mr. Benson didn't originate the Land Bank idea or socialist ownership of the farmers' land, that was originated by Karl Marx away back in the 19th century and it certainly hasn't changed. But you know he said, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be prepared to subsidize the interest rate of the farmers, he said, the Liberals didn't come up with any alternative. I want to tell him that we do come up with an alternative. If you want to subsidize the interest rate don't take the title of the farmers' land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Then he brought up the very ridiculous example of the farmer who produced 3,200 bushels, that meant \$3,200 and he had to pay \$1,800 rent. I don't know where Mr. MacMurchy has been the last few years but I always thought there was what we called the quota system in Saskatchewan. In the last few years it has been 4, 5 and 8 bushels and if that means you can sell 3,200 bushels for \$3,200 on a 20 bushel per acre crop, it is news to me and news to most of the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a very few remarks and then I want to move a very important amendment. Mr. Speaker, this debate has carried on for something in the neighborhood of ten days and one factor stands out very clearly after listening to the remarks of all the Members opposite and particularly

the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). This Land Bank proposal is exactly the same proposal that was produced by the Minister of Agriculture six months ago in his Land Bank booklet. He stood here and he told the farmers of Saskatchewan that he was going to go around the province and have public hearings. He turned around and he said they were a farce, that's all, they were a grandstand show, a travelling circus - because there has not been one substantive change, not one, not one substantive change. Mr. Speaker, at every single one of these meetings, farmers, farm organizations, individuals, businessmen got up and pointed to the weakness of this particular proposal and yet the Minister of Agriculture has not made one substantive change.

MR. ROLFES:— Where were you?

MR. MacDONALD:— Yes. He has made a farce out of the whole concept of public hearings on the Land Bank. They were a selling political hoax, that's all they were. Not one substantive change.

MR. ROLFES:— Were you there?

MR. MacDONALD:— Yes, were you?

MR. ROLFES:— How many?

MR. MacDONALD:— I wish to repeat, Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Party has been saying for several months about this proposal. First of all it is an unthinkable bad financial deal for the farmer, an unthinkable bad financial deal. Second, it only offers perpetual tenancy to any farmer who accepts it. Third, it is a socialist nightmare. A socialist nightmare that guarantees the state ownership of this land because every single proposal in that Land Bank makes it impossible for any man who accepts a lease to ever own his own farm. The fourth thing, Mr. Speaker, it lays the ground work for the biggest corporation that the Province of Saskatchewan has ever seen in agriculture and that's the state farm.

Mr. Speaker, let me assess these statements for a moment. First of all I say it was an unthinkable bad financial deal. I am going to read for a moment the introduction to the Bill, the second reading by the Minister of Agriculture for example because he says we always use bad examples. Then of course the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) he parroted the same set of figures. He isn't even capable of assessing his own. This is what the Minister of Agriculture said:

I should like to give a comparison of the cost of renting land as opposed to buying. Let us consider the case where a farmer wishes to extend his land base by an additional 320 acres. Let us assume this land is worth \$75 per acre or \$24,000 for a half section. If the farmer bought the land prior to the beginning of the farming season this year or before the 31st of March and borrowed money from the Farm Credit Corporation for the purchase he would pay 7½ per cent interest. If the farmer buys the land using a 29 year amortized loan, the annual payment of interest and principal is \$2,052.

As the Member for Gravelbourg parroted. The farmer must pay \$2,052 per year for 29 years for a total of \$59,507. If the farmer had leased this half section of land the rental would be

May 2, 1972

7 per cent or \$1,680. The difference in annual payments between renting is \$2,052 minus \$1,680 or \$572.

Mr. Speaker, let me use the Minister's figures. First of all the farm credit for 29 years is \$2,052. Total payments \$59,000. Land Bank \$1,680 for 29 years is \$48,720. Mr. Speaker, how many times have we heard the Minister stand up on his feet and say it's the capital, it's the principal payments that hurt the farmer. Do you know how much the Government is going to pay on the principal, 45 per cent. The farmer is going to pay 55 per cent. The farmer is going to pay 100 per cent of the interest. The farmer is going to take 100 per cent of the risk. The Government is going to pay 45 per cent of the principal and get the title to the land and complete ownership. Of the total cost of the land including principal, interest and risk, the Government is going to pay between 15 and 20 per cent and the farmer pays over 80 per cent. Then he turns around and says this is a good financial deal. Do you know that in 35 years under the same payments with the Farm Credit Corporation that it will not cost the Saskatchewan Government one single cent for that land. The farmer will have paid the total cost of that land and the Government will pay nothing and the Government will have the title of that deed. The Minister of Agriculture is trying to tell the farmers of Saskatchewan that this is a good financial deal, believe me it isn't. The farmer pays 80 per cent of the principal, the interest and takes all the risk and the Provincial Government seizes the title within 29 years or 35 years, whichever figure you want. And let the Minister of Agriculture not think that the farmers of Saskatchewan are stupid because he is walking around with a big chart, with a diagram of how much the Government pays and how much the farmer pays. If you think the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to buy that kind of a proposal where the Government of Saskatchewan is going to steal their land, steal their sweat and their blood and their tears, and that's exactly what they are going to do.

Now let me take the other example that the Minister of Agriculture used. Then he got the financial wizard from Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) to get up and he said, you know you can take that \$372 and you'll buy one cow. He said, you know in 29 years he'll save \$55,000. You know what he did - wait till I tell you - and then he went on. The Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is a farmer so he rushed out and bought a cow. He said in 29 years I'll be able to retire with \$55,000. So what happens the bull was no good. The bull was no good and the cow died. And then we all thought you know, it's too bad the Member for Nutana that he didn't have twins, if the cow had twin calves, do you know what he would have had, why he would have had \$110,000. Then we sat down and calculated. The Member from Cannington got 30 cows. We figured it out in 29 years he's going to be worth \$1.5 million. So we all decided that we would all quit work, we're going to buy two of those cows and we're all going to retire. That's just as ridiculous as the total Land Bank proposal is for the farmers of Saskatchewan and is exactly what the Member for Nutana Centre has said.

Mr. Speaker, the second argument. Everybody has told the Minister of Agriculture it is going to mean perpetual poverty. When you turn around and tell a man that he's got to pay 7 per cent of the capital cost as rent and it has got to be cash, not based on productivity, not based on the quota system, not based on anything, but a cash rental basis. That cash rental basis is so high that it makes it impossible for him to make any kind

of a subsistence level. It doesn't take into consideration taxes. It doesn't take into consideration cost of production. It doesn't take into consideration wages, depreciation of machinery, equipment improvement. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that that particular cash rental clause is perpetual poverty for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I heard the Minister of Agriculture talk about the stabilization program. He said, you know that's poverty. Well, I'll tell you something the Land Bank makes the stabilization program look like small potatoes when it comes to perpetual poverty. Then he turns around and he says the \$60,000 net worth. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is perpetual poverty because it isn't related to assets. One farmer could have a half section with \$60,000 net worth. Another farmer could be farming three or four sections and it is not related to net worth and he doesn't have over \$60,000 worth of net worth. This program, Mr. Speaker, means perpetual poverty that the farmer will be on the land for his entire life, he'll leave the land at 60 or 65 years of age and dependent upon nothing but Canada Assistance Plan or welfare.

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, is that this plan does not present anything but state ownership. It is a socialist's dream of paradise on earth and that's the unbelievable part. I believe that most of the socialists over there believe it. It's paradise on earth. And what is of even more concern, they believe that the end justifies the means. They don't care how much authority, how much power the Minister of Agriculture has. When my colleague from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) called him Chairman Messer believe me he wasn't exaggerating. The powers in this Bill make him the land dictator of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to buy in this Bill is nonsense. There is no opportunity to buy. When you place a limitation of \$60,000 and you turn around and make the rent so high that no man, no man can ever purchase. When you make that rent on a lifetime basis, not only that from the second and third and fourth generation, when the Government after 35 years is going to be making nothing but a straight profit on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan. It is deliberately made impossible, Mr. Speaker, for any farmer who takes a lease under the Land Bank arrangement to ever own his land. You know that as well as I do and not only that the Member for University (Mr. Richards) and all the other Members who stood up admitted it.

This is not an economic solution to the farmers' problem, this is a new theory of land tenure. A new theory, and that new theory is nothing other than state ownership of the farmers' land. Mr. Speaker, that's the result. It will make nothing of Saskatchewan farmers but share croppers and tenants, it will take them back a thousand years. Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that some of the Members opposite can't go behind the iron curtain or take an analogy of the agriculture production and productivity in areas around the world where farmers own their own land and have their own incentive and encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that bothers me.

MR. SNYDER:— Can't stomach it.

MR. MacDONALD:— And we can't stomach anything that you have done. The

May 2, 1972

Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) you know, and you're such a coward you ran away from them in the election campaign. You ran away from them, that's how big a coward you are. You didn't have the guts to face them in Moose Jaw North and every time the Member for Moose Jaw North gets up here and puts a legitimate criticism you stand up here like a wailing calf and do nothing but make a personal attack on him. Let the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) not cry any more to me. Have enough guts to go back to Moose Jaw South.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more thing that bothers me about the Land Bank, that's the plan or the clause in the Bill that says the Land Bank will have the power to farm the land. The Land Bank will be able to farm the land. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Nutana (Mr. Robbins) stands up and talks about the big corporations. This is the ground work for the biggest corporation in the agricultural industry in Canada. State ownership, a state corporation, with the NDP Government of Saskatchewan running this land.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this plan is a nightmare. This plan is confiscation and theft of the farmers land and his own sweat, blood and tears. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture paid absolutely no attention to the hearings around the province which pointed out the weakness of this Bill, because the Minister of Agriculture was advised by his own Waffle Group who pointed out the exact same thing as the farmers, exactly the same thing as the Opposition, exactly the same thing as the Farmers' Union, that the rental arrangements were unbelievable, that they had not listened to the farmer, that there was a need to go back to the farmers of Saskatchewan and listen to them, we want to give the Minister of Agriculture an opportunity to shelve this Bill for six months, to bring it back in the fall, to go back to the farmers in Saskatchewan and have a decent public hearing so that he can get presented a realistic picture of what this Land Bank proposal will do to the farmers of Saskatchewan. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by my colleague from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald):

That Bill No. 110, An Act to facilitate the Acquisition and Disposition of Farm Land in Saskatchewan be amended as follows:

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

That Bill No. 110 be not now read the second time but that it be read six months hence.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 12
MESSIEURS**

Steuart
Coupland
Guy
Grant

MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac
Gardner
Weatherald

McPherson
Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N)
Wiebe

Nays - 42
Messieurs

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

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville):— Mr. Speaker, the disposal of the last amendment was very proper. I think the one speaker who spoke is enough said about that.

I want to make a number of comments on some of the things that were said this afternoon. I am going to leave the answering of the major part of the vociferous and loud speaking Member from Milestone, I'm going to leave that to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture when he closes the debate.

But I do want to say in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) that the Land Bank formulated mostly by urban and young men at their convention is untrue. It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that he wasn't at the New Democratic Convention because had he been there he would have seen that the majority of our people attending conventions is composed of many professions. I would assure you that at least 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the people are solid, staunch, hardworking farm people at those conventions . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK:— . . . like myself and many other farm Members from this side of the House.

Another statement made by the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER:— I don't see too many calluses on your hands.

MR. KOWALCHUK:— Another statement . . .

MR. KRAMER:— Oh, there's the old salesman back.

MR. KOWALCHUK:— Would you like to speak, Sir? Another statement made by the Member for Regina Lakeview is that the son will have no opportunity go get his father's land, rented or otherwise, which

May 2, 1972

is absolutely not true. That will be provided right into the agreement. When the father is selling his land or renting it, it will be available to the son rented first and then sold to him.

Now the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) made one comment I must mention. He says that the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) in saying that Mr. Benson was the originator of the Land Bank program was all wet and that the original plan was brought for some 70 years ago by a man by the name of Karl Marx. May I be so bold as to say, Mr. Speaker, that the plan for the farmers of Canada that was being planned by the Liberals at Ottawa and being planned by the Liberals of Saskatchewan would leave one to think, Mr. Speaker, that there was another gentleman in history who was so "far right" by the name of Hitler who would have been well understood by the Liberals in their comments that have been made from that side of the House.

The Member from Milestone said the Land Bank means "state ownership". Now, Mr. Speaker, when I think of state control and state ownership I think of the Federal Government in so many fields that they have control of, so many hundreds of things. I would say this to the Member from Milestone, what about the Farm Credit Corporation, which is in the position today to take over millions of acres of land and who knows what is going to happen if the situation doesn't get better.

What about the Farm Improvement Plan? Liberal legislation from Ottawa! Is that state ownership or is it leading to state ownership? I should like to have that question answered. It is interesting, very interesting. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has left the House. I wish he had stayed because many of my remarks are going to be related to what he is saying in Saskatchewan these days. I know he has been in Melville again and I welcome him. I am sorry that we are missing the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), the farm Member from Albert Park, because he, too, has been up in that country. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition came to Melville and he spoke to a capacity crowd of 50 people. Not only in Melville but he went to Churchbridge and the paper reported that he spoke to a packed house, it didn't say how many, but I understood that it was in fact a meeting held in an adjacent part to a hall kitchen and it was packed with 75 people. The Leader of the Opposition in his usual slam, bang style, full of verbiage and you could use other words to describe it, slammed the Land Bank proposal. Now the one thing he did say in Melville and, as it was said here today and other times, "confession must be good for the soul" because Mr. Steuart finally admitted to the Liberals in Melville that the Liberals had made mistakes in the past, but like the proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing he pleaded with them, 'look we've changed, we're different'. Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll let the people judge that when the time comes.

The one comment that the Leader of the Opposition made in Melville that must be replied to, Sir, is this, that the Land Bank will reduce the farmers to nothing more than share croppers and it was repeated here today by the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). The other day it was also said by the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) who pleaded the case of the poor European immigrants who broke and tilled this land and that it had become very meaningful to them. Rightfully so, Mr. Speaker, I and many other Members on this side of the House and that

side I am sure, as well, don't have to be told about these immigrant families who came to this country and their fantastic contribution to the Canadian West, their toil from sunrise to sunset. I don't need to be told this, I am one of these youngsters who was brought up on that kind of work from sunup to sunset. I know what labor and sweat and toil and tears mean, Mr. Speaker, as do many other Members in this House. I know what it's like to pick roots and stones at the age of five. I know what it's like. Indeed, these people, all farm people in Western Canada, no matter where it is their forefathers came from, have built the Canadian West. Now, Mr. Speaker, now that these lands have been broken and grubbed and put into shape and put into proper utility, now that the roots have been grubbed and the land made arable, the Liberals and their free enterprisers say, "it is time for our corporative friends to move in! It's time to move in! Time for the huge corporate farms to take over!" This is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, if we don't have this kind of a legislation called the Land Bank. Yes, they want to exploit the labors of these people who have been here for many, many years. It's time to put them out to pasture so the Liberals say. Any method, and you can think of the Task Force recommendations to supply some of the basic answers as to how these small farmers are to be put aside.

Mr. Steuart and Mr. Gardner forget conveniently to mention that that is all the farmers of Saskatchewan have ever been from away back 'share croppers' for years and for years. You know I recall very clearly that in the 1920s my father bought a quarter of land for \$2,500, ten years later he had paid over \$3,000 but the debt on it was still over \$3,500. This was the situation for 98 per cent of the farmers in Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, what brought about the betterment of that situation. It was Hitler's war that brought it about, to drop enough crumbs off the profit table for farmers to pay off some of their debts in the 1940s and 1950s. Today, after good years, real good years, Mr. Speaker, the result of better farming practices and better farming methods, under the private enterprise system the majority of the farmers are in as great a financial debt than ever before with no sight of redemption for them.

Now last Friday when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) brought in the Land Bank Bill with what I thought were clear and honest statements of fact and procedure in so far as implementation of the Bill was concerned, the Leader of the Opposition got up right after and shouted the usual socialistic, communistic, rantings. Got up right after and shouted all these things including communistic insinuations which were carried throughout the province by the Press and the news media. Now the Leader of the Opposition thought he was really making hay politically. It was thought that somehow the tactics used by the late Premier (Mr. Thatcher) in 1964 and somewhat to a lesser extent in 1967 would once again reincarnate the fear among Saskatchewan people. May I say to the Hon. gentlemen as I have said times before that the people of Saskatchewan and particularly the young men and women won't buy that kind of scare tactics any more. The cry of 'wolf, wolf', by the Liberals has been heard and noted for what it really is. Yes, they are cries of a political party in trouble. They are the cries of a political party that knows that it was soundly beaten in last June's election, that knows that the Liberal force in the West has lost all credibility, that knows that the Liberal Party may well be breathing its last gasps insofar as Western Canada is concerned. Yes, Mr. Steuart, the Hon. Leader shouted and ranted

May 2, 1972

on Friday and came back on Monday quite a timid and different person.

Now I wonder who had gotten through to Mr. Steuart? I wonder who had said to him, "lay off man! What are you trying to do sink the Liberal ship in Saskatchewan?" Yes, I wonder if that man who brought the message home wasn't the Hon. Member of Parliament for Saskatoon-Humboldt, Otto Lang, who changed the Leader of the Opposition's manner between Friday and Monday. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition has been in close touch with the Federal Liberals for it was at Saskatoon he said, when he was first elected Leader, "Our first job is to elect Otto Lang! Let's forget our differences, a Liberal, is a Liberal, is a Liberal." That's what he said at Saskatoon. And let us not ever forget that Hon. gentlemen, that a Liberal, is a Liberal, is a Liberal.

Mr. Speaker, as already stated by many Members on this side of the House that the people of Saskatchewan, young and old, gave evidences of a plebiscite on the formation of the Land Bank on June 23rd of last year. In my opinion and in the opinion of the Members of this side of the House, that is good enough. People of all walks of life, all political parties, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of a few Liberals, and farmers in particular have indicated that the fate of the family farm and the small farmer depends almost entirely on some radical scheme such as the Land Bank program. As it has been pointed out by other Government Members that the same cry was heard when the CCF was first formed and I have clippings written in different languages where in it states in the 1940s, "Don't vote CCF! They will take your land away! They will close your churches, etc., etc."

MR. McISAAC:— Now you're doing it.

MR. KOWALCHUK:— Shades of the 1930s and 1940s repeated once again by Mr. Steuart and Company. Yes, the same cry promoted by corporate capitalism when hospitalization was introduced, when the Power Corporation was formed, when medicare was brought in. The same old story.

Well, let's hear what one newspaper has to say about the Land Bank. I am going to read the Yorkton Enterprise, not noted for being pro New Democrat, Mr. Speaker. The heading is this, "Political Bluster Not Needed". Let me quote:

It is not surprising that the Saskatchewan Liberal Party has come out strictly against the Government's proposed Land Bank. But in our view Opposition Leader, Dave Steuart, would be further ahead to work for changes in the existing proposal rather than simply demanding that the legislation be scrapped in favor of a scheme more acceptable to the Liberals.

And further on it says, Mr. Speaker, and I quote again:

It is our impression that public opinion favors government ownership of farm land for purposes of long-term leasing.

Let me go on farther:

Mr. Steuart has often said that his party accepts the

principle of Land Banks but he seems to accept nothing in the present proposal. We submit that he could do a valuable service to both sellers and lessors of land if he could convince the Government to make leasing a more feasible, economic proposition and take steps to make the present proposal more acceptable on the other points and issues. The Land Bank could be and should be an effective instrument to enhance the future of those who wish to retire from farming and those who want to get into the business. It is important enough to transcend the party politics and deserves the sober thought of all able men on both sides of the Legislature. Revisions are needed in the Land Bank proposal before it becomes law but they won't be made through political bluster and angry charges. Mr. Steuart knows that the government won't withdraw the Land Bank in its present form because he demands it. He and his party would make more political points by bringing in some realistic suggestions for making the plan better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was headlined, "Political Bluster Not Needed." Yes, Mr. Speaker, here is a newspaper that is not socialistic in the least, saying, "Get off your high horse, Mr. Steuart! This is a matter of great concern. This is a matter that should concern every Member of the Legislature, every businessman in Saskatchewan, every teacher, every farmer." It is important enough to transcend party politics says the editor of the Yorkton Enterprise. Exactly so, Mr. Speaker. "Political bluster is not needed", Mr. Steuart. As for the Member for Moosomin's (Mr. Gardiner) assertions that the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan is out: 1, to get the land; 2, buy it as cheaply as possible; 3, with no intentions of ever selling, is really not worth commenting about. It is pure political hogwash, even worse than that displayed by the Leader of the Opposition and is well covered by the phrase, Mr. Speaker, that political bluster is not needed. An amazing situation, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) whose laborious effort resulted in a heading in the Leader-Post saying "Liberal Member offers alternative to the Land Bank Program", and as already mentioned by the Hon. Member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) that was nearly the sum total of the alternative, the bold type of the headline. Nothing much more was really in that article.

Now to be fair to the Hon. Member for Cannington I have to admit he did mention an alternative, almost identical to the Federal Land Bank program. The crux of the alternative, Mr. Speaker, was not much different than what we have had for many years. The basic point behind it is, 'just guarantee the loans and the interest, and the Farm Credit Corporation will do all the work'. They will do the rest. Just guarantee the loans for these people, Mr. Speaker, and many other financial institutions and they will jump up in glee. I assure you they then would be just too happy to provide even more capital for these farmers for they have taken too much as it is already.

Let me quote again from the Yorkton Enterprise of February 9th, 1972, and I should like to read some portions of it:

If Saskatchewan farmers are feeling somewhat confused these days it is hardly surprising. When you total up the number of programs that are either in force or somewhere in limbo during planning emanating from Federal and Provincial governments it is nothing short of

astounding. The confusing part is that while all Government schemes are supposedly devoted to 'saving the family farm' they are certainly taking a variety of routes to reach that destination. A good case in point is the difference that exists between the Saskatchewan Government's Land Bank proposal and the Federal Government's small farm improvement scheme. Both propose to purchase land from farmers because owners can't or do not wish to carry on with their operation. But apparently that is the only common factor in the two plans. The Federal Government will make farms more viable if they buy the land so we are told depending on the source of the comments. This means: 1. The salvation of the western farming industry . . .

And the other question I asked and this is my own question, is, for whom? They have No. 2 in the editorial:

2. The end of the family farm.

I think they are right, Mr. Speaker. A very apparent realization by the editor that the only similarity between the provincial and the Federal Land Bank program is that both propose to purchase land from farmers because the farmers can't or do not wish to carry on with their operations. This is the only common factor. The Federal Government will make farms more viable if they buy the land and then following the proposals of the Task Force in agriculture sell it to the highest bidder, no holds barred. Who wins, Mr. Speaker? Who wins? The big farmer or the big corporations. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Federal scheme becomes the vehicle for the implementation of the Task Force on Agriculture where two thirds of the farmers of Saskatchewan and other agricultural areas will be removed off the land. As the editorial says, what does it mean, salvation of the western farm industry - for whom, Mr. Speaker? For whom? The big corporate farmers, agri-business for the large agricultural industrial barons. And as it says in No. 2, the end of the family farm. Now this is a basic problem and something that we, as Members on this side of the House, are looking at. This is why we have the Land Bank instituted and we hope that it will serve to help out in the area of preserving the small farming unit.

Yes, that is what the Liberals say. They are saying this, that what the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) wants as an alternative is what implementation of the Federal Land Bank program means, the destruction of the family farm.

I should like to read the remainder of this editorial, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's very applicable:

The Land Bank (Saskatchewan Land Bank) on the other hand, is dedicated to keeping the small operator in business in the way of life that he wants, (never mind who owns the land). And the other view on that issue is that the Saskatchewan Government wants to own the farm land of the province because of a socialist philosophy. We'd be the last people to say that the farm industry needs no help. As always, we've maintained that as the principal source of economic nourishment for the population of three prairie provinces, farming deserves every bit of attention it gets from government departments.

But we can't help but feel as the grain growers must do, that a return to simpler times would be welcome. It seems only yesterday that when a farmer knew that there were hungry people all over the world, that they could produce the food to satisfy the hunger and the only real worry came from easily understood forces like rain or the lack of it or hail.

Yes, in the first sentence that I just read, "The Land Bank, on the other hand, is dedicated to keeping the small operator in business in the way of life that he wants, (never mind who owns the land)," that is exactly what the New Democratic Party says. The first and foremost commitment is to keep the small operator in the farming business, in a way of life that is good, growing food for a hungry world, Mr. Speaker. This Government is not interested in owning land for the sake of owning land. If it only means saving the farmers from a lifetime of perpetual debt, because in many cases that's what it means, a lifetime of slavery so that he, the farmers, and his sons can feed the hungry world cheaply. Under our present set-up the farmer is controlled by these financial octopi, Mr. Speaker, whose never ending perpetual greed has kept the farmer in an everlasting purgatory of debt. Maybe it is time that another means be provided for the farmer to exist without that debt hanging over his head throughout his lifetime.

I don't need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that throughout the years good times and bad, good crops and bad, good prices and bad (if there ever were good prices for the farmers), the farmers' debt load has continuously increased, whereby the debt on arable farm land on the Prairies has become a mountainous burden of billions of dollars. The immigrants whom we talked about who came from the older country, who slaved and toiled and hungered and died working a lifetime and in many cases ending up with what, Mr. Speaker? A bigger debt than ever! Or they accumulated land which they couldn't sell. They lived in poverty to die in proverbial riches, Mr. Speaker. We are very hopeful that the Land Bank will help to keep people on the farm, to preserve the family farm without the bitter struggle of those great financial burdens so well exemplified by the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) the other day, Mr. Speaker.

I want to read one more excerpt from *The Western Producer* by George Sales, the re-elected president of the United Farmers of Alberta Co-operative, made at the opening session of the United Farmers of Alberta in Calgary on March 7th. And this is what is said, Mr. Speaker:

He suggested that farmers who want to meet rising production costs could abandon the idea of owning their own land and operate farm land that is rented or perpetually mortgaged. Sales says such procedures to finance land 'would take a great load off the farmer's back and give him a better chance at making a decent living.' Calling his suggestion a great departure from most farmers' thinking, he said many would be alarmed, and no doubt there would be politicians who would fear for the family farm (for we all want to see the family farm survive). During the period 1949 to 1970 when general farm costs increased an average of 8.5 per cent per year, the cost of interest on farm working capital and farm mortgages and mortgage payments increased by 20 per cent per year, (said Mr. Sales). It seems obvious that this

May 2, 1972

rate of increase cannot be tolerated and some other method of acquiring the use of land must be found by the farmers.

This is said by Mr. Sales. The title of the article is "Suggest Farmers Lease Land, End Burden of Land Purchases". Now the Land Bank in no way suggests that this be applied to all lands of Saskatchewan. A minimum of land will be purchased. Land sales can go on as formerly. The buying and selling of land to the Land Bank will be entirely voluntary. For the young and poorer man to acquire land and get a viable farm unit, that is the only salvation. The figures I quoted were between 1945 and 1970 general farm costs went up 8.5 per cent, but, Mr. Speaker, the cost of interest on farm working capital and farm mortgages went up 20 per cent per year. With the kind of debt and the meagre income that is being derived off the products that a farmer produces and sells, can this continue? In no way can agriculture and the small family farm be saved except through such methods as the Land Bank and even then, not by that alone, Mr. Speaker. Possibly, price controls as suggested before many times by New Democrats and, definitely, income stabilization must come.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand up in this House today and say I support the Land Bank program. And I invite the Liberals to your left, Sir, to do the same. And may I repeat once again, Mr. Speaker, this is no time for political bluster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.L. HANSON (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible in looking over to the opposite side and see Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition have had only two Members in this House for some 30 minutes when a debate as important as the Land Bank situation is in progress. And I think it's despicable that the Members choose to go out for some half hour in a debate this important. These new-found spokesmen for the farmers, the saviours of Saskatchewan's farmers don't even think it's important enough to stay in here.

For the benefit of some of the Members I want to reiterate the figures that the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) used in his speech because I still don't think, even though they have heard them some three or four times, that they have digested these figures. And the facts are that; if you purchase a half section from the Farm Credit Corporation your payment will be some \$372 more per year than renting under the Land Bank scheme. And what do the Members opposite say? We say that we, on this side of the House, believe in the theory that a farmer should be the master of his own destiny. We think that he can handle this \$372 better than the Farm Credit Corporation can. We feel that if we give him the chance to use the \$372 per year for the reasons that he sees fit, whether to invest them in bonds or whether to invest them in his own farm enterprise, in cattle or fertilizer or whatever, that he will come out of this thing in a much better position. And to compare the figures - to compare the figures, on a 29 year lease or purchase plan under Farm Credit, we should find that he, under the Land Bank would have \$32,094 just investing this at 7 per cent compound interest. At that time, if he chose to purchase the land he

could do so and remember, that at any time during his lease he can purchase the home farmstead immediately upon receiving this lease, but any time after leasing for five years, he can purchase any part of that property that he wishes to.

MR. STEUART:— For cash.

MR. HANSON:— For cash, right. But what are you people over there proposing right now? That we throw out the whole thing and we go back to the system where he has to have someone backing him to get it. And I cannot accept this principle. But even so, if he comes out after purchasing the land at 29 years for a purchase price of \$24,000 and we consider an inflation clause of probably 10 per cent over that period, I would just like to point out that the average inflation affecting farm lands from 1920 to 1962 amounted to 7/24ths of one per cent per year, so I think we are reasonably safe in assuming a 10 per cent inflation factor. If we subtract another \$2,400 off this \$8,494 profit that he has made, it still leaves him with a net profit of \$5,092. And for some reason the Members opposite just can't get this through their heads.

AN HON. MEMBER:— They're pretty dull.

MR. HANSON:— What have land values done since Farm Credit started lending money at two to three per cent below the going market rates? Remember the figure 7/24th of one per cent before 1962. Since that time, up until 1969, land inflated at a rate of seven to eight per cent per year and until the whole farm situation crashed, the situation was that everything that you earned off your farm, strictly went in to cover the inflation costs.

The Members opposite mentioned the cancellation of leases, that our guaranteed lifetime lease was never any good. But I am asking the Members right now, what kind of a guarantee do you have under the Farm Credit Corporation or from the banks or from the credit unions? You have no protection against a cancellation clause in these types of mortgages. You pay or you hit the road.

The basic argument, I feel, in the whole concept of the Land Bank, must be that we are prepared, as a Government, to set up a plan whereby young farmers can get into the business of farming without having their fathers or someone else back them and stake their whole life's savings on that younger person. We can allow a person the right to farm land and to turn around and purchase land and never to tie up the assets of his parents. We can permit the parents to retire, receive a cash or an annuity settlement, invest his money in whatever he chooses, or he can lend some of it back to his sons at below market interest rates and thus we can by-pass the lending institutions once again.

And in summing up, I want to point out to all the Members of this House that I think this is the real argument in the Liberals' opposition to the Land Bank. They are not the saviours of the farmers. The reason they are opposing the Land Bank is because we are by-passing the lending agencies, once, twice, possibly three times, in the total of transactions, and this is the reason the Members opposite are opposing the Land Bank.

May 2, 1972

Not because it won't work for the farmers, not because it won't work for Saskatchewan as a whole, but because it will not work to the advantage of the lending agencies, the mortgage companies, the people who have bled the farmers of this Province for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River):— Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Land Bank Bill I simply want to sketch a little more of the history of the development of this idea. It has been pointed out by several speakers in this House that ideas related to the Land Bank were spoken of and thought of in the 1930s. From that point until the 1970s the idea did not lie dormant and you can see ideas very close to the present Land Bank suggested in the Rural Life Reports of the 1950s. The idea was discussed at the Yorkton Agricultural Conference which was sponsored by the New Democratic Party in May of 1969. And a resolution suggesting a Crown corporation to buy land and then rent or sell it to farmers can be found as a resolution passed by the NDP Convention in July of 1969. Just a footnote to the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards), this was at least a year before there was a Waffle Group.

I might suggest to the Members opposite, however, that if they intend to criticize the Bill they should at least do a little bit of homework and come up with more intelligent kind of criticism than they have. We've heard them talk about the tremendous benefits of owning land due to the capital gain that can be made on it. Yet, if you look at the average land values of the years, you will find that a farmer who bought land at an average value in 1919 had to wait until 1958 to even recover what he paid for that land in 1919. That's about 40 years. And if you consider the losses of the value of money due to inflation, he lost a great deal of money over those 40 years. And if they would like to suggest to a farmer who bought land in 1968, some young farmers paying up to \$125 or even more an acre for it, and if he tried to sell that land today, that he has made a good deal in terms of capital gains, they would be laughed right out of the room. Another point which they try to make is that the rent charge wouldn't be acceptable to farmers, and they boasted of the Farm Credit Corporation. The Federal Farm Credit Corporation doesn't change its farm interest rates just once a year, but rather twice a year. And if the Land Bank is unacceptable for this reason, the FCC is twice as unacceptable.

They said further that there has been a lack of consultation in regard to the Land Bank. Well, I don't know how they can make this charge other than a quotation that apparently was made by Roy Atkinson. Now, I don't know whether he was quoted correctly or incorrectly, but I hope he was quoted incorrectly because simply thousands of farm union members have corresponded individually with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) concerning the Land Bank. More than that, dozens of locals of the farm union have sent in their ideas. And I have here a submission by Local 614 of the Farmers' Union which is the local in my area. Further than that, the Farmers' Union on a provincial level has been invited to make submissions and they didn't, that's their free choice. But I have in my hands right here, a submission made by the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, entitled "Statement on Agricultural Adjustment", February 16, 1972, and the Members opposite know about this submission, they

know that the farm organizations have had every opportunity to make submissions. I should like them to point out one piece of agricultural legislation, Provincial or Federal, in the history of Canada where farmers have had more chances to express their views and their opinions concerning it than this piece of legislation. They call this legislation communistic. They like to talk about Karl Marx and how communistic this is. Well, then they should read what the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture says about it in their brief which they presented in February of this year:

We are very pleased the Land Bank policy was made public and provision made for farmer, rural and farm organization feedback prior to implementation of the legislation. This process also was one of the requests and policy positions of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture has recognized the Land Bank concept as a useful instrument in agricultural adjustment but only as one alternative for farmers, not a cure-all for the ills that beset farming and agriculture.

The recognition for such a policy was contained in the May, 1969 Canadian Federation of Agriculture brief on Prairie Grains Policy and re-emphasized at our June, 1971 semi-annual and January 1972 annual meetings.

Now here is the support for the Land Bank concept which the Members opposite call communistic. Furthermore, if you look at page 16 of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agricultural brief you will find that they have there an analysis of Federal land adjustment proposals and what did they say about them. They say this:

It appears the main and the significant problems with the Federal proposal is the insufficient dollar commitment and the unwillingness to use the Land Bank concept to a greater degree.

Now, if it is a communistic idea it is very strange that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which are not generally thought, except by perhaps Archy Bunker from Milestone, to be communist organizations, would support this concept.

Certainly they have some criticisms in detail and I am sure we all have. But I think we should all be very pleased that the farm organizations and individual farmers in Saskatchewan have been given an opportunity like never before in the history of this Province, to criticize a program.

There is one further point that must be made concerning the Land Bank and that is the point which is made in the Federation brief and made very well. That is that the farmer's main problem is net farm income. And for that reason the Land Bank cannot be considered a cure-all and it is not considered a cure-all by this Government. I know there have been some criticisms of the Land Bank which, in my opinion, are invalid because they have failed to recognize that you can't subsidize agriculture just through the Land Bank Program. This would be extremely unfair. If you intend to subsidize the rents very, very heavily, what you would be doing is passing on a subsidy, helping the net farm income of those farmers who happen to be renting from

May 2, 1972

the Land Bank and not those farmers who are outside. At any time, certainly for a very long time in the future the proportion of farmers under the Land Bank will be a very small proportion of Saskatchewan farmers. And to suggest heavy subsidization for these farmers and not for Saskatchewan agriculture in general, would be extremely unfair. I hope that we won't have that position taken by the Members opposite, but what I would rather they would take, is the position that we must have a realistic net farm income program taken by the Federal Government. If they would use whatever influence, however small it may be, with Ottawa to bring about a decent net farm income program they would be doing a real service to all of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this motion and I hope the Members opposite will do so as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina Wascana):— Mr. Speaker, I am going to say a few words on this filibuster debate that has been going on for some time on the Land Bank. I don't know whether my contributions will make any changes but I certainly want to let the people know where I stand with regard to something that is of great benefit to the farmer.

I am amazed that anyone in this House would oppose the principle of this Bill. Perhaps there are some areas in the Bill that need another look now or even in the future, but to stand up and speak in opposition to the principle and parts of this Bill is to destroy the family farm and the agricultural industry in this Province. Those who oppose it are supporting Otto Lang's Task Force, which advocates cutting those engaged in farming to about one-third of the present agricultural population.

You notice the recent census statistics of Saskatchewan which gave our province a cut in population to 928,000 people from the 955,000 figure, over the past 10 years. A three per cent reduction in population. The only province in Canada that had a reduction in population. And it is plainly seen that this loss of population all took place mostly during the term of office of the former Government's regime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:— So our task as legislators on this side of the House must have certain objectives in mind for farming, and that is that we keep the farmers of the land we have now, and do all we can to increase those numbers. But most important of all we must preserve the family farm.

One of the Members opposite stated that we should act as co-signers of the mortgages farmers are taking with the Farm Credit Corporation, to implement the purchase of land under this Act. As I understand this Credit group in the main, it seems to favor large corporate farming, the very thing that we are trying to avoid. If this corporation is concerned in maintaining family farms and increasing their family farm members, then perhaps the resources could be pooled.

I am not against working with the Federal Government on sensible projects, in fact, this is one time that they should come to us. We planned this great program. I believe that had the former Government brought this in we would never have been elected to this side of the House as a government today.

It appears to me that they must or are forced to oppose this because if this legislation is given unanimous approval and it would be the last piece of legislation necessary to make their party become completely extinct. They are opposing it in the hopes that it won't work. This is their only and last straw of hope.

Yes, we will run into some troubles with it. I enumerate some of the feelings of the public. Some feel that the right to purchase immediately should be one of the conditions. Some say that we should have the option of leasing or purchasing at the outset. Some say that at the outset we should have a lease-purchase agreement if desired. I believe that we should have a close look at this, the matter of a lease-purchase agreement.

Personally I prefer a lease-purchase arrangement at the beginning of the inauguration of this Act. If we had a lease-purchase arrangement a farmer would build up an equity until the five-year period was up. If he decided to keep the land on a purchase basis, it would put him ahead of the game instead of going back to an original deal. If we decided to be relieved of the agreement he should get the major portion of this equity back.

When a man pays a cash rental and pays taxes too, in essence he is contributing a fair share towards a purchase. I say that this plan could work because, in essence, through a straight rental lease he has actually signed a document with the option to buy anyway. However, I am prepared to go along with a lease arrangement for the present. I see in this Bill, while it is a lease arrangement, the ultimate aim I would hope would be directed toward ownership where requested.

Even on a lease arrangement the Land Bank Bill had to be brought in in our province at this time because of a debt-ridden agricultural economy, if we want to preserve the family farm. Surely there is no one who doubts that the family farm is essential to the rural way of life in Saskatchewan. However, simply being in favor of the family farm will not guarantee its continued existence.

What is the economic situation? For proof of that let's look at the record. In 1961 there were 94,000 farms in Saskatchewan. By 1966 there were only 86,000 farms - a drop of 8,000 in only five years. When the 1971 census figures are released the drop, no doubt, will even be more striking. After all in 1970, the most recent year for which figures are available, the average farm income was a mere \$2,560. What family can be expected to live on an income this low, an income considerably below the poverty line? It should be no surprise that 35,000 people have left Saskatchewan in the last two years.

Almost all these losses have occurred in the smaller centres and rural communities. It is these areas which can least afford to lose valuable members of their community. What is needed in a crisis such as this is a major revision on the Government's approach to agriculture. The conditions which have killed off

May 2, 1972

and continue to kill off many of our family farms must be tackled head on.

The Land Bank will go a long way towards achieving this necessary goal. One of the greatest problems facing the Saskatchewan farmer is the burden of heavy land payments. Often these payments make the difference between a successful and an unsuccessful farm operation. Let me give you several examples: If a farmer borrows \$10,000 from the Farm Credit Corporation at the current rate of 7 per cent, his total payments over a 30-years period will amount to over \$24,000. If he is able to borrow the maximum of \$55,000, which is still less than the capital assets of the average Saskatchewan farm, he will be required to meet the interest and principal payments of \$4,480 each year for a total of 30 years.

For anyone who misses a payment, the interest rate increases one half of one per cent. If the farmer has a bad crop or is left with large amounts of unsold grain, he has no alternative but to let his payments lapse and be assessed the penalty. The only alternative, of course, is a lean way of life with future setbacks.

Clearly this is not an adequate solution to the farm crisis which has occurred in recent years. What is needed is a program to ease the crushing debt burden faced by many farmers. This is why the Land Bank legislation has been introduced.

The Land Bank will relieve the farmer of part of his debt obligation, leaving him with the interest payments and taxes to be met. The Land Bank will also give the farmer security of tenure of his leased land. His economic viability will be increased and we will be as secure as the farmer whose land is fully paid for. What the Land Bank does is provide the retiring farmer with an annuity giving him economic security in his golden years. His son will receive the family farm, but by leasing land first, his financial obligations will be restricted to the minimum possible amount.

If the son receives his father's inheritance he can use the money to purchase the land from the Land Bank. The Land Bank provides the maximum possible protection to the family farm and places both the farmer and the son in favorable economic circumstances.

The capital value of the average Saskatchewan farm is approximately \$60,000. The Land Bank will allow farmers to increase their holdings up to this level but not higher. It is not intended to cater to merely privileged groups, but to the farmer who needs help to continue in his chosen occupation.

The \$60,000 limit on farm assets will allow farms to achieve economic viability but not allow unlimited expansion. This is vitally important, because the goal of the Land Bank is to preserve as many family farms as possible and not finance corporate takeovers.

In summing up, putting all these facts together for the future and progress of agriculture - 1. We must get a proper two-price system for wheat. 2. We must continue diversification to livestock in order to remain viable farming units. 3. We know the Land Bank will save the smaller family unit. 4. The Land Bank should put more farmers back on the land.

5. The Land Bank will bring a real measure of security to the farmers when they know that as they reach their retirement they have an opportunity to sell their farm with an annuity security plan if they wish, or a choice of outright payment. 6. The Land Bank should bring fair and reasonable prices for the land, and 7. stabilize prices for land sold in Saskatchewan. 8. It could be the means of stopping the booms and busts in land prices.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank brought in in this Session could do for the people of Saskatchewan and the farm industry - 1. What hospitalization and medicare is doing for the health needs of our people. 2. What Government Insurance did for the motorist. 3. What the Homestead Act did for the farmer and the city dweller. 4. What our Trade Union Act did for the protection of the worker. 5. What the Minimum Wage Act did for the income of the worker. 6. What the free medicare card is doing for the pensioners.

In conclusion, the Land Bank was a major issue in last June's election. The results clearly indicated massive support for the plan. This was further provided by the enthusiastic support of over 11,000 concerned farmers in the 13 hearings recently held throughout the province. There is no doubt that this support is well justified for the benefits of the Land Bank will go to those in need of help. Surely no one will disagree that the Government of Saskatchewan has a right and obligation to help its farmers in these times of crisis.

This is precisely what the Land Bank will achieve. Again I repeat, it will reduce the burden of debt on the farmer. It will help the transfer of the family farm from father to son. It will provide a stable income to the retiring farmer and help the younger farmer achieve economic viability.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank will provide the assistance to Saskatchewan agriculture which is so desperately needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North):— Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to speak following this filibuster by the backbenchers of the Government's own Bill, I intend to limit my remarks on the Land Bank to the principle involved in the Land Bank and not to any of the particular features. I rise at this time only to place on the record my objections to the Bill.

The Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) when he rose to speak in this debate indicated that we Liberals are wasting time in this House by talking about such superficial things as socialism. This, to me, is the issue of this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— The Minister went on to talk about the rental rates and the quotas and the other administration details, whether it is a good deal or a bad deal, and so on. And he said that this was what was important, this is where we could make a contribution to the discussion on this Bill.

May 2, 1972

Well, I tell the Minister of Education that he talks nonsense when he says this. The issue is socialism and I will make no apology for talking about it in this House or anywhere else in the province. Certainly there is lots wrong with the Land Bank Bill. In this point I agree with the Minister of Education. But at this time I am not interested in the individual clauses and the problems that they may cause in the overall administration of the Land Bank.

The reason for this is that the whole concept of the Land Bank is bad. It is alien to my thinking. The principle involved in this Bill is socialism. The basic concept of socialism is that the state will own the land and the means of production. This Bill provides for the state to own all the land in Saskatchewan. It opens the door for the Government of Saskatchewan to own every bit of the land. The Wafflers have urged this and the farmers' union have urged this. I cannot accept this. I don't believe that the state should own the land and I never will. I don't believe that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has the right to tell who can farm, why and where they can farm.

This Bill will lead to this. This is the principle involved in this Bill and this is what we should be talking about. The transfer of land that was indicated in the title of this Bill is not a transfer from farmer to farmer and we should remember this. It is a transfer of land to the state from the farmer. I think this Bill ignores the facts that are inherent in human nature. I don't believe that farmers want to farm state land, and to be told how and when to do it.

Farmers don't want to be serfs of the Government or of any other particular organization and this Bill makes them so. Farming in many cases is a way of life and involved in that way of life is pride of ownership. I think it is an extremely important part of farming as a way of life. You can't show me how pride can be achieved when the state owns the land and the Minister of Agriculture tells the farmer, how, when, why and where to farm.

The Bill is just a foot in the door and the ultimate hopes and the aspirations of the Socialist will be realized. The Farmers' Union and the Wafflers have indicated they are not happy with this Bill, that it doesn't go far enough, that it doesn't place all the land in the hands of the state fast enough to satisfy these people. The Government is proceeding with the Land Bank in this fashion so that it will not upset too many people too quickly. However, the intention is obvious, the intention is that the state must own all the land. That is the principle, Mr. Speaker, that is important to me and to suggest as the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) did that this is a waste of time to discuss in this House, I say again, is nonsense.

I entered this debate, and I want it recorded that I am opposed to state ownership of land and I always will be. Therefore I cannot support the Land Bank Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter this debate on the Land Bank. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support what I consider to be one of the most

far-reaching Bills . . .

MR. MacDONALD:— Landmarks . . .

MR. ROMANOW: . . . or landmarks, yes, watersheds, use any description that I am sure that the Liberals opposite don't have either the imagination or the courage to think of in the field of agriculture. They don't use those words because they can't think in those terms to try to solve the problems of our farmers in Saskatchewan. They never could say that about any of their agriculture bills and they feel very aggrieved that we come in and say it about this great Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture. Because you know all that the Minister and all that the former Government did for seven years was to sit on this Government side. They didn't use words such as watershed, or landmark because they didn't have any such bills. All they did was preside over the destruction of the family farmer in Saskatchewan during seven long years. Liberals in the Government sat by while farmers were forced off their lands, Liberals sat and did nothing but talk about the Task Force on Agriculture. Storekeepers in rural Saskatchewan because of the agricultural crisis created by the Liberals in Regina and Ottawa had to close their doors, in towns, in cities, everywhere and yet the Liberals in Regina did nothing. Farm houses were boarded up, granaries boarded up, thanks to the Liberal policies on agriculture and in Regina. Yet the Liberals did nothing whatsoever. The Task Force was launched as the answer, the Task Force that the Liberal Party still wants to implement would remove two out of three of every farmers in Saskatchewan from the farm lands. Back streets in our villages had grass growing in them because of inactivity by the Liberal Government. What did the Liberals do? They did nothing. They continued in search of iron mines, in search of promoters from Eastern United States, in search of their private enterprise promoters so that they could give thousands of dollars away for everybody who lived outside of Saskatchewan and nothing for the family farmer at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— Now the Liberals come forward and they say that they are against the Land Bank. The future of this Province, I remind the Liberals, rest with the development of agriculture in our province. The Land Bank and other measures brought in this Session are introduced recognizing that fact. Mr. Speaker, the history books record that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. The history books will also record that in seven years the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan whistled while farmers withered away in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support a vital piece of legislation which is so important to the basic industry of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in one of his earlier statements sometime during this debate or sometime outside the House or even in the House, the new Leader of the Liberal Party, was quoted as saying that the Liberals would be a "constructive Opposition". That is the exact quotation that I read on many occasions widely reported in the Press throughout Saskatchewan. Many hoped that in fact would be actually so. However, Mr. Speaker, this Session has proved it again and this debate has proved it again, it is really the same old Davy Stuart, it is really the same old Liberal Party, it is really the same old gang of Liberal

May 2, 1972

Party boys who are in the hip pockets of the big corporations of Eastern Canada. It is the same old Liberal Party that is devoid of ideas in agriculture, refusing to debate issues, tricky in the games that they play, abusive in the language that they use. We should know by now, never, never to believe any statement by any Liberal on any subject, even if it is a statement from a reformed new Leader of the Liberal Party.

No wonder that the Liberals opposite are now facing a terrific challenge from within by Group 171. I see that the Liberal Party opposite now is being challenged by leadership of the men of the calibre of George Leith, a man who all Members on this side had a great deal of respect for. He advanced good and positive ideas, although we did not agree with many of them. But those ideas were progressive, they were not sloganeering ideas such as, "This is an issue of Socialism versus freedom", "This is an issue of Communism versus freedom". This is an issue of a man's right to work his land or not as the Members opposite are saying. Mr. Leith and Group 171 do not believe that. Group 171 of the Liberal Party want a debate on the issues, they want plans and programs which are designed to help the family farm and not to scuttle them before the Bill even becomes before the law implemented in Saskatchewan. I wonder what Group 171 would think if they saw the actions of the Leader and the Liberal Party in the Legislature on this vital issue. I wonder what Mr. Leith would have said if he had been able to speak in this House and witness the tactics of the Liberal Party opposite. What would Group 171 dedicated to injecting new ideas in politics have said about the actions of the boys opposite who still behave in the manner that somehow you can win government by using political tricks or stunts. Is this the new wave of the Liberal Party opposite? Is this the new politics of the new Leader of the rejuvenated Liberal Party? Mr. Speaker, let no Member be mistaken, it is the same old Liberal Party.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Speaker, I was saying before 5:30 that this debate has proven again to the Legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan that there is nothing politically new to be expected on agricultural problems from the Liberal Party opposite. I was also saying prior to the adjournment at 5:30 that because of this attitude and because of their position, I think that everybody knows that the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan is going to be in Opposition for quite some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I say that because I firmly believe it. I feel that many of the colleagues on this side also firmly believe it . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I also want to tell the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that I believe they know that they are going to be in for a long hitch in Opposition. I have a clipping from the Ottawa Citizen, February 9, 1972. Mr. Speaker, because of positions taken by the Liberal Party as they have done on the Land Bank I think this clipping also shows something about

their positions. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) gave an interview to a reporter by the name of Nick Hills in Regina. He was talking about the election of June 23, 1971. He was talking about the long range forecasts for the Liberal Party in 1975 and onwards. It is a very interesting story, Mr. Speaker, that I commend every Member to read. But the headline simply says, "Saskatchewan Grits See Long Hitch in Opposition". Quoting from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steuart goes on talking to the Ottawa newspaper about how good a leader and Premier, Mr. Blakeney is. Those are the types of things he tells the Eastern Press. Then he goes on to say, "This is the sort of man who will be around for a long time." I say that if anybody stated the case correctly it was the Leader of the Opposition. This Government is going to be around for a long time as the Opposition Leader has said . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— . . . and it's going to be precisely because of your opposition to the Land Bank, your lack of constructive Opposition. It has been suggested in newspaper editorials and elsewhere that there are two or three Members on this side of the Government who don't believe in a strong Opposition. I want to say that there is nothing further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. I personally feel that a good democratic system requires a strong Opposition. I only regret that in Saskatchewan we don't have a strong Opposition for a good democratic process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— What we have in a Saskatchewan Opposition is a political party which seeks to emphasize its position by obstructing, Mr. Speaker. I mean by obstructing simply adopting sloganeering positions and never really proposing an alternative approach, never criticising with any degree of academic truth, any of the points that are contained in a Bill. That is no Opposition and the entire Legislature and the Government of the day suffers by the fact that we have a very weak Opposition and a very weak Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals say that they are against the Land Bank. At the outset let me say that I believe that there will likely be administrative problems connected with a land bank, especially in the first years of operation. Few would deny that, including even I believe the Minister of Agriculture. There is also bound to be some disappointment among farmers because of their exceedingly high expectations about any new idea and in particular this idea. This is especially true in these circumstances when they find themselves in the past year or so in very difficult economic straits. Now having said all of that, let me say that our farmers will realize, however, that the Land Bank is not a final or total solution to their agriculture problems. It never was presented by the Minister of Agriculture or Premier Blakeney as such. We don't maintain that now in second reading. Today's farmer realizes that ultimately his problems can only be solved by the actions of the Federal Government especially in the area of marketing price controls. However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Saskatchewan farmers will realize that a Land Bank and this Act is a positive piece of legislation that will assist

May 2, 1972

them in their struggle to maintain themselves as a family farm unit. They will recognize this as a positive piece of assistance carried out by this Government. The administrative problems will be ironed out. The concept will be well received especially within the next two or three years. I say that this House should congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for his hard work in putting together this Bill, listening to the farmers in the fashion that he has and explaining to them and getting their views on the operation of the Bill.

Now there are many reasons, of course, why the Liberals say they are opposing the Land Bank. But, Mr. Speaker, sitting and listening to their debate there is one central theme in Opposition, it is a disturbing theme. They argue on the simplistic grounds that the Land Bank will take away the privileges of land ownership. They say that somehow the Land Bank is equivalent to nationalizing the land, or the right wing element of the party say it is the same as socializing, or even on the more right wing of the party, to communizing the land, as the Leader of the Opposition has said. I've been in politics and in this Legislature for four years, Mr. Speaker. I thought when I first got interested in politics, back in 1962 and 1961, and I was listening to the Liberal Party rising at that time, just prior to attaining power, that we would likely never here again in Saskatchewan see the bogey of communism. Having sat here for four years I didn't hear it until just a few days ago when the Leader of the Opposition, supported by the Member from Milestone in particular trotted out that old bogey in an attempt to scare, in an attempt to stampede the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan against a rational, good, cold look at this Bill. I wouldn't have believed it would have been possible today in 1972 to trot out this fear that the Land Bank would take away the privileges of land ownership and substitute therefore the drudgery of tenancy. That's their argument, that's their central theme. Boiling that argument down what the Liberals say is that the Land Bank will make our farmers the slaves of the state. The Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) has described it as an agency that will tell the farmers what to seed and when to seed. I say again, Mr. Speaker, all of Saskatchewan must be amazed at this quality and this level of debate in 1972. Stripped of all of its excess verbiage what this argument by the Liberals of Saskatchewan seeks to do is to scare our farmers into an emotional stance against the Land Bank. I say that I was amazed at this position for many reasons but two primarily. Firstly, I couldn't believe that there would be a modern day political party in Saskatchewan fighting issues by inflaming passions and prejudices as the Liberals opposite do. But now I realize that this is the stock and trade of the Liberal Party. They seek to inflame farmers every time there is a strike anywhere in Canada or in Saskatchewan. Their tactics are to divide and to rule. They bring the farmer against the laborer. In educational matters their stock and trade solution was to bring the teacher against the trustee. I recall the old days when a government of the day called young people as gooks, hippies and long-haired weirdos and other expressions. I couldn't believe in 1972 that there were those who honestly believed that this form of scare tactic would have any political effect but I was wrong. Apparently they do believe that it does have some political effect.

In 1948, Mr. Speaker, on the agricultural issues of the day, I am told that the Liberals then campaigned on the slogan of Tucker or Tyranny, when they discussed agricultural issues.

I recall seeing advertisements, Tucker or Tyranny, when the proposal of land reform was advocated then. They went up and down the countryside playing on the prejudices and the fears of the people. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, playing on the fears of new Canadians, of Eastern European background particularly, warning them of the dangers of socialism. If that ever was, Mr. Speaker, if that ever was a legitimate political tactic, it was rejected in 1948 as it will surely be rejected today and in 1975. But lo and behold there is nothing new under the sun. Today we have the new Liberal Party and the new Liberal Leader and lo and behold we see the dawning of a new age of enlightened Liberal politics. We see the rise of the new slogan to substitute for Tucker and Tyranny, the new slogan of Steuart or Slavery in the Province of Saskatchewan. This argument of communism versus freedom, socialism versus freedom, right versus wrong, poverty versus wealth, enslavement, all of the slogans attached by the Liberals opposite is an argument, Mr. Speaker, that debases the level of debate in a democracy particularly in the democracy in Saskatchewan. Modestly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I think I know something of the feelings of our farmers. I was born in this Province but some of these farmers of Eastern European origin came to this country for very special reasons and these slogans were designed to try and catch their support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I think, like all Members I have some feeling for Saskatchewan. I predict to the Members of this House and to the farmers that this type of scare tactic based on race or any other emotional overtone as the Liberals have based this campaign, will surely be defeated as night follows day in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I say also not only about the defeat but it tells a lot about the Opposition and I said the hollowness and the obstruction of it. What does it say, Mr. Speaker, about a political party that can't mount an academic argument about the Bill? What does it say, Mr. Speaker, about a political party that is limited in its debate trying to scare some of those Canadians who have worked for years to toil on the soil? Farmers of Ukrainian background who have worked for 20, 30 or 40 years in building up the land and what we have is a political party running up and down the Province of Saskatchewan not trying to help them to understand legislation but trying to scare them. What does that tell of a political party?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I say that the Liberal Party should re-examine its values and the direction that it is going to take if they're going to stake out a position on agricultural matters. I say they are going to be in for a big surprise if they think that our farmers, those of Eastern European background or otherwise will be stampeded into that type of racial approach. I don't think they are going to be. I said that the Liberals did not believe in meeting issues with issues, ideas with ideas. Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank has proven that point of view again and again, we really have no opposition in the Province of Saskatchewan worthy

May 2, 1972

of the name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of this House that I enjoy campaigning although some may not suspect that of me. I enjoy making political speeches on the hustings. Some may be surprised by that bit of information but I ought to say that I am going to take a great deal of delight in explaining the provisions of the Land Bank to many of my farmer friends in some parts of Saskatchewan, particularly farmer friends using my best Ukrainian tongue. It will be, Mr. Speaker, somewhat difficult not to laugh when I try to translate Steuart or slavery in Ukrainian, but I shall give it a try. It will be somewhat difficult not to laugh but I shall try anyway not to turn it into a comedy hour when I tell them about the Liberal prosperity of the last two or three years compared to the socialist poverty they are now experiencing. It will be mildly difficult I am sure to try to resist the humor in these circumstances but I can tell the Liberals opposite and all the Members of the House and those of you on this side who appreciate this point of view that we are going to try to tell the farmers of Eastern European background exactly what kind of tricks the Liberal Party was up to in the Province of Saskatchewan. We are going to do it not only with them but all of the farming people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying this. The central issue in this debate about the Land Bank is this question of whether or not this House will vote for the establishment of a vehicle which will facilitate transfers of land to our Saskatchewan people, make it easier, a means of keeping land values realistic over a period of time. That's basically what this Bill does. There are other issues of course. Every Member in this House has to ask himself the question, are these objectives valuable? Are these objectives going to help our family farm? If the answer is Yes, if they are laudable objectives and the Bill seeks to accomplish that aim, then you must vote for this Bill in second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— I have obviously concluded that those are valuable objectives and that this Bill, although meeting perhaps not the target dead on, will be a direct form of provincial assistance in this area. However, whether you use slogans, whether you say that I believe in an Otto Lang Land Bank or whether you are afraid because of Cabinet control or whatever other side issues if you adopt that position it is clear to me and to the Province of Saskatchewan that quite clearly you are opposing those objectives and thereby opposing this Bill. This Bill is designed to help the family farmer. This Bill may not solve his problems, Mr. Speaker, but this Bill is an attempt to work out a solution to his problems. We seek to work to get that solution. That is why we think of these ideas and this legislation. The Liberals either are unwilling or unable to present solutions in alternative or any solutions whatsoever. And I say that the issue here is an issue of whether or not the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan and the MLAs of the day are prepared to stand behind the most important man in Saskatchewan, the family farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— It is as simple as that. Those who vote against this Bill on second reading, make no mistake about it, are voting against the interests of the family farmers, there is no other way to interpret it. Those who have sloganeered against the Bill as the Liberal Party have, have condemned the family farmer to the mercy of the Task Force whereby two out of three are to be eliminated. That may be a position for the Liberal Party, it may be one that they support. It may be one that their corporate friends want them to support but it is one that Members on this side, and I am proud to say that I am one of them, will never support. We seek to work for the maintenance of our family farmer and this Bill does it, Mr. Speaker. I will be pleased to vote for it in second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake):— Mr. Speaker, I hadn't just figured on entering this debate because a lot of my colleagues here have covered it very well, but after a lot of the dissertation I have heard this afternoon and especially the last one, I just want to say that I am absolutely opposed to this, and I want to give you a good reason why.

One of the first things that I had to do after I was elected to this House was to straighten out a farm deal in the Pierceland area where there was a poor farmer who was leasing land from the former CCF Government. That poor farmer had sowed his crop, his wheat was six inches high, the Government of the day hired a tractor and machinery and went in there and one-wayed his crop down. Now that was a pretty tough situation where this farmer was sitting there with a shot gun to keep Government officials off his land. And you people talk about saving the family farm. I went to the Minister, Hammie MacDonald, at that time and we got this thing straightened out and we made it possible for that man to buy that land and there has been no trouble since. Now if that is any indication of the way the situation is going to be when you people take over this land, your farmers won't know whether they have a crop coming or whether some Government officials are going to come and plough it down - this happened. This is something any one of you can go to Pierceland today and check out. That is why I am opposed to this Land Bank in its present form. I haven't heard one of them speaking from the Government side there who have said they are going to save the family farm. How are you going to save the family farm when you take his land away? Why not buy some land from some of the old fellows that want to retire and can't get a sale for their land and then help some young fellows get started or put the assets of the Government behind the young fellow and help him get started. But let him buy the land so that he can keep away from this Government interference and this is all it will be. Because we've seen it and I am definitely opposed to this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture):— Mr. Speaker, since moving second reading of this Bill there have been a good many Members to your left, the Members of the Opposition, take part in the debate on second reading. All of

May 2, 1972

them I think have been at least harmonious in one area of the debate and that is that all they have been able to do is criticize and not in any real way bring about some objective criticism or recommendation for change that will be an improvement or an asset to the Bill that we have introduced at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— The Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) spoke, the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe), Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), and Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and Athabasca (Mr. Guy) spoke last evening, also the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) and we even had the opportunity of hearing a few words from the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). But this afternoon we had the opportunity to have a few remarks made by the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), in a last ditch attempt to make an amendment to the Land Bank which would in effect curtail the passing of this legislation and further worsen the problems of Saskatchewan farmers by asking them to wait another six months before this most important Bill is passed. For those Members who have sat in the House as Opposition prior to the Government change in June of 1971, they would have been aware of the opportunities that the Member from Milestone has taken advantage of previously to throw his fits of what I think can't be called any thing else but verbal diarrhoea. He says that the meetings, in his remarks this afternoon, that the meetings that were held by my Department in fact the Government of Saskatchewan across the province during January and February were a farce. His reasons for saying that were that there was not any real substantial changes from the proposals that I made at those meetings that we now have in the draft Bill before you today. Simply because there was not significant change, he says there is something wrong with the program. I should like to remind him and the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, if they would have taken the time to attend some of those meetings or perhaps to read some of the material that was sent out to the farmers and other interested parties in the Province of Saskatchewan, if they had gone to Weyburn or North Battleford or Lloydminster or Prince Albert or Tisdale or Yorkton or Wynyard or Swift Current or some of the other areas of the province where we had those meetings, they would know that there was no real substantial objection to the proposals that we were presenting at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— They would further know, Mr. Speaker, that there was no real feeling by any individuals, groups of individuals, farm organizations or other spokesman asking for significant changes. The reason there wasn't any feeling such as that is that the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the farmers in this Province, agreed with the proposals that we made at that time and that's why we have the Bill in front of them today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— Now, he lists several reasons for being against a Land Bank besides that. One was that the example I used to show him the difference between a farmer who was purchasing land from the Farm Credit Corporation and a farmer who was

renting land through the Land Bank Commission. And he tries to impress upon us that the farmer of Saskatchewan is not stupid. We already know he is not stupid. They just finished tossing out that Government ten months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— But he says he is going to take a chart to the rural areas of Saskatchewan or a pie whatever he referred to it, along with blood, sweat and tears and he is going to show the farmers of Saskatchewan how they are going to be hoodwinked by the Government of the day. I invite him and all of his colleagues to take all the pies and the charts they want to rural Saskatchewan and rural Saskatchewan will tell them whether they want a Land Bank Commission or not and we are willing to stand on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— His second objection was the rental, an objection that a number of Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, have made, cash rental to which they object because it is adjustable. They say that it shouldn't be adjustable. It should be set and that is where it should stay regardless of the economic problems that farmers may be confronted with. Don't ever change the rent. In other words it can't go down and if the times improve and incomes improve it shouldn't go up either. He says that it is not based on productivity or production or wages or the improvements that a farmer has to make. He says that it doesn't take into consideration the cost of operating a farm in that light. Again, I would suggest to the Members and particularly the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) he should have read the material or attended one of the meetings where we told them that the reasons it was adjustable is so that we could give some consideration to farmers when their incomes in fact do drop. The rental is adjustable to a maximum and a minimum of 15 per cent in any given year. Certainly it relates to the costs of money to the Government but we also incorporate that flexibility so that it does not create a hardship for farmers who are renting land from the Land Bank Commission. We also said that if there are continuing bad years of production, or continuing bad years of sale of agricultural commodities whereby the income to farmers drop that we will waive the rent during those periods of time until some time in the future when better economic conditions and better incomes occur so that they then at that point in time can pay the rent. That's the reason for flexibility so that we can give assurance and stability to farmers who are renting land from the Land Bank Commission that they won't be confronted with rents that they cannot pay.

He also made the observation that \$60,000 net worth would exclude all farmers above that and because we put a \$60,000 net worth on those who are eligible in the first few years for land under the Land Bank Commission that that is not right. Again let me impress the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, that our priorities are to the younger farmers and those that are having difficulty in establishing now and all those farmers will not be over the \$60,000 net worth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 2, 1972

MR. MESSER:— His third remark was and the Attorney General and other speakers on this side of the House have already referred to it, the scare tactics of the campaign that the Members to your left have tried to launch, Mr. Speaker. He says that it is no better than state ownership. He says there is no option to purchase which there is and all Members know full well but because of that scare campaign and those scare tactics they don't want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that that is a major portion of the Bill. They try to leave the impression that the Government of Saskatchewan has the intention of buying all land in Saskatchewan. Just let me remind them, Mr. Speaker, that there are over 46 million acres of cultivated land in this Province, 20 million acres of grazing land. On top of that we have about 8 1/2 million acres of land that is already administered by the Lands Branch, Crown land administered by the Government of Saskatchewan. In order to buy that kind of land we would have to have something in the neighborhood of \$3,225,000,000. And it only stands to reason that the Province of Saskatchewan does not have that kind of money nor does it have the intentions to raise that money to buy that kind of land. There will be no significant change in the large way to ownership of land in the province. But they continue to try and impress upon those who are not all that aware what the Land Bank Commission is at this time, that they will be nothing but share croppers, that they will all be tenants and that in fact they will be in the same position as those who are behind the Iron Curtain, which is ridiculous. They do not mention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is already a large percentage of farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan today who are renting land. They rent land because it is the only way that they can obtain a basic farming unit. They rent land because it is the only way that they could achieve an economic and stabilized farming operation.

The survey - and I made mention of it on the introduction of second reading of this Bill - that was taken in Moose Jaw involved 14 municipalities, pointed out conclusively that better than 30 per cent of the farmers in that area were renting land today and they are not complaining about it.

The real reason, Mr. Speaker, why the Members opposite are objecting so strenuously to this Bill is that they are protecting the mortgage companies with which they have some close association. That is the reason. The same reason as they objected to and voted against the Consumer legislation that my colleague, the Attorney General brought in only one week ago. The same reason they opposed The Family Farm Protection Act in the July session of 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some comments in regard to what other Members to your left have said in regard to this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) several days ago, moved an adjournment to the Land Bank Bill, but when there came the opportunity for him to speak again, obviously he had shot his wad on the first round because he only sat there and smiled and said nothing. His initial speech was full of a great deal of sound, but it contained very little in the way of analysis or constructive proposals.

If one were to analyze his speech and boil it down I think he would end up with two points. I think that was a mistake that the Leader of the Opposition made. He used up both of his

points in his initial address and found himself with nothing to say when his turn came to speak again.

The first point he made was that we should give farmers a reasonable chance to buy the land. His criticism completely ignores the fact that the Land Bank farmers farm the land because he chooses to do so in the beginning rather than put himself deeply in debt with a Farm Credit Corporation or some other kind of mortgage.

The Land Bank will give the young farmer a choice of ways of getting into farming. He can use any of the routes which are now or were previously opened to him because they will be continued to be open to him as a way of getting into farming. But on top of that he will have this extra alternative way of starting a basic farming operation.

As the Leader of the Opposition says in effect to young men in our province who are struggling to become farmers, that you must go out and buy your land whether you want to or not. And so far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, if you choose to rent from the Land Bank you are making a mistake. No other alternative, Mr. Speaker, that is arrogance and I think compulsion in the grand Liberal tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is not saying to any farmer that you must rent from the Land Bank. They are not saying that you cannot buy from the Land Bank. The farmer or the farm family can use the Land Bank arrangement if they chose to do so in preference to the other arrangements that will continue to exist for land transfer.

The requirement that the farmer who may later want to purchase the land will pay cash for it, recognizes the fact that the Farm Credit Corporation and other lending agencies are already in the business of providing mortgage money for the acquisition of farm lands in Saskatchewan.

Surely, surely the Hon. Members opposite do not want us to spend provincial funds duplicating a program which is already in operation by the Federal Government. We are not saying, as they would have Saskatchewan people believe, that to the farmer who wants to buy his land he has to save all his money until he gets the complete price. We are saying that there are other credit institutions which will assist you in the purchase of the land, including the Farm Credit Corporation and, therefore, if you want to purchase land you will need to make your arrangements through those regular mortgage channels.

Mr. Speaker, the other remark that the Leader of the Opposition made about the Land Bank revealed his lack of familiarity with the way that mortgages are now being used in the financing of property. His complaint was that the percentage interest rate used in the computation of rents would change from year to year, as the condition of the money market changed. He indicated that it was his understanding that under almost any other contract that he could think of, the interest rate was fixed as long as a 20-year period.

His complaint ignores the fact that many mortgage companies are now generally using, or attempting to use, a five-year period of setting the mortgage rates and this is a far cry from the 20 years to which he referred to in his address. The

May 2, 1972

Leader of the Opposition should also be aware of the fact that many of the farmers who are now locked in at comparatively high rates with the Farm Credit Corporation or other mortgage companies, have been urging the Federal Government to do the very thing that we are suggesting, namely, to review the interest rates charged in the light of the current interest rate picture.

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture has also urged Farm Credit Corporations to revise its interest rates now. The locked in situation which many farmers who bought their land in the middle and late '60s are now caught in, is exactly the sort of situation which apparently the Leader of the Opposition thinks should be the privilege of all farmers whether they like it or not.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) when he spoke last week, gave what to my mind was a reasonable view of the entire farming situation. He said, and I was pleased to note this, that the great responsibilities for marketing farm products rests really with the Federal and Provincial Governments. And, therefore, it is important that Provincial Governments take some measure of responsibility for improving the markets for the products from our farms. That is a comment which has a great deal of merit and I can only take a brief moment to remind the House that the Department of Agriculture has put in its Estimates a substantial amount of money for that very purpose of market development which the Member says is important. We are also adding staff in the Department of Agriculture for market development work.

All this amounts to a new thrust in the whole area of market development which should improve the income situation for Saskatchewan farmers, even though it does not affect the transfer of land directly. The Member for Cannington went on to indicate that many, many of our farm operators are presently getting close to retirement age and that we must do everything we can to retain as many viable farm units as possible, because this is the only way that many communities, which are dependent upon agriculture, can survive.

That is a very good analysis of this situation and from the point of view of the political stock of the Members opposite, it is unfortunate for them that they did not have, during their seven years of office, an understanding of this important inter-relationship of farm transfer, farm populations and community life. They should have because we told them often enough during our term as Opposition and passed a number of resolutions trying to bring it to their attention.

I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan are wondering whether, when a Member states this relationship with some considerable feeling, whether he has much prospect of bringing the Liberal Party along with him into realization of the importance of agriculture in our province. The alternative which he proposed was striking, not for its significance, Mr. Speaker, but rather for the fact that it is merely a rerun of what the Provincial Liberal Party promised, promised in 1964 and promised again in 1967, and didn't have the courage or the faith or the guts to do anything about it.

Moreover, it is essentially a tinkering with the Farm Credit Corporation arrangement which now exists. The Farm

Credit Corporation is in fact a creature of the Federal Government. And if the Member for Cannington is successful in persuading the Federal Government to improve the services provided by the Corporation, then, of course, he has our blessing. But it is scarcely reasonable to expect the Provincial Government to come along after the Farm Credit Corporation and to say, that we will do this or that to make the Farm Credit Corporation more satisfactory and more desirable. When the Federal Government has both the financial resources and the legislative responsibility to make the Farm Credit Corporation adapted to the needs of Canadians, and in particular Saskatchewan farmers.

I am sure that the Federal Government and the Farm Credit Corporation itself will be interested in having the Member's views on the ways to make the Corporation more useful to our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke earlier to this Bill I indicated that there was a considerable lack of understanding of elementary arithmetic and mathematics in the interpretation given by some critics of the Bill. The Member for Cannington combined forces with the Member who sits in the row behind him, the agricultural critic or his assistant critic from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) in giving the finest illustration of a complete lack of understanding of elementary mathematics when he discussed his \$372, one cow per year for a 25 year operation.

The assistance agricultural critic speaking with all the conviction that one can have on matters pertaining to agriculture when he has his roots deeply in the soil of a city lot, said that that would in over 25 years be 25 cows. The Member for Cannington continued in saying, "Yes, my colleague says that in 25 years you could buy 25 cows." The point which both of them ignored, which was later explained very adequately by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) was that the progeny of these cows should also be considered in making the comparison between rental and ownership. Since compound interest and other income has already been drawn to their attention from this side of the House in numerous addresses, I will not try once more to give them an elementary lesson in such computations.

I would say, however, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that the 25 cow incident does indicate the completely superficial analysis that the Members opposite have made of this Bill. And also, Mr. Speaker, their inability to project alternatives it allows to farmers participating in the Land Bank. This relates to their government and the kind of agricultural legislation that came from that government in their seven years of power.

One other speaker, from your left, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) stated that there were indeed a good many of inconsistencies in the Bill. I should like to clear up a couple of those factual misinterpretations that he made regarding the Land Bank legislation. The farmer will be able to operate the land as if he owned it and consequently he will farm it the way that he personally as a farm business manager feels is most appropriate, having regard to the soil, the weather, the market, the crops, his financial situation, his labor supply, the other enterprises on the farm and all the other considerations that any farmer takes into account when he knows that he is going to be in business, in business for a long time.

May 2, 1972

The Commission will not presume to dictate to the young farmer, the use which can be made of the farm land which he operates. The normal operating decisions will rest where we all agree they should rest, with the man who actually farms the land himself. I should also mention for his benefit that the provision will be made so that tenants can recapture the value of improvements that they have added to the land during the period of time they farmed it. Consequently they will be free and as willing to effect improvements to add to their farm income as if they were the owners of the property themselves.

Like the Member from Cannington earlier, he trotted out a series of complaints about the way in which the Farm Credit Corporation has operated and in particular he said that young farmers are now limited or restricted in being assisted into farming through the Corporation because they lack the security or the guarantee as related to owning a great deal of other property.

Of course, that is an important criticism of the Farm Credit Corporation and I would expect that the Members opposite would be very keen to try and persuade the Federal Government and the Corporation to overcome that criticism and that shortcoming, which has been pointed out by various people in times past. Again, I would say that all of these defects of the Farm Credit Corporation could best be remedied by the government which is responsible for the Farm Credit Corporation. We, as a province, have better things to do with our time and with our money than to guarantee or amend defects of Federal legislation.

The Member also conveniently ignores the fact that there may be young farmers who do not have the necessary down payment or the ownership of other land to provide the initial security. Who may not want to get themselves in a very insolvent position and who may, therefore, want to use the arrangement of the Land Bank even though they do have the resources to go to the Farm Credit Corporation. Surely the Member would not want to be in a position of saying to such people that they do not know what is best for themselves.

The Member went on at some length to defend the feature of the Farm Credit mortgages under which the annual payments are fixed and determined ahead of time. He said that the annual cost to the farmer is constant, regardless of the increase in land value, increases in interest rates, increases in productivity, or increases in farmer's net income. Now that is a sword, Mr. Speaker, a sword which cuts both ways. As I said earlier the farmers who have Farm Credit mortgages secured in the mid and late '60s are now calling upon Ottawa and the Federal Government to scale down the interest rates in line with the current market interest rates today.

Since these mortgages were obtained, interest rates have gone down. Land prices have gone down and the farmers' net income has gone down. But as the Member has so admirably pointed out, the annual fixed cost of Farm Credit mortgages has not gone down. That cost remains constant.

Mr. Speaker, the various Members opposite have quite obviously not talked to each other before putting together their criticisms of the Land Bank. Many of their criticisms are quite obviously mutually contradictory. Perhaps there is some merit from their point of view in the shotgun approach. Nevertheless

it is important to notice that in spite of all that they have offered in the way of criticism they have reluctantly conceded that the Land Bank will meet the approval of the people of this Province.

This is most clearly seen in what the Member for Morse said, that the draw back is that only \$10 million has been allocated for the purpose of buying land. This, surely is a clear-cut admission that the Land Bank will be doing a very active business and the criticism that we may not have allocated sufficient funds, is a criticism which is indisputable recognition that the program would be well received and much used.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of criticism which we are very glad to hear, because it means that the success of the program, even in the minds of the Members opposite, is assured.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the Members have all been inconsistent in their remarks. Some of them want the Government to have certain powers in the administration of the Land Bank, yet some Members don't want the Government to have that kind of power. Some want the program to be subsidized, yet some don't. The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says he doesn't want the program subsidized. Some want a Land Bank, from their remarks at least that is what it would seem, yet some others say they don't want a Land Bank, nothing like a Land Bank, some say they want a plebiscite yet others say they want the Land Bank to go into effect, but they want it to go into effect with some modifications. Some say that it will not work, yet some others say that it will work as the Member from Regina stated, it will work for only those who have a New Democratic Party membership. But then some others yet try to impress upon the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan that this program was originally intended to do something which now the Bill will not do. And I want to make it clear to those Members by quoting from a pamphlet which the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) quoted from earlier this afternoon, the New Deal for People pamphlet that we put out prior to the election in 1971, and which I think formed one of the planks in the platform for our election. I want to tell them again in case they haven't heard when we referred to it in times previous what we said the Land Bank Commission would do for farmers in Saskatchewan. If I may quote from the pamphlet:

Establish a Land Bank . . .

MR. STEUART:— Which one have you got?

MR. MESSER:— I am certain you've got it Mr. Leader of the Opposition. I know you read it before you go to bed every night, I would have thought you had it memorized by now. Obviously it doesn't stick with you, you should put it under your pillow and then maybe you'll get somewhere with it. It reads:

Establish a Land Bank Commission which could purchase land offered voluntarily on the market at competitive prices and lease this land, guaranteeing tender on the basis of need with option to buy, with the objective of promoting the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan.

That's what we said the program would do in 1971 and that's what this Bill will do when we pass it in this Legislature in 1972.

May 2, 1972

Mr. Speaker, some say that they would support a true Land Bank program. I say to them that this is a true Land Bank program. It is a program we told the people we would introduce prior to June 23rd and it is a program that we have drafted after having briefs and submissions, discussions and dialogue and continuing communications with farmers and farm organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan. There was no significant change in this Land Bank plan from what I proposed because there was no request for any significant change. If I may, Mr. Speaker, just briefly refer to a statement and a brief that was presented to myself in February by the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. The Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) made some brief statements in regard to it earlier this day. But I again want to make mention of some of the statements that they have in this brief. In general comments pertaining to the Saskatchewan Land Bank they say this and I quote:

We are very pleased the Land Bank policy was made public and provision made for farmer, rural and farm organization feedback prior to implementation of the legislation. This process also was one of the requests and policy positions of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture has recognized the Land Bank concept as a useful instrument in agricultural adjustment but only as one alternative for farmers, not a cure-all for the ills that beset farming and agriculture. The recognition for such a policy was contained in the May, 1969, CFA brief on prairie grains policy and re-emphasized at our June, 1971 semi-annual and January, 1972 annual meetings.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to point out some things that they want included in the Land Bank Commission. They say this:

We thus believe a Land Bank system should recognize and/or provide for the following criteria: 1. Voluntary participation by farmers.

That it has.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Is this . . .

MR. MESSER:— Oh, they are getting a bit squeamish, Mr. Speaker, because they realize now some of the statements they have made have been made with short-sighted investigation in pursuit of what the Land Bank will really do for farmers in Saskatchewan.

2. Viewed as an alternative for some but not as a panacea solution to farm problems.

We said that it would not be that.

3. Minimize land speculation.

This is one of the intentions of the Land Bank.

4. The realized net income position of the tenant in the rental arrangements.

This consideration is in fact the basis of the criteria for the establishment of the land rentals.

5. Regional and area deficiencies.

And it recognizes that.

6. The broadest possible use for farm land.

And it will endeavor to do that.

7. Federal-Provincial technical and cost sharing.

We have had a number of discussions and meetings with the Federal Government to encourage some sort of harmonious undertaking between the two levels of Government.

8. Average and weighing of calculated values.

And we attempt to do that. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that we have little chance of getting any money from the Federal Government. I agree with him, Mr. Speaker, because of the attitude of the Opposition in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's why we had no chance to get money. Because a program that has some merit for farmers in Saskatchewan but for political gain and political gain only, they'll sell those farmers short.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— And we'll be saying that when the Federal election comes along and the Prime Minister is going to be a little disappointed from what he thinks will happen in Western Canada. I suggest you meet with him again.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of recommendations that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture asked that we take into consideration.

MR. McPHERSON:— Four days in the House . . .

MR. MESSER:— You've had your opportunity to speak now allow me the opportunity to wind up second reading. When we get into clause by clause consideration of the Bill you will have your opportunity to shoot your wad again if you've got one to shoot. Mr. Speaker, there were a number of recommendations and observations that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture made, recommendations and considerations that I assure you we took into consideration before we drafted this Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another area that the Opposite has been critical of in their debate of this Bill, is the selling of the land. They say that we should immediately provide the provision to sell the land and that there should be no five-year waiting period. May I remind them that all of the land that has been administered by the Government of Saskatchewan prior to 1964 to 1971 had a five-year waiting period before a tenant or one who was renting the land could purchase it. That's the way it is now and that's the way it is in the Land Bank Commission. We say there is a reason for that, that's the way it has always been. It's been like that for 20 years,

May 2, 1972

even they didn't think of changing that in seven years of mismanaged government.

MR. STEUART:— What was that, I missed it?

MR. MESSER:— You miss a lot of things. No doubt you will have the opportunity when we get into the Committee of the Whole to go through it again, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

We say that there is a waiting period of five years so that farmers will have an opportunity to establish themselves during the renting period before they may prematurely make a decision to purchase land simply because of one affluent crop year without the opportunity to have assurance that future years may not give them that same kind of income. Unless we have an opportunity for them to have that period of time to give them some sort of backing to enable to provide them with an opportunity to analyze their financial position so that they then, with good judgment, can make an arrangement to purchase the land from the Land Bank Commission. We say that we are not giving them the money, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, because there are already a host of lending institutions in the Province of Saskatchewan, one of them being the Farm Credit Corporation and we don't believe that we should start a second lending institution in the Province of Saskatchewan that is in competition with the Farm Credit Corporation. If you want to use some of your energies, if you have any energy, you should be impressing upon the Federal Government and the Farm Credit Corporation to recognize the Land Bank scheme in Saskatchewan and give it some assistance in the transfer of the land so that there may be some equitable means of transferring the land to ownership if farmers do decide they want to own it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— And while we are talking about the Federal plan, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a couple of observations pertaining to the small farm adjustment plan which they have made reference to in their debate. They say that the small farm adjustment program is the answer to the Land Bank Commission and that it is in fact the answer to the transfer of farm lands in the Province of Saskatchewan. One would think that they would then know something about the program. Obviously they don't because they would know that there is a ceiling of \$20,000 per farm on the small farm adjustment program which makes it virtually inoperative in the Province of Saskatchewan. They know that the only way the small farm adjustment program plan will work in the province is that the land when it is purchased from a retiring farmer has to be immediately resold through the Farm Credit Corporation. They would also know that there is only some \$30 million provided for all of Canada and so that obviously the program is not going to be of much assistance in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to make several further observations in regard to what the Members opposite have said. I have heard the word 'compulsion' mentioned by every Member. That we are compulsive, that we are forcing farmers to involve themselves in the Land Bank Commission and are using scare tactics in order to do that. I want to refresh their memories that the program is completely voluntary. It purchases

the land voluntarily, it leases the land on a voluntary basis, the improvements are made on a voluntary basis, they give the opportunity for those who are renting land from the Commission to retire voluntarily, they have the opportunity to pick out preferential people to have the land assigned to. The only compulsion there is about the Land Bank scheme is that it was unfortunate it was not brought into effect sometime ago so that farmers would have had other alternatives when they were confronted with bankruptcies and lack of net income in order to meet the commitments that they had pertaining to the mortgages they had signed in order to purchase and establish themselves in farming.

They have also made mention that there are no renters but only sellers of land. I invite them, if they so desire, to take a look at the correspondence that I have received in my office and the other communications that we have from not only those who wish to sell but from those who are young farmers wishing to establish a farming enterprise or to expand their farming enterprise.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, they have tried to leave the impression that it is too political, that it is dominated by the Government and those appointed to run the Land Bank Commission will have to answer only to the Cabinet and the power will all come from the Cabinet. In fact, in the words of the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) he said that it "boggles the mind". May I refresh their memory in regard to the structure of the Land Bank Commission. There is an advisory council of not less than seven members, the majority of whom will be farmers or representatives of farm organizations who make recommendations in regard to the running of the land or the administration of the Land Bank Commission. There will be Land Bank Committees in the twelve regions of the province, each made up of not more than five members and these will have the opportunity of also making recommendations to the advisory council or to the Land Bank Commission. They may be appointed by the Minister, they may be appointed by farm organizations, they may be elected or they may be both elected and appointed. Where there are members elected the majority of them will be elected rather than appointed. There will furthermore be an appeal board made up of three members so that if anyone feels that he has been dealt with unfairly by the Land Bank Commission and its administration he will have a fair hearing pertaining to his grievance.

Now we have said, Mr. Speaker, that the Land Bank Commission is not an answer to all the farming problems that are confronting those farmers that are farming in this Province. We say it is a base, a base from which to work from so that we can launch other programs. Programs such as a net income stabilization plan, market development program, expansion in our livestock industry, expansion in secondary industries in relation to agricultural production. We want to further the management opportunities of farmers by counselling, to structure co-operative enterprises so that farmers will be able to take better advantage of group activity. We want to launch a massive rural development program so that we will be able to have stability and economic feasibility for farmers in this Province. This is a major step, I think a major cornerstone in building that kind of a future.

I said when I introduced this legislation, Mr. Speaker,

May 2, 1972

that it was progressive and that it was bold and that it was daring. I think people in Saskatchewan will agree with that. They know that this is a beginning of a program, not only one that recognizes the problem of Saskatchewan farmers but one that is starting a solution to those problems. The Members opposite I think have to ask themselves a fundamental question as to whether they oppose that kind of recognition, whether they oppose that kind of move which will ultimately solve the problems of the farmers in this Province. Having asked that question, Mr. Speaker, I think that they have only one decision that they can arrive at and that is a decision to support this. For if they do not support this legislation they in fact do not recognize the problems of Saskatchewan farmers, they in fact do not care about the farmers of Saskatchewan and they in fact will not provide the opportunity for a solution to those farmers. Due to these facts, Mr. Speaker, I ask them to support this Bill and I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

**YEAS - 42
MESSIEURS**

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

**NAYS — 12
MESSIEURS**

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Coupland	McIsaac	Lane
Guy	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Grant	Weatherald	Wiebe

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 115 - An Act respecting the Foreign Ownership of Agricultural Lands in Saskatchewan, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Romanow be now read a second time.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, this Bill demonstrates the intent, the direction and the goal of the NDP Government more than any other Bill introduced in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, it presents a very clear and very vivid picture of an NDP socialist Saskatchewan which is the goal of this Government that is in office. An NDP socialist Government, Mr. Speaker. It demonstrates the menace of this Government, of Premier Allan Blakeney and his radical followers. This Bill is ominous, it's menacing, it's vicious. Mr. Speaker, we have never been presented with a more ridiculous spectacle when the Minister introduced this Bill. He beat the most rapid retreat since Napoleon left Moscow. And, Mr. Speaker, he beat it because all of a sudden he heard about the feeling of the shock waves that went out to the people of Saskatchewan. Then, Mr. Speaker, when he realized the hostility of the people of Saskatchewan, he rushed back to this House and three days later tried to sell them a bill of goods, that all he wanted to do was to put it up for debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— Let's examine the facts. Every Bill that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has introduced in this House, he's come in like a trained puppet. A \$17,000 specialist has written it for him and he has read it off just like a trained seal. When he came in with this particular foreign ownership Bill, he came in with a few pieces of paper of hastily made notes, he threw his speech in the waste paper basket and came in and gave a terrible demonstration of the most far-reaching Bill probably that has been introduced in any Legislative Assembly in Canada in many, many years, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hanson) really told us what it was. He says, "I went home on Saturday night, I went to visit somebody and 20 people rushed in and that's all they were talking about." Twenty people, there was a big fight going on. And the Members came back and got a hold of the Minister and said, "Hold it". This is the kind of Bill that will disturb Canadians right from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Mr. Speaker, that retreat is understandable. Never have I seen anybody backwater, never have I seen a Government just turn around in an about face like the Minister of Agriculture. And it's understandable because it threatens every single Canadian, it threatens every farmer in Saskatchewan, it threatens his children, it threatens even his old age, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the Attorney General talk about the Liberal Party walking up and down, preaching fright and scare tactics. You know, Mr. Speaker, in five minutes after this Bill was introduced people in Saskatchewan were talking about it. Mr. Speaker, they were talking about this impact on Confederation. They were talking about its impact on citizens of Saskatchewan. They were talking about what is this Government going to do next, Mr. Speaker. But the tragedy of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the retreat is worse than the attack. This Bill is now in force, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is now in force! It is not in force because of debate, it is not in force because of resolution, it is not in force because of legislative approval, it is in force because of ministerial threat and ministerial decree.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the Minister of Agriculture. He says:

Foreign and corporate purchases of land are usually

May 2, 1972

not limited by shortages of capital in the way that our farmers are. Consequently, we believe it essential and entirely just that we now give notice that this legislation will be made retroactive. Prospective purchasers now have been advised forthright and fairly that they should have regard to the effect of the forthcoming legislation when they are considering any land acquisition in the province from this date on.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say:

It isn't foreigners, it's absentee owners . . .

And I want to repeat, "it isn't foreigners, it's absentee owners" from the Province of Saskatchewan. It doesn't make any difference if they are sons or daughters, uncles or aunts, if they are children or members of the family or brothers or sisters, it's absentee owners from the Province of Saskatchewan.

What will be retroactive, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Minister, what will be retroactive? Mr. Attorney General, what will be retroactive? It's a Bill without exemption, without qualification. He hasn't told us the limitation on the farm. He hasn't told us anybody that will be exempt. It is Bill 115 without exemption.

Mr. Speaker, this is the worst piece of legislation that the Minister of Agriculture could have ever done to harm the citizens of Saskatchewan. Never has a Minister, probably in the Dominion of Canada, issued a bigger threat. And it is a threat. Never has the Minister demonstrated such complete arrogance, complete disregard for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members opposite, the Member for Nutana (Mr. Robbins), the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris), do they consider that this is what this Legislative Assembly is for, to have a Minister stand up and by ministerial decree, tell them that a Bill is going to be retroactive to April 1, 1972 when it might not be passed for a year or a year and a half hence.

Mr. Speaker, let's take succession duties. The Premier came in and said, "You know, we'll turn around and put those retroactive to December 31st, but he informed the public of Saskatchewan about changes, he informed them about the exemptions.

The Minister of Agriculture has put in Bill 115 without exemption, Mr. Speaker, what does it mean? Well, let's take the Attorney General, the number two commissar. Let's suppose this Bill doesn't get passed until May 1st of next year. And if we turn around and do this and if we have our way, you won't pass it until May 15th of next year, that's 13½ months. Now what happens? That means everybody from April 1, 1972. Does the Attorney General seize their land? Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, you've got the power and the authority according to the ministerial threat. Mr. Speaker, this is so arrogant. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Government. I don't think the Minister of Agriculture has the courage to perpetuate his own stupidity. Now that's what I believe. He doesn't have the courage to perpetuate his own stupidity.

Mr. Speaker, let's examine this Bill and what's happened in this House in the last two or three weeks. First, the

Government brought in a Bill to destroy the principle of individual ownership in farm land. Mr. Speaker, its purpose is to transfer the ownership of land to the state. They called it the Land Bank. But then they turned around and they said, "You know, Mr. Speaker, this Bill will be a voluntary transfer. Only farmers who wish to sell their land to the Land Bank will use it. We'll make it completely voluntary." And then they developed a plan that made it virtually impossible because of provisions of the plan for anybody to own his own land if he entered under a lease. Then, Mr. Speaker, they bring in this Bill. This, Mr. Speaker, is the companion piece of the Land Bank. The companion piece, the reluctant bride, the reluctant bride that is marching up the aisle. By its provisions it destroys all competition to purchase land in the Province of Saskatchewan on behalf of the Land Bank. Completely destroys competition. It effectively reduces every farmer in this Province to state ownership. It's really nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than a companion piece. Then to top it all off, the Premier comes in and he says, "We'll put in succession duties." Then if any farmer lives, if he survives that onslaught of the foreign ownership, if he survives the onslaught of the Land Bank, then the Premier will grab his land when he dies. Mr. Speaker, three Bills, the Land Bank, the Foreign Ownership and the Succession Duty are there for one specific purpose and that is to get state ownership of the land.

Mr. Speaker, what will this Bill do? Let's look at Bill 115. What will it do? It will affect three classes of people or classifications in Canada. 1. Foreigners. Certainly, I suppose the NDP are against probably their American friends. 2. It will affect every Canadian from the Atlantic to the Pacific who wishes to purchase land in Saskatchewan. 3. It will affect every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan far more than it will affect the Americans and far more than it will affect anybody outside the Province of Saskatchewan.

Let's examine these three classifications. First of all, no one on this side and in the Province of Saskatchewan will object to reasonable limitations to American or foreign ownership of agricultural land in Saskatchewan. No one. Mr. Speaker, states south of the border have put in the same kind of restrictions for Canadians. They have limited non-resident ownership in the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not directed against Americans, it's not directed against foreigners. Mr. Speaker, the description of non-resident has nothing to do with an American, it has nothing to do with a foreigner. It describes one group of people who are Canadians, who live outside the Province of Saskatchewan. It says any person living outside Saskatchewan, it includes family partnerships of two brothers, it means anyone living in Alberta, in Manitoba, in Ontario, in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, it is a vicious attack on confederation. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine, it turns around and separates the Province of Saskatchewan from the rest of Canada. It discriminates against Canadians. It certainly does, Mr. Attorney General, against non-residents of Saskatchewan. It means no one now living outside of the Province of Saskatchewan can purchase land.

Mr. Speaker, it is even against industry. Supposing the Roumanian Tractor Plant wants to purchase land outside the city of Saskatoon or Moose Jaw to build a plant. By the effects of this law and the ministerial threat they cannot even purchase land. Mr. Speaker, Section 4 is even worse. It says, "No

May 2, 1972

non-resident including Saskatchewan families can transfer land or give it to another non-resident." Not even to a daughter. Let's take an example of this. A farmer has a son and a daughter and he splits his estate. The daughter gets married and moves to the Province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, she cannot even inherit the father's own land. Section 5 - "No Saskatchewan resident can sell to a non-resident." This includes gifts by estates - not even to his own family. Mr. Speaker, it immediately eliminates all competition of land from the Land Bank. You couldn't sell the backhouse on the back forty today. It has completely ceased all agricultural sales in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, how arrogant can a Minister get? But, Mr. Speaker, the most important thing is that it affects every farmer in Saskatchewan.

Let me explain why. Can the Minister of Agriculture please tell us how a farmer is going to establish credit with this Bill in force? It says all major financial institutions, banks, even trust companies, that do not have their head office in the Province of Saskatchewan, that do not have a majority of shareholders, cannot hold an ownership interest in land. Right? Now, Mr. Speaker, this Act prohibits them from having an interest in land. Someone should advise the Minister that mortgages whether registered or hypothecated have an interest in land, is that not correct? Now, Mr. Speaker, this Act specifically states that an interest cannot be acquired by foreclosure. A farmer's land is his collateral. Suppose he wants to buy some cattle, suppose he wants to buy some additional machinery, suppose he wants to buy a building? He cannot even go to the bank and use his title as collateral because the trust company cannot foreclose on his land. I'll give you another example, Mr. Minister.

MR. MESSER:— Give us some facts.

MR. MacDONALD:— Well, read the Act. That's what the Act says, Mr. Minister. Oh, Mr. Minister, why didn't you give some exemptions? Are you going to back up again? I hope you're going to back up again. Let's take another example, don't try and back up because you turned coward. That's what you did, you turned coward.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a father or a farmer who has broken his land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! Will the Members quit their interrupting . . .

MR. MacDONALD:— They are just like a bunch of chickens.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! Will the Member take his seat when I rise, please. Will the Members quit interrupting please so that one Member at a time may speak.

MR. MacDONALD:— Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. They are terribly impolite. Mr. Speaker, let's take a man who owns land in Saskatchewan and he sells to his neighbor and he retires to Victoria. Then, Mr. Speaker, what happens? A year goes by and the farmer to

whom he sold the land doesn't make his payments. That owner, by this Act, cannot even foreclose on his own land. That's exactly what that Act means. Mr. Speaker, not only that, but a second effect on Saskatchewan farmers is that immediately that this Act and the Minister put in his threat, land values in the Province of Saskatchewan decreased and I think that's part of the reason, that's part of the Minister's intention, because he knows that the Land Bank wants to purchase land. Maybe it went down \$5 an acre, maybe \$10, who knows until somebody tries to sell his land.

Mr. Speaker, not only that but how stupid the legislation is - it even requires the man to be domiciled in Saskatchewan. That means a man who retires to Victoria and buys a house, domiciled in Victoria, comes back here for three or four months to farm his land in the summertime, he is considered a foreigner by the terms of this Act. Mr. Speaker, a man who owns his own land and has farmed it for 30 years and still farms it, by the terms of this Act is a foreigner in the Province of Saskatchewan. That's how stupid this legislation is.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister states that it's against the corporate farms. Read the definition. It doesn't describe a corporation. It talks about beekeepers, fur farmers, every single kind of agricultural land or even potential agricultural land in the Province of Saskatchewan and makes no mention of a corporation, makes no attempt to define a corporation. This Bill has set out deliberately to deny anyone outside the Province of Saskatchewan the right to own land or the right to purchase land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, not only that - the worst part of the Bill is the power given to the No. 1 and No. 2 commissars of land in Saskatchewan. If a non-resident fails to divest himself of the land within one year, the Attorney General, according to this Bill, may obtain a vesting order and give, sell or otherwise dispose of it, and it provides that the proceeds or distribution of the proceeds may be done in any way he sees fit. That's what the Attorney General of this Province can do to the agricultural land of this Province. When the Member from Qu'Appelle said that it's a radical Bill he didn't even describe it. Mr. Speaker, it's an unbelievably stupid Bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are outside of the Iron Curtain. Yet three Members of this Government, the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General confer such power upon themselves as this Bill indicates. Mr. Speaker, what is even more ominous, there is no provision for appeal in the Bill, none whatsoever. The Attorney General can sell that land to the Land Bank, he is going to sell it at whatever price he says, he is going to give it to the Land Bank. He is going to dispose of the assets in any way he likes, and there is not even the right of an appeal to the courts, Mr. Speaker. This is the worst piece of legislation and it only took them ten months to put it in. This is pork barrel politics at its worst.

Mr. Speaker, it gives to Mr. Jack Messer, the land commissar in the Province of Saskatchewan complete and absolute control of the rural lands of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, Canadians and in particular, citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan, will not stand and cannot stand for a Government and a Minister to assume that kind of power by any Act.

May 2, 1972

Mr. Speaker, look at section 11 and 12 - you want to talk about an Act. It gives a civil servant the right to investigate any one of our citizens to find out if he is going to be an absentee owner or not. He can go in and check his records, his financial statements, he can do anything he likes and this Bill doesn't even give the farmer the right to appeal. So much for what is in the Bill.

What is not in the Bill? What about what is not in the Bill, Mr. Speaker? First of all, the Cabinet has given absolute power to define any term or any provision in this Act. The other day we had a real debate in this House about whether legislation should be definite or leave a great deal to regulations. It's always been a principle that the more a piece of legislation is definitive, the better it is. The more regulations the poorer the legislation it is. This Bill turns around and gives to the Cabinet and the Minister of Agriculture power to even define the Bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, not only does it give to the Minister of Agriculture the power to make any regulations he wants, it gives him complete power to declare which land will be exempted and which will not, without any right of appeal. Any other person in the Province of Saskatchewan will not know where he stands. First of all the Minister of Agriculture can make one regulation today and he can make another regulation tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture stands up here and says, what about the Committee. That Committee is a farce and I will tell the Minister why. He travelled around the Province of Saskatchewan for six months on the Land Bank, and heard representation from everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan, including the Farmers' Union, including the Wafflers, and then never made one substantial change. He held another legislative committee on the Farm Machinery Act. Every single person practically who made a representation according to the two Agriculture Members on this side of the House, came in and recommended that the implement dealers should not stand the financial losses. The Minister of Agriculture completely ignored them.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, you go out into the country and the farmers of Saskatchewan don't trust you, they don't trust your public hearings because they think that this Bill that you have introduced in this Assembly, that you have made retroactive by threat, or by ministerial decree is the Bill that will be in effect when you had your hearing finished.

MR. MESSER:— . . . take you . . .

MR. MacDONALD:— Oh, will you ever! Mr. Speaker, I make two or three suggestions to the Government. First of all, Mr. Speaker, immediately withdraw this Bill and the resolution. Then set up a proper legislative committee, not to investigate Canadians and fellow citizens, not to investigate the very basis of confederation in the Dominion of Canada, but to investigate foreign ownership. After they have had a good public hearing, after they had every farmer have an opportunity to make his choice heard, then sit down and draft new legislation that is good legislation. Bring it into this House and introduce it. Mr. Attorney General, (Mr. Romanow), the farmers of Saskatchewan don't trust you any more. They don't have any trust whatsoever

in your Government. When you go out to the farm communities, and the Minister of Agriculture knows, Mr. Speaker, go and ask your Federal Members of Parliament. That is why this Resolution was amended, because they knew that the Federal Members of Parliament were in serious trouble because of this Foreign Ownership Bill. It has made the NDP Government the laughing stock, the laughing stock of Canadians all across Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— When you tell a man, in a mobile country like Canada, I even think the Fathers of Confederation would roll over in their graves if they read this Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this Bill is ominous, I say it is vicious, I say it is insidious, I say it should be withdrawn, I say the Resolution should be defeated and I say this Government should be defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— Will the Member who has just taken his seat permit a question.

I should like to ask the Member, Mr. Speaker, if he is aware of the remarks that I made on the introduction of second reading of this Bill, that this Bill was going to be referred to a special committee. And if so, why is he trying to mislead this House at this point in time that it would not be referred to a special committee?

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer that question and I would once again like to repeat what he said:

Foreign and corporate purchases of land are usually not limited by shortages of capital in the way that our farmers are. Consequently, we believe it is essentially and entirely just that we now give notice that this legislation will be made retroactive.

MR. MESSER:— That has nothing to do with my question.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, when you introduced this Bill in second reading, you said that it would be made retroactive.

MR. MESSER:— Right!

MR. MacDONALD:— Right! April 1, 1972. You also said that it would be concerned with foreign and absentee ownership. Absentee ownership refers to Canadians, refers to anybody outside the boundaries of the Province of Saskatchewan. And that is why people in this Province are frightened. That is why people right across Canada are looking at your Government and saying it is the worst Government that has ever been in the Dominion of Canada.

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, will he answer

May 2, 1972

the question? I asked him whether he knows that I would be referring it to a special committee when I introduced second reading of this Bill. If so, why does he continue to mislead the House?

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture turned coward, that is what happened. He turned coward when he saw the shock waves . . .

MR. MESSER:— I asked him a question of whether he knows I was referring it to a special committee. That has nothing to do with the statements that he is making now.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! Apparently the Member does not wish to answer the question. I can't permit a crossfire of discussion.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, you permitted the Minister to ask the question and I would now like the opportunity to answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:— Yes, but if the Member is going to answer he should answer it and not bring in other material.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, I was only half-way finished the first sentence. How could you tell whether I was answering the question or not.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly was aware of what he said. I know that he turned coward, Mr. Speaker, because he heard the shock waves that the people of this Province reacted against that Bill. And then when he introduced that Bill, then he turned coward and backtracked and referred it to a special committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.L. FARIS (Arm River):— Mr. Speaker, the reason why this Bill should not be immediately withdrawn and the reason why it was taken through second reading was because this Government, unlike the Opposition, is serious about this matter. It is a great disappointment to many people in the province that the Opposition while saying they are concerned about foreign ownership, show by the level of their debate that they in fact are not concerned.

MR. MESSER:— Just like the Consumer legislation.

MR. FARIS:— Yes, just like the Consumer legislation. If you look at Section 14 of the Act you will find there all of the problems that were raised by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) are contained in there. This matter of defining words in the Act, the matter of designating what number of acres would be allowed to any class of citizen, the definition of what a non-resident is, all of these matters are being referred to this committee for the opinion of the farmers, the people of Saskatchewan. I don't know why the Opposition is trying to pretend that these

matters are not going to be decided after referral to the people of Saskatchewan.

Do they not trust the people's opinion? Is that the problem? I know very well that when they were the Government they never referred, they never consulted with the people.

Not long ago I attended a meeting up in Davidson, a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, and they had speaking at that meeting Mr. Neil German, the national president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. He told the farmers there, who were members of the Chamber of Commerce, not to worry about the future of Saskatchewan agriculture. He told them why they shouldn't worry. He said he had a business friend in Ontario who had great faith in Saskatchewan agriculture. He had great faith in Saskatchewan because all of the farm land in Ontario was being eaten up by the processes of urbanization and there soon wasn't going to be any farm land in Ontario.

Now this businessman with his great faith in Saskatchewan agriculture was sinking every dollar he had to buy up land in Saskatchewan, because it was good speculation, a good investment. And that is what Neil German, the national president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce said.

Just not long ago, W.O. Twaits, who is the chairman of the Board of Imperial Oil said that foreign ownership isn't the only problem that we have in Canada. He said that regional disparity is just as great a problem as foreign ownership. That it is just as great a problem for the people of the Maritimes when investment dollars come in from Ontario and buy up their industries, as if those dollars came across the American border.

Now I think these gentlemen who are in places, positions of power, that you would think would align them with the Opposition, have at least shown a great deal more insight and honesty than the Members opposite. Because every person who thinks about these problems, the problems of speculation in land prices, must be concerned. And all you have to do is look at the booklets which show the farmland prices in Saskatchewan, which will indicate that from 1958 to 1968 land prices more than doubled in ten years and now they have taken a drop again. But it is the young farmers, particularly, the young people of Saskatchewan who suffer from land speculation. And this is not only a problem that relates to foreign ownership but also money coming in from Ontario where most of the wealth of Canada is concentrated.

If these people are allowed holus-bolus into this Province, I say we have a problem. And if the Members opposite aren't willing to face that, then I think there are some people out in the country who are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden):— Mr. Speaker, the very quick reaction of the people of Saskatchewan is this piece of legislation indicates how bad it is and the quick back peddling of the Blakeney Government opposite in its attempts, indicated how bad this Bill is.

But let's look into this Bill and see what it is supposed to do. It is supposed to restrict and prohibit the ownership of land by foreigners. Now we all know there is a strong anti-

May 2, 1972

American feeling in this Province against the massive purchase by American of Saskatchewan farm land. But to show the concern of the Members opposite, this Bill in its main title only refers to agricultural land we are now going to discuss the question of concern just referred to by the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris).

The Government opposite isn't just concerned about foreign - and I suppose I should say non-Saskatchewan ownership of land in Saskatchewan. It is a phony attempt by the Government opposite to play on an emotional issue. If the problem really, really concerns you why do you just restrict this problem of foreign ownership to farm land. Why don't you talk about city land. You don't. The drafter of the legislation doesn't even know what it says in the title - An Act respecting the Foreign Ownership of Agricultural Lands in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Your pious concerns in this are phony because you only restrict it to agricultural lands and if you really wanted to discuss the question of foreign ownership of lands in Saskatchewan, your Bill would have dealt with the whole question of lands in Saskatchewan and not agricultural lands. That is why you have come across in this issue and why your credibility is lacking is because you are phony in this issue and the people know it and the people reacted very quickly.

The attempts to eliminate all non-Saskatchewan residents from owning land indicates that there must be other reasons for this Bill. Your Bill attacks farm families in Saskatchewan themselves. Farm families who have relatives living in other parts of Canada. And you attack the very foundations of national unity with your proposals.

If the Province of Quebec had said, 'we do not intend to secede but we define all non-Quebecers as foreigners,' there would have been a hue and cry across this country probably coming from the Government opposite. And yet this Bill brings into public discussion your sorry record on Canadian Confederation.

The Waffle wing of the Government opposite has gone on record - maybe not the Waffle wing, the Waffle Party with its moderate wing opposite - has gone on record as favoring self-determination for the Province of Quebec.

You opposed the War Measures Act . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:— The only position that you haven't taken on Confederation is on the Executive Council Bill, you didn't put in a Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

I don't think it was the intention of the Government opposite to bring to the public's attention and into the public forum their sorry views on Canadian unity or Quebec separatism. I am not so sure that the Bill was never intended to deal with American ownership of land. Their Bill was not designed, I don't think really, to attack the Saskatchewan resident who has children in other parts of Canada, which it does by preventing non-residents and such children from owning land by Section 8.

I don't think that you are stupid enough to attack Saskatchewan families like your legislation sets out to do. So

you are not attacking foreign ownership, you are attacking Saskatchewan families which I don't think you intended to do. I don't think that you intended to bring into public discussion your views on Canadian Confederation and so there must be another reason for this Bill.

Let's look at the Blakeney statements on the Land Bank. The Premier's lackey for agriculture made several statements with regard to the Land Bank, all in the same tenor which said the Land Bank would purchase the land at prices consistent with the market value of land. I quote from the Star-Phoenix of January 22nd, 1972, the Liberal Press, as the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale says:

Mr. Messer said that the Commission will purchase land at prices consistent with the market value of land in any particular region. Assessment and the productive capacity of the land will be other factors in the pricing formula. He stressed that the Commission will not attempt to inflate the price of land if the market value in an area is too inflated, land in that area will not be purchased.

And in the Star Phoenix of March 9, 1972, he repeated an earlier assurance that the Commission will purchase land at market value.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I trust that the Hon. Member will stay to this Bill.

MR. LANE:— That is precisely what I intend to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:— Well I hope you will do it. And when I rise I hope the Members would take their seat, please. I think we have just finished Bill 110 dealing with the Land Bank. I know cross references are sometimes difficult to prevent but I would ask Members to stay to the Bill that is going before us.

MR. LANE:— They are especially difficult to avoid when there is a master plan involved, Mr. Speaker. But let's look at some ways to reduce the market value of farm lands, some major reduction of market value enabling the Blakeney bank to expropriate or foreclose or take over land at bargain basement prices.

How can we reduce the market value, Blakeney style? One, succession duty to remove wealthy purchasers and prevent the accumulation of capital in Saskatchewan. Succession duties to confiscate the wealth that develops in the province. Gift taxes to prevent the avoidance of succession duties for the stated reasons. Remove the wealth of the Province of Saskatchewan by succession duties and gift taxes. These Bills eliminate potential purchasers of farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan and these Bills eliminate competition within the Province of Saskatchewan for the Land Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:— Then bring in a phony Bill intending to mislead people, which Bill is designed to prohibit every other class of people

May 2, 1972

including families of Saskatchewan residents from purchasing land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

This Bill has one purpose and one purpose only and that is to eliminate the competition for the Land Bank Commission. This Bill is designed solely to depress the market for the farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Agriculture was right when he said that the Land Bank will purchase land consistent with the market value of land and will not attempt to inflate the price of land. No truer statement was ever issued. He will not attempt to inflate the price of land, just the opposite. The Land Bank cannot work without compulsory acquisition of land or elimination of competition. As long as the Land Bank is a competitor, which Bank is going to give their definition of fair market value in a free market, it is very easy for any other individual to merely offer \$1 an acre more and the Land Bank could never be put in the intolerable position of having to retender every time someone wanted to pay \$1 more.

There are only two ways for the Land Bank to get land easily . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— I do believe that the Member is spending too much time on the Land Bank and not enough on Bill No. 115.

MR. LANE:— I am into the question, Mr. Speaker, of the sole purpose of this legislation to eliminate competition outside the province and I have to for the purpose to show this.

Either inflate the price by being another competitor which you cannot afford to do, or eliminate the competition. The people of Saskatchewan should also be told very, very bluntly that although this Bill may be held up, the effects of it are not withdrawn. As long as there is no decision as to what the Government intends to do, the effects of this Bill run from April 1, 1972 onwards. No one can leave this estate to his children outside the province. The effects of this Bill are not ended by the Government referring the Bill to Committee. This Bill for all practical purposes is designed to eliminate the competition for the Land Bank Commission as and from April 1, 1972. Because, Mr. Speaker, this is a phony Bill on a phony issue with a phony purpose trying to take advantage of an emotional issue and because I oppose the long range attempts of the Government opposite to nationalize farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan, I oppose this Bill most strongly.

MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North):— Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 142 - An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to

inform the Members of this House that the comments which I shall be making with respect to the Bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act also apply equally to Bills amending The Liquor Board Superannuation Act, The Power Corporation Superannuation Act, The Saskatchewan Telecommunication Superannuation Act and The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act. You will recall this morning in moving first reading I moved that the latter four Bills be referred to the Non-controversial Bills Committee because the principles of those other Bills are identical with those contained in The Public Service Superannuation Act. The main amendments to these Acts are all the same. The Members will notice minor differences which are necessary because of special types of employees covered by a particular act or different funding provisions contained in the various superannuation acts, however, the principles are identical. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to Section 3 (a) will increase the maximum salary on which employees must make contributions to \$18,000 per annum for the period after April 30, 1972. The present maximum salary for contributions under these superannuation acts is \$16,000 per annum. Prior to April 30, 1970 the maximum was \$11,500 and prior to April 30, 1969 the maximum was \$10,000 per annum. A new Section 3 (b) is being introduced to provide an option to employees whose earnings were above the maximum for contributions since May 1, 1968 to contribute retroactively for this period on actual earnings up to a maximum of \$16,000 per year. This will enable employees to improve their average earnings for pension calculation purposes, Mr. Speaker. These two amendments will result in pensions for senior public service employees being more in line with what is available from other governments and in the private sector.

The new Section 5 (a) provides employees a further means of elective early retirement. This Section will make it possible for an employee who has attained the age of 60 and who has served continuously for at least 20 years to retire at his option on fully earned pensions. The present Act would require employees in this category to accept a reduced pension if they were to retire prior to age 65. This provision was requested by the employees, I believe it will contribute to a general trend throughout our economy to easier retirement provisions. Hon. Members may be interested in knowing that at the present time under The Public Service Superannuation Act as well as the other Acts, if an employee retires at age 60 rather than 65 his pension is reduced by 15 per cent. What we are proposing that any employee with 20 years of service and who is 60 years of age can get the full benefits of the pension if he so wishes to retire. The option of early retirement is of particular interest to certain types of employees. For example, field employees and workers in our large institutions such as mental hospitals and correction institutions frequently find that they would like to retire prior to age 65. We feel that these employees who have often served under very difficult circumstances deserve a full pension when they elect to retire early. There are other groups of employees in the same category including some employees who have held senior positions but because of many years of service have indicated a desire to retire but at the present time they are penalized or their pension is penalized to the tune of 15 per cent. The amendment to Section 7 reduces to 55 the age at which a male employee may be retired on an earned pension at the option of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The present Act requires male employees to be age 60 and female employees age 55. We consider

May 2, 1972

it desirable that the age of retirement in this category be the same for both male and female employees. In other words bring about uniformity in that particular section.

The new Section 34 (a) is one of the provisions which covers a specific category of employees not covered by other superannuation acts. It is desirable that where a provincially employed superintendent of schools accepts an appointment with a local school board as a superintendent of schools that he not be penalized on his superannuation benefits. This new Section will enable employees making this change to continue under The Public Service Superannuation Act even though they are employed by the local school board. Naturally they would have to continue contributing to the Public Service Superannuation fund. This will contribute to the mobility between the Provincial and local governments for superintendents of schools and contribute to ensuring that the best qualified candidates will be employed in this very important role within our school systems throughout the province. The Hon. Member will recall that it was a couple of years ago that the amendment was made to the School Act but this particular area I think inhibited this kind of desired movement. What we are doing is giving them the opportunity to either move to the superannuation plan that may be established by the local government authority or stay under The Public Service Superannuation Act, they have the option to choose.

We are very pleased to amend Section 41 to increase the rate of interest paid on employees contributions to the superannuation board. After April 30, 1972 the rate of interest on these contributions will be compounded annually at the rate of four per cent per annum as opposed to three per cent which will apply to the period April, 1959 to April 30, 1972. In periods of high interest rates such as we have had in the last number of years we feel that higher rates paid to employees on their contributions is fair and necessary.

A new Section 58 (a) will enable employees who have left the Provincial employment after 10 or more years of service to return and make contributions covering the previous period of employment so that this earlier employment will be considered in calculating their pensions. In the case of the present provision, an employee after 10 years of service can take the option of taking a reduced pension but if he comes back and particularly an employee who may be 55 years of age who comes back, he can't get into the plan under the present rule. This provision is being amended making it possible for them to come back. Naturally they will have to pay back or pay for the period that they were away. The addition of Section 73 to the Act will provide clear authorization for instalment means of payment in instances where the amounts are owed to the board by employees. Where the instalment means of payment is used the payment owed shall bear interest at the rate of six per cent per annum compounded annually on the unpaid portion.

A number of other amendments of a minor housekeeping nature can also being introduced in this Bill simply to do some housekeeping. These amendments are designed to ensure that the employees in the Public Service within Saskatchewan are treated fairly both with respect to other Government employees and fairly with respect to the superannuation provisions in other types of employment. With a general trend toward longer life spans for people it is important that the provisions to enable them to enjoy retirement years are watched closely. Our Government will continue to review the provisions in the superannuation

acts that the employees of the Public Service will have an enjoyable and desirable retirement plan. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the amendments that we are proposing will receive the approval of both sides of the House.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that while I personally am not satisfied that we are doing everything that I think ought to be done on a long term basis in changing the provisions of these Acts, I think it is a step in the right direction to make improvements. For example, in other provinces the ceiling provisions in a number of cases have been removed and I think this is the direction in which we should be going. However, one of the things that is necessary in order that we make sure that the plan is financially sound, we need to have an actuarial study of all our plans and those of you who may have looked at the Estimates will see that we are providing money under the Public Service Sub-votes for some additional funds, it is the hope that following this Session some comprehensive studies will be made on all the superannuation acts so that we can make further changes in the next session or the one following. But I do believe that the amendments that are contained in this Bill and in the others that I have referred to are worthwhile amendments. I think they are a step in the right direction. I think they will go a long way to solve some of the anomalies that exist in our plans. It is a step forward as I said before I hope it receives the unanimous approval of the House.

I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, let me say first, in general we agree with the principles as outlined by the Minister in introducing this Bill for second reading. One of the problems certainly in acquiring top grade people to work for the Government and Crown corporations is pensions, deferred income. And from time to time in Saskatchewan the pensions have been raised but the fact there is still a ceiling on them, I think is not a good thing in this day and age. I am pleased to see the Government moving toward raising this ceiling and I hope next year they will bring in legislation to take the ceilings off. I think that this is certainly one way they can entice and encourage good people to come here to work for the Government and the Crown corporations and in fact get people to stay here. I think it is reasonable that a man or a woman if they earn a large salary should be entitled then to a pension commensurate with the money they earned, so we welcome this move to raise the ceiling, in effect and again I say that we will certainly support the idea in another year or two or whenever the Government is prepared, if they are in fact prepared, to bring in the changes to the legislation to remove this ceiling altogether.

Again we agree with the idea of back dating because there have been many people who have retired and in fact, they had reached the limit of their pension and some of them even had to pay money after they had reached the ceiling. They had to continue to contribute although they had reached the ceiling of their pension and were in fact paying in money from which they could receive no benefit. This I am sure will take care of that inequity. In regard to early retirement, again I think this is a move in the right direction. There are many people who like to retire at 60 years of age or 61 or 62 or 63 if it

were not for the penalty that they must suffer in their pension and so I think the fact we are going to make it easier for them to retire and not penalize them by way of their pension, this will give it to them I presume on a proportionate basis, will allow them to retire and will make room for younger people coming up in the Civil Service and I suppose this will be carried on in the Crown corporations as well. We haven't had time frankly to study the Bill. The Minister talked to me earlier and said they would like to introduce it and get it to second reading so, Mr. Speaker, we will support in principle the outline of this Bill as presented to the House by the Minister and then we will be prepared to look at it clause by clause. If it contains nothing else and I don't suppose that it does, then we will give it our support in Committee and third reading because the principles that the Minister has outlined as contained in this Bill are certainly, I think, timely and ones that this side of the House are in full agreement with.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I should just like to add a comment. I should like to ask the Minister if he would make arrangements with the House Leader to try and have this Bill perhaps brought into the Committee of the Whole tomorrow morning so that we could go through clause by clause of the Act, so that when we go to the Non-controversial Bills Committee we would have examined all the main principles in Committee of the Whole and it would reduce time in the Non-controversial Bills Committee. It would also give us the feeling of the House in relation to the Bills because there are certainly very definite changes in principles, some major changes in the implications as far as it affects the pensioners in the province. So if this is possible we would like to ask that this be brought in in the morning.

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two brief comments on it. I commend the Minister for the alterations in The Public Service Superannuation Act related to making certain that people have the opportunity to retire at earlier ages without penalty and I agree with the Minister and with the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the removal of limitations on salaries in which contributions may be made. I think this is essential in the type of society in which we live that we get people to earlier retirement. Not only from the standpoint of benefiting those individuals but also from the standpoint of employment opportunities for people at younger ages.

I should like to make one brief comment if I may on another Section of the Act which reduces the age limit where a male may be retired to age 55. I realize this is still at the option of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, but this is an important step as well. I have never been able to understand why that anomaly has been very consistently present throughout pension plans generally. Females have the right to retire at age 55 and males at 60 when in actual fact males do not live as long as females, almost five years less in terms of the actuarial tables. Obviously this made no sense. The assumption seemed to be that the female was the weaker sex and that is obviously not true, they are tougher and they last longer. I warn Members in the House that the average male cannot beat a woman in the long run. I certainly support the main context of the Bill and I am pleased to see the Government moving in this direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that this legislation is getting unanimous approval. Let me advise the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) there might be an area that we might be willing to accommodate the Members of the Opposition. I don't know who their Member is, that might be piloting this legislation from their side, but it might be useful for us to get together, that is the Member whom they designate together with myself and some of our officials, whereby we could go through the proposed legislation. I don't think the explanatory notes have come down yet. The legislation is relatively simple but I think it might help if we meet together. It would likely accommodate them and it would assist a smoother process in the House later on. Perhaps they might consider that matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacDONALD (Milestone):— May I break the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and make a comment. If the Minister could send across the time and the place I will try and have somebody there.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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