

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I have a double pleasure today to introduce two groups of students from Saskatoon City. One of the groups of students is from my constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair and the other group of students is from the constituency of Riversdale. Unfortunately, Mr. Romanow, their Member is not here today as he is out of the city. I take this opportunity to welcome them as well as the group from Mayfair.

The group from Mayfair constituency are from St. Michael's School. There are about 24 of them and I believe they are accompanied by Mr. Gordon Henderson, their teacher.

The group from the Riversdale constituency are from St. John Separate School, about 53 in number and are accompanied by Mr. Buettner, Mr. Miazga and Miss Brisebois. I want all Members to join with me today to welcome these two groups of students to the Legislative Chamber. I hope that they enjoy their stay here and are able to take back some fond memories of this trip to Regina, to their respective schools. I hope, as do all Members, that they gain a better appreciation of the democratic system in action while visiting this Chamber.

I believe the students are located in the west gallery and in the Speaker's Gallery.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce through you and to this House a group of students from St. James School. They are approximately 50 in number and are seated in the west gallery. These students are accompanied by Mr. Brysky and Sister Engel. I would hope that the Members of this House join with me in welcoming them to the city and I hope that their experience in the House here today will make their trip worthwhile.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Changes in University

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I notice on the front page of the *Leader-Post* and in other newspapers is a story indicating drastic changes in the University Board of Governors, the takeover of the administration by the provincial government, dismissal of top

officials and other very major changes.

Mr. Speaker, this is becoming a daily occurrence in this House. Certainly the Government and the Premier must plug the leak in the NDP dyke. It is becoming a flood, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I must ask Hon. Members not to make a speech based upon a news story prior to asking a question. If the Member wishes to ask a question he can refer to the news story, ask the question and then he can follow up with the supplementary questions in accordance with the rules of the House. But I really think this business of making a very declamatory speech, as the Member from Milestone had begun to do, in preparation for a question, is out of order and ought to be called as such.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order. I think that you should point out to the Premier that he may not like the questions, he may not like what we bring up and I am sure that he doesn't. He is not the one who decides. Yes, Mr. Premier, you showed your arrogance. The Speaker is the one who decides and I suggest that he put you in your place, for you are not the one who decides.

RULING

Reading of Newspaper Items Etc. in House

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I should like to refer Members to Beauchesne's, page 177. It says:

Reading of telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to a question when Orders of the Day are called, is an abuse of the rules of the House.

And he goes on to explain that any statement in a paper, a Member is responsible to find out the validity of it and not to question a Minister. I would ask Members, as I attempted to do before, to ask their questions and not perhaps start with reading from a paper.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should also hope that you would also ask Members of the Government to refrain from making long speeches in reply then as well.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this: Is it the Minister of Education's policy to have the head of the Wafflers announce major changes in the University structure and to announce decisions outside this House by a Government back bencher, particularly a man who has a vendetta against the University?

Hon. Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind responding to the question of the Member for Milestone at all about the policy of this Government, for the leader of the Waffle, whoever that is, to make announcements. There have not been any leaks with respect to The University Act, but the question was raised when the

Member held a copy of another publication from Regina before. I replied then, as I reply now, there is a good deal of speculation in this story, in fact certainly the two paragraphs are not accurate.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members opposite that we are going to bring forward legislation dealing with the University in this Session; that we are in discussion with the members of the University with respect to that legislation. We are planning to hold a further meeting with them very shortly as we work out a draft Bill, as we work out legislation to be brought forward in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The morale at the University has never been lower, increased tuition fees, financial strangulation, now government takeover. The question, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We must have questions and not statements.

Mr. MacDonald: — Will the Minister of Education stop the rumor mill by assuring this House whether or not he is going to dismiss top officials and, is the Government planning a takeover of the University administration?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, we will stop the rumor mill when we bring in the legislation in this House and I hope it will be within three weeks from now or approximately that time. I would ask the Member for Milestone to stop the rumor mill as well.

QUESTIONS

Department of Agriculture Meetings and Survey

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, and in connection with this I have a couple of documents which I will table.

We are receiving very disturbing reports that the Department of Agriculture officials are holding meetings quietly around the province to recruit people to inform on their neighbors. I have a copy here of the manual and the forms being used. They are interested in such questions as: Does the farmer spend the winter in Florida? Is he living common law? Does he or his wife work off the farm? Does he have some other business interests? His age, so on and so on.

I should like to know, are these surveys and these spy schools being held with the permission and under the authority of the Minister of Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of the survey that the Hon. Member for Moosomin is referring to. I will take his remarks into consideration and see whether the Department of Agriculture is any way involved.

STATEMENTS

Roselyn Apartment Fire

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make a brief statement. This has to do with the tragic fire which occurred in Regina yesterday when I was in Ottawa on Government business.

I should like to add my words of sympathy and regret to the bereaved families in this most tragic residential fire in the history of Regina. I should like to advise the House that inspectors from the office of the Fire Commissioner have commenced an investigation of the fire. We do not yet have a report, but we are seeking additional information from the staff of the office of the Fire Commissioner. In addition to this, I have asked the Minister of Government Services to enquire as to ways in which the Government of Saskatchewan may be able to assist the victims of this fire who may have special need of government assistance.

Mr. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my sympathies and personal condolences to the bereaved families on this occasion, a very sad tragedy that took place.

I would hope that after the investigation is made that there be some substantive compensation to those concerned. If not, perhaps it sometimes takes occasions like this to see that we do pass proper acts to make regulations to see that adequate compensations are made.

I am very pleased that the Government is taking some real action to investigate, and hopefully, we will be able to do something in some other way.

Again, my deep condolences to the families concerned, seeing it is in my constituency, Regina Wascana.

QUESTIONS

Level of Unemployment in Saskatchewan

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a question to the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley).

Yesterday the Minister of Finance stated in this House that the Government opposite intends to reduce unemployment to as little as possible. Is the Minister of Finance now prepared to tell us exactly what level of unemployment the Government is projecting for this summer in the Province of Saskatchewan and what level of unemployment the Government is attempting to reduce it to in this province this summer?

Mr. Speaker: — I think that I must rule that type of question out of order. I have pointed out before that Members can ask questions on what is factual, but not on future policies because a Minister can rise and say government policy will be announced in due course. Those types of questions do get us away from what this period is intended for.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, are you saying then that the Hon. Minister is able to stand up at this time and say that future policies will be announced and is he prepared to do that?

Mr. Speaker: — I am saying that I rule that question out of order.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 117

Mr. Wiebe (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 117 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Marquis No. 191, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been complete; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons I gave in the House last week, I move that the return be amended by deleting all of the words after “showing” and substitute the following:

In the Rural Municipality of Marquis No. 191 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, the other afternoon when we were debating these motions we asked the Minister of Agriculture if he could tell us exactly when the end of the year is for the Land Bank Commission.

Now there is no reason that the end of the Land Bank Commission is necessarily March 31st, the end of the fiscal year, nor is there any particular reason for it to be December 31st the end of the calendar year. It can be any period of 12 months. At that time he said that this information would be provided to the House.

Now the Minister has had time and an opportunity to check on when the year end is for the Land Bank Commission. Could he indicate to us now what the year-end date for the Land Bank

Commission is so that we will know when this information will be available?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, the year-end of the Land Bank Commission is the same as the fiscal year-end of the Government, March 31st. As I have indicated to the Members of the House, after the Land Bank Commission has had an opportunity to close off its year-end statements, I believe it has to lay on the table of the Legislature within 90 days of its year end, its activities, and within that 90-day period of time if the Legislature is again sitting, we will be publishing the prices paid for land that the Land Bank Commission has purchased in the province.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to this amendment, I understand there was a long debate last Friday — I wasn't in the House — about this question, about the Government's refusal to give to this House and to the public of Saskatchewan the price they are paying for land.

Now we are going to find out what price they are paying for land and we are going to make it public.

An Hon. Member: — Go ahead!

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, they say, go ahead. They have already indicated that they will have invested about \$30 million of taxpayers' funds in the Land Bank in the first two years. What it will be next year I don't know, but I presume it will be at least at this rate, if not higher.

So within a short time, if this program is not changed, we could be talking about investing \$100 million of the taxpayers' money, when within two years we have \$30 million, it is not very difficult to project that kind of spending in a short period of time.

Now when we were the Government, the NDP asked for such things as the total amount of money both spent and committed in the pulp mill deal, and they got it. I think that they got it rightfully so and in fact, that pulp mill deal cost the people of this province — the Meadow Lake one — \$6 million and there was full disclosure by the Government. Here this Government is involved in transactions of a major size, huge transactions, transactions that will affect the lives and the organization of our basic industry, agriculture, now and for years to come.

It will have an effect on the price paid for land all over this province — agricultural land — and this surely is of vital concern to this House and to the people of the province. And yet they arrogantly tell this House and the public that it is not our business. The Government Members say it is not your business and we won't tell you, we refuse to tell you what we are doing with your tax dollars. I don't think this is good enough, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell the NDP Government that we are going to keep on asking, we are going to keep on prying and we are going to keep on pressuring, until they recognize their responsibilities or until such time as the public forces them to recognize their

responsibility, and they tell us what they are doing with this money.

I ask them now: What have they got to hide?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Nothing!

Mr. Steuart: — Nothing, he says. Then get up and tell the people of this province what you are paying for the land. I can tell you right now that the rumors, if you are in favor, if you want to support . . .

An Hon. Member: — Your rumors . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Never mind if we start any rumors, I'm saying the rumors that are rampant all over this province. If you want this Land Bank to be soundly based and if you want this Land Bank to have a measure of support across the province, then I say get up and tell the people what you are paying for the land. If you have nothing to hide then why are you denying this information to the House and to the people of the province?

Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace and I find it very ironical that the same people when they were in Opposition got up and cried crocodile tears about our then government holding back information as they called it, refusing to give out information and from time to time we did refuse to give out information.

An Hon. Member: — You refused . . . !

Mr. Steuart: — Of course we did and there is nothing wrong with that, quite legitimate. I asked a question this morning in the Crown corporations about the Timber Board. I asked what price they were paying for pulpwood and they said it was not in the public interest and I agreed. I never pressed the question. But I say that this is a totally different situation and it is in the public interest. In fact it is typical of the arrogance of this Government so short a time in office that they are refusing, not just us and that's not really important, what is important is that they are refusing to tell the farmers of this province, the public of this province what they are doing with \$30 million of their money and what they are paying for farm land. I ask the Government to reconsider this, I ask them to take another look at this question and to put forward honestly and openly in front of the public, if they have nothing to hide, exactly what they are paying for this farm land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder may I add a comment or two to this general debate.

I think that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has made clear that the Government proposes to give and give at this time if Members wish it, details of the gross amount spent and the gross amount of land purchased. We will give at a later time details on individual purchases. We do not believe it in the public interest to give details of individual purchases right now when fully dozens and dozens of other purchases are

under negotiation. I don't know for what reasons Members opposite decided that during their entire years of office they would not tell us how much they lent or on what terms from the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to any business in this province. But I know that Members opposite when they were on this side of the House declined to give any of that information. They declined to give any of it because in their judgment they felt that this information would prejudice the carrying on of those transactions. They were saying that that was not in the public interest to reveal the affairs of businessmen in this House. Now I think it is similarly not in the public interest to reveal the affairs of farming businessmen in this House at least at the time that they are negotiating the sale of their land. It seems to me that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Now, we are going one step further because we think that in the aggregate when time has passed and some deals have been made there will be no harm in giving individual results. At this time we think there is no harm in giving global results because we think the whole House should know how fast the program is moving along. We do think, just as Members opposite thought it was unwise to give details of business transactions ever – and they didn't during their whole seven years – we think it is unwise to give these details at the time the negotiations are going on as they are now. Now, if an individual member who has sold land to the Land Bank wants to give out this information then that is his affair and doubtless Members opposite have all sorts of ways of finding out any individual transactions. They will just go and ask the fellow and if he wants to give them the facts he will. It seems to us, in any case for the most part for land transactions there is information in the records of the Land Titles Office which would permit an individual transaction to be sorted out, if Members opposite wished that. But we think that as a general proposition when there are dozens and dozens of transactions now being negotiated it makes sense in the protection of the public Treasury not to reveal the price for which each individual acre was sold or bought at this time. Now we think that is a reasonable position, we think that measured against SEDCO that it is eminently reasonable and measured against anyone else who went out to buy up land who undoubtedly would not give all the details of every transaction, it makes sense on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. So we invite the House to follow with us the logic which they followed in the time of SEDCO, and invite them to see the reason of the situation whereby we say, global figures now and details after the transactions are completed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the very phony, hypocritical arguments of the Premier opposite . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, his argument falls down on two points, the matter of SEDCO is a matter of lending money and not giving money away or selling as is the case of the Land Bank. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Premier pointedly refused to state that he is carrying on the same practice of not giving

information to the Members of the Opposition when it comes to SEDCO information. Now we have no objection that that, Mr. Speaker, but there is a big difference between the SEDCO situation and that of the Land Bank where the Government opposite is giving away millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Mr. Speaker, it is the right of the public to know where these moneys are going and we, in the Opposition, intend to press on behalf of the general public their rights to get this information, Mr. Speaker. The Government opposite has said it would affect the individual transactions. Mr. Speaker, the neighboring transactions and all these factors are taken into account when the assessment price is made and that is all the more reason for making this information public. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we have a right to know. We, from the information given by the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, will not get any of this information for a following year, Mr. Speaker, from the year-end that was given. We feel, as I have said, that the public has a right to know and have a right to know now, and we in the Opposition are going to press this Government, put pressure on the Government to get that information immediately and stop the rumors that are going around of the extravagant sales and purchases to NDP supporters by the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to add a comment. Most of the time the Premier's logic is pretty good but in this particular case it isn't. I think everybody will recognize that when you lend money to a businessman the man is still in business and therefore his business transactions are going on. When you buy out a farmer he is no longer in the farming business. He may be on his way to Florida, he may be on his way to Victoria to retire wherever it may be. He also said that while deals are under negotiations no information should be available. Members will remember last Friday, I moved an amendment saying that we did not want to know the offers of anybody under negotiation, only those deals that were completed. Whether it be now or six months from now there will still be deals under negotiations, so the timing is not related to negotiations. What is really important, Mr. Speaker, and what is important to the people of Saskatchewan is to find out what formula the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is using. We have what we call the supposed equalized assessment. What is the relationship of each purchase to the assessment. Is every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan being treated equally? Is there a formula that is related to the assessment? Does it have some variations? What are those variations? So that everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan knows that when the Government or the Land Bank Commission makes an offer that the offer is based on a formula to treat every farmer equally and that there is no special preference either up or down in any individual deal.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, just briefly to close debate on this particular question. It again is quite evident that the arrogance of this Government has shown through and we are not going to get the answers. The remaining questions which we have on the Order Paper it is quite evident that they are not prepared to answer them either. It rather puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that in one year's time you

will get the answer to your question, that 90 days after the year end which, in practical terms, could be in the fall if we are fortunate enough to have a fall session, if not it will be a year from now. Does this mean that the reasons that they are giving today for not giving that information is that they don't want to upset any present transactions that are being conducted? Does that mean that a year from now there will be no more further transactions in the land business? They are going to make those figures public then, what effect is that going to have on the purchases that they are going to be making in 1974? I think the answer which we have received is a hollow answer, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to get the answer to these questions even a year from now.

Going back to some of the comments that the Premier has made regarding not paying too much for a particular piece of land and that each parcel of land must be assessed separately. The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) stated that there must be a formula which the Land Bank Commission is using for assessing the type of land. An acre of heavy clay loam for example in Regina should be worth exactly the same as what an acre of heavy clay loam is worth in Morse. The only thing that I am beginning to wonder is that possibly an acre of NDP clay loam is worth an awful lot more than an acre of Liberal or Conservative clay loam. These are the questions which we want answered, Mr. Speaker. If you are willing to pay so much in Regina you should be willing to pay so much for that identical type of land in another part of the province. The fact that you are not willing to give us this information is a clear admission, Mr. Speaker, that there are substantial variations.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I am sorry that the Government has taken this attitude and are denying the people of this province this information.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 118

Mr. Wiebe moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 118 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Eyebrow No. 193, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Bowerman (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) that Return No. 118 be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'showing' and substituting the following:

In the Rural Municipality of Eyebrow No. 193 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section.

Mr. Speaker, I do that because the Land Bank Commission does have, as the Members opposite are fully aware and knowledgeable of a consistent formula for appraising and evaluating land in the Province of Saskatchewan and they should not continue to try and hoodwink or confuse the farmers of Saskatchewan that we use a different formula in different areas of Saskatchewan or a different means of establishing a price with one farmer than we do when we deal with another farmer. They have been told as have all other farmers in Saskatchewan that we have a consistent formula. We sent appraisers out to appraise the value of land that has been offered for sale to the Land Bank Commission. We relate to transactions that have taken place in that particular region either by sale or by gift or by estate. We take into consideration the municipal assessment in that region and the multiplier factor in regard to arriving at what is referred to as a ball park or general figure for land value in that area. In relating all those in one context we come out with what we say is a fair market value for land. That same consistent formula is followed throughout in all land transactions that the Land Bank Commission is involved in.

Now we have heard, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions reference to rumors that are being spread about the Province of Saskatchewan. We know that the farmers of Saskatchewan know where those rumors are emanating from. They are emanating from the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) who have both made observations in regard to inconsistencies in the Land Bank formula. I have asked them to bring that information to my attention, weeks have gone by and they have not seen fit to do that, meaning, in my mind, that they have not got the kind of evidence that they profess to have as to the inconsistencies of the Land Bank and its operation in the province. They know what the global expenditures are and when we have finished negotiating the transactions in regard to the parcels of land that we are now dealing with and the Land Bank Commission's year-end arrives. We will make that information available to them. It is inaccurate for Members to say that we, in fact, are giving away millions of dollars. I wish they would go out into the rural areas of Saskatchewan and tell farmers that we are giving away millions of dollars under the Land Bank program because they will find out that that is not consistent with the farmers' viewpoint in Saskatchewan today. They also profess to be bringing this to the attention of the Legislature because the public is in fact demanding to know the amount of money that we are paying for farm lands in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I have had not one single request brought to my attention by any farmer in Saskatchewan asking to know what we paid for a particular parcel of land. In fact it is the contrary. Those farmers who are dealing with the Land Bank Commission are asking us to give them some assurance that we

will, at least, not in the immediate future, release what the sum was that was paid for their land and I think we all know the reasons for them not wanting that information released immediately.

We say that we have to have respect for those individuals who are selling the land. We say in order to have some consistency in arriving at prices for land we have to withhold the information until we have completed the negotiations that are taking place in regard to the purchase of lands in a single area, not only for the seller's benefit but for other sellers' benefits in the area so that we do not do what we say the Land Bank is trying to stop and that is escalating land values in the area without relating to the productivity of that land. We also, I think, realize that there has to be some confidence in regard to the values of land while we negotiate with the lessees of that land. Those people when they apply for a lease on the land will know what the price of the land was because their rent formula will relate to it. So for any of those who have a genuine concern because of interest in either purchasing or renting the land from the Land Bank Commission that information will be brought forward to them because they will be dealing with the Land Bank Commission and we do not withhold that information. For those that suspect that there has been some error made in the transactions of the Land Bank Commission, I ask the Members again to bring the information to my attention and I will pull the file and reveal the information so that I can correct an error if any has been made. If the Land Bank in any way has made a human error we will certainly attempt to correct that.

Having said those few words, Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the only thing the Opposition is trying to do is to continue to pursue the kinds of rumors and sabotage they have launched in relation to the Land Bank Commission. It is a commission and a program and a policy that has been well accepted by farmers in Saskatchewan. I, therefore, move that we support my amendment in regard to Order for Return No. 118.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that he doesn't know, he is not aware if there are any complaints about inconsistency in the price. Well, there was a question asked a minute ago about some of his department officials running around snitching on the farmers of this province, asking them all kinds of personal questions, and he stood up and said, "I'm not aware of it." "I don't know." Yet, it's a fact, they are doing that right now.

So, I don't know what he really knows. I know they are doing it and we've tabled the questions. Let him answer them. I don't have to name them — I'm saying they are doing it. We have asked him the questions, let him produce.

Just as, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to bring into this House the inconsistencies, we have said that inconsistencies have come to our attention about the pricing of land. Let the Minister tell us there are no inconsistencies and prove it. He's got the facts, he's got the figures. I accuse this NDP Government of paying different prices for land of similar

value. I accuse this NDP Government, under the Land Bank of discriminating between, not only those whom they buy land from, but I accuse them of discriminating on how much they paid for the land of similar value . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . and I challenge the Minister that if these accusations . . .

An Hon. Member: — Show us the evidence!

Mr. Steuart: — We don't have to give you the evidence! We asked for information, legitimate information and you have refused to give it. Well, then I am telling you that these are not rumors, these are accusations and I challenge you or the Premier to stand up in this House and then give us the facts. If we are wrong, then we are wrong and we won't say any more about it and we'll apologize and withdraw the accusation. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not wrong and he knows we're not wrong and that is why he is burying this information, that's why he is refusing to make it public!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — It is very evident that the Leader of the Opposition is using McCarthyism of the worst type that we have heard in this Legislature during this Session. He is trying to label people, he is making all kinds of accusations but when you ask him to produce the evidence, what did he say, "I don't have to do it."

Mr. Steuart: — They're tabled!

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — All right, table the stuff and produce the information. By making irresponsible speeches as he does, so very often, as I said, he is just resorting to the worst type of McCarthyism that we have heard in this House during this Session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, there are others of them who are saying that the Government is going around and spending millions of dollars and giving away public funds. Where are they giving away public funds? Where is the money being wasted? If the Land Bank purchases some land, that is an investment, an investment that the province has made in the purchase of land. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition and the Members of the Opposition don't know what a purchase is. They are saying that the public has the right to know. I agree. The public has the right to know and at the right time the public will be informed. The Minister has indicated that a complete report will be supplied at the end of the year and the information will be provided. The Minister has indicated that he has not received a single letter from the public asking that this kind of information be provided. All that the Leader is trying to do is create an issue out of something that is not an issue, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, what we have just witnessed is another demonstration of arrogance — a fantastic demonstration of arrogance from the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). I had hoped that he would have been able to keep his temperature down a bit today, but it appears that he is just the same as some of the other Members on his side of the House. Whenever something comes that bothers them or they have been accused of something it hurts and it digs deep, of course, their ears perk up, their hair stand on end and their voices rise to all levels; they come out and start crying McCarthyism, trying to defend their position of why they are not giving us this information.

Mr. Speaker, it became very evident in the Minister of Health's remarks that the public will know what the Government is spending only when 'big brother' says it's okay for them to know what they are spending.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — And what assurances have we got that in a year from now we are going to find out what the Government is spending? The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has proved to us in debates on other Bills in this House that what he says then doesn't necessarily apply now. I would love to give those examples now but I would be speaking on some other issue on this particular debate. He has proved then that those answers were not given to us and a year from now, again we will not get these answers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as well I should like to comment on the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture about accusations which we have made on this side of the House that we have not furnished proof and this type of thing. The Minister of Agriculture will remember that on Friday I tabled two pieces of literature on errors that have been made by the Land Bank Commission in their advertising — errors that have been made by the Commission telling people that they are not qualified for land because it has been leased to someone else and they have completely ignored it. I still haven't got the answer back from the Minister of Agriculture as to why those mistakes were made . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Here again it's just a clear indication that they want to deny the people of this province the information that we are requesting and again I say, Mr. Speaker, that the public will find out what this Government is doing only when 'big brother' decides that it is time that they do know.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — It is very regrettable again I say that the Government has taken this attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on for hours but I understand that we will have an opportunity at some later date to try and get information from this Government on five other questions which are still on the Order Paper. I hope that the Government will provide its sincerity in what they are saying and prove that what we have asked today will not be denied us. This can be proved very simply, Mr. Speaker, that when the next question comes up they answer that question. It will prove that they have nothing to hide. It will prove that they are not taking the attitude of the arrogant 'big brother' that is only going to let them know, what the people want to know, when they themselves want the people to know about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 208

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 208 showing:

The number of new employment opportunities involved in the businesses and industries locating in Saskatchewan during 1972, along with names and locations of such businesses and industries.

Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — I should like to propose an amendment to Return No. 208 as follows:

That the following words "businesses and industries locating" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

manufacturing and processing industries which commenced new commercial production or commenced an expansion.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Motion will read, and let the return show:

The number of new employment opportunities involved in the manufacturing and processing industries which commenced new commercial production or commenced an expansion in Saskatchewan during 1972, along with the names and locations of such businesses and industries.

I might just say, Mr. Speaker, that this will provide the information that is sought and it will bring this Order for Return in line with an earlier one that has already been passed by the Assembly.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment doesn't exactly supply the information that we are seeking, but I'm sure it will supply information that will be helpful to us. I'm certainly not going to oppose it, but there have been quite a number of statements made in the House by Members opposite as to the number of positions that have been created in Saskatchewan. I believe the figure of 1,507 was used and I'll be very interested indeed to see if the figures resulting from the amendment will approach that figure of 1,507.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 221

Mr. Lane (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 221 showing:

The amount of money that has been paid by the provincial government or any of its agencies, Boards, Commissions, or Crown Corporations for the period July 1, 1971 to February 1, 1973 through fees and other payments to the law firms of: (a) Griffin, Beke and Gilbert; (b) Pederson, Norman, McLeod and Todd; (c) Walker, Stevenson, Glendinning and Buglass; (d) J.E.L. Lamontagne; (e) Newsham, Raney and Deptuck; (f) Myron A. Kuziak; (g) Donald F. Woloshyn; (h) Jack Gibson; (i) Makaroff, Sherstobitoff, Hrabinsky and Stromberg; (j) Vause and Shaner; (k) Goldenberg, Taylor, Tallis and Goldenberg; (l) Clifford H. Peet; (m) Thomas B. Morgan.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 221, we have no objection to providing this information with respect to these law firms, if it so applies to them. But I think that the Hon. Member would want also to know what other expenses were incurred by the governments in the past with respect to other law firms. Accordingly, I will be proposing an amendment as follows:

That all the words after the word “for” in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

each of the calendar years 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 in fees and other payments to all Saskatchewan law firms and individual solicitors in private practice in Saskatchewan.

That way, not only will we get information presumably on the people listed, but who knows, maybe some other people did some government work during 1969 and 1970. I am sure the Hon. Member would want to see comparative figures with respect to the charges and the expenses that the Government paid with respect to legal work, and who exactly received the money involved.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — As the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) says it is only fair. So I would so move, seconded by the Minister of Public Health.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 222

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 222 showing:

February 27, 1973

The total dollar value of Kraft products purchased through the Government Purchasing Agency or any other Government Department, Agency, or Crown Corporation for the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 to February 1, 1973.

Mr. Guy: — I hope the Hon. Attorney General will notice the fairness of this question. It goes back and included the last year of our administration.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I indeed note a greater degree of fairness in this question than in the other one. But nevertheless I do believe the Minister of Government Services might have a remark or two to make on this. The result is that I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Return No. 225

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 225 showing:

The amount of the \$100,000 under Subvote 11 Department of Industry and Commerce 1972-73 Estimates that has been spent to February 1, 1973.

Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to propose an amendment to Return No. 225:

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

With respect to The Department of Industry and Commerce Development Act 1972 and Subvote 11 of the Department of Industry and Commerce 1972-73 Estimates:

- (1) The date The Industry and Commerce Development Act, 1972, was proclaimed.
- (2) The activities to be administered under the Act.
- (3) The cost of the activities under (2), (a) to date; (b) estimated for 1973-74.
- (4) Recipients of grants under the Act and amounts paid to each.

Mr. Speaker, it will become obvious that if this amendment passes then this Return No. 225 will cover the information sought in No. 226 as well. And I will be asking, assuming that this one passes, that No. 226 be withdrawn or defeated.

I think these amendments will give all of the information that was sought plus a little additional information.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the amendment. I might

point out to you, Sir, and to the Members of this House, that should we pass this amendment we will be setting a precedent which I hope the Government recognizes.

They are now putting into their amendments Estimates for years in the future which would mean that from now on if this amendment is accepted, we in the Opposition can ask any question dealing with next year, the following year, or any time into the future, projections into the future. We have 200 or 300 questions on the paper now but I am sure we can come up with a few hundred more if you are going to allow this precedent to be set in this Legislature. I think we have always before maintained that Orders for Return should be related either to the year under review or years previous to that. Now they are widening the whole framework of estimating what is going to occur in the future. Certainly we on this side of the House have no objection but I just wanted to point this out that we are opening up a precedent which we welcome.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, in the light of the comments made — I haven't had a chance to take a look at the amendment — perhaps I could beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 4 – Co-operation between Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission and Federal Small Farms Development Program

Mr. Feduniak (Turtleford) moved, seconded by Mr. Larson (Pelly):

That this Assembly press for a co-operative arrangement between the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission and the Federal Small Farms Development Program in order to make the full benefits of both programs available to the Saskatchewan farmers, and urges the Federal Government to respond immediately to Saskatchewan's request to establish such a co-operative arrangement.

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for a bold and comprehensive attack on the problems which confront family farms and rural communities. There is an immediate need for the Federal Government to make a basic commitment to the survival of the family farm.

Our Government is making such a commitment.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, farmers have been victims of Federal policies which are aimed at ending farming as a way of life — policies which were, and are depopulating our countryside.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals brought in the Task Force Report. It said two out of every three family farms must disappear. The Liberals enforced the LIFT program. It told the farmers not to grow crops. It resulted in low farm incomes and short supplies of grain for current markets.

An Hon. Member: — Short supply of Liberals too!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, when the LIFT Program was enforced, we called it LIFT, less income for tomorrow. At the time it sounded like a joke but when the meaning became a reality, it was no joke.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives were responsible for the MacPherson Commission, instituting a master plan for rail line and country grain elevator abandonment on the prairies. Now the Liberals want to implement that plan.

If this plan to abandon rail lines succeeds, the following consequences will result: More than 2,960 miles of the 8,420 miles of rail line in Saskatchewan will be abandoned; at least 790 of Saskatchewan's 2,667 grain elevators will be closed; out of 540 communities affected, more than 300 will simply disappear; farmers will have to pay more for trucking to deliver their grain.

Then there was the Grain Stabilization Plan. The Liberals introduced it, the Conservatives supported it. Only the bold New Democrats in Parliament forced the withdrawal of this disastrous policy from the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Now the Liberals are trying and threatening to bring it back.

Meanwhile, farm income continues to fall. The farmers' share of the food dollar continues to drop from 57 cents in 1949 to 38 cents in 1972. Farmers are not getting their fair share. In 1971, a farmer received 2 cents from a 30-cent loaf of bread; 22 cents from a pound of pork which cost the consumer between 59 cents and 99 cents a pound; 25 cents from a price of 47 cents for a dozen eggs; 17 cents from a 35-cent quart of milk. Between 1967 and 1970, farm operating costs have risen by 27 per cent while farm income has dropped 41 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, it has been established and the facts are very well known, that the millions of dollars spent by the food industry promoters on advertising through the news media — newspaper, radio and television, is another reason for the increased prices of food and other products, forced on and paid for by the consumers. It is easy to see that it is not the farmers who are making the money from the consumers.

Because of current Liberal and past Conservative policies, farming as a family enterprise is on the decline. For example, in 1966, there were 85,686 farms in Saskatchewan; in 1971 the census shows only 76,970 farms, a decline of over 10 per cent in the last five years. In 1967, there were 23,000 cream producers in Saskatchewan; in 1971 it is down to 15,000; 1972 continues towards a further decline in both areas.

While incomes in other segments of the economy have risen to new heights, net farm incomes have been declining continuously.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the backbone of our economy, directly or indirectly it ties in and affects almost all of our industries, be it mining metals, or potash, oil, forestry, manufacturing, retailing, employment and construction, you name it. Their advancement and growth all depends on the soundness

of agriculture. It is noted the agriculture industry consumes 30 per cent of the domestic fuel requirements, 40 per cent of tires sold in Canada, 40 per cent of iron and steel used in Canada, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, in the early part of 1971 the Federal Government mentioned a farm plan. This program had no new ideas or new formulas to correct our major problems. It was just simply drafted to transfer farm lands from the small farmer to the larger farm operators. It did not do anything to help establish a small farmer or keep a small farmer from going under. It was drafted like all the Liberal programs to assist the large operators to become larger.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern of land use and transfer that has been prevalent in the past has contributed in a large way to the economic difficulties of the farmer in Saskatchewan. Farmers have been forced to tie up large amounts of capital in land resources which yields them a lower rate of return than many other areas of production or investment would.

The revenue generated by grain has not kept pace with the increase in the cost of production, the cost of land ownership accounting for a large portion of this. The burden of land debt has been passed on from one generation to the next.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major undertakings of this Government has been the establishment of the Land Bank program. The Land Bank Commission is purchasing land from farmers who wish to retire and this land is being made available to younger farmers to establish or expand their land base, on the basis of a secure long term lease with an option to buy if they so desire after five-year tenure.

This program will relieve the farmer of the necessity to tie up large amounts of capital in principal payments on land. This capital can be invested in livestock or other diversified ventures which would yield the farmer a higher rate of return on his investment.

The land will be purchased and allocated for lease on the basis of a firmly established criterion which is designed to obtain maximum benefit for rural communities. In the first year of operation, \$600,000 has been allocated for staffing and operational expenses. \$10 million has been allocated for land purchases in the first year. This year another \$20 million has been allocated.

Saskatchewan has the Land Bank program, Mr. Speaker, and what does the Federal Government have? Two years ago the Federal Government set up a Task Force to study and make recommendations on the future of agriculture in Canada. The proposals which emerged from this study aimed at a reduction in the number of farming units in this country.

In March 1971, the Federal Minister of Agriculture released details of the proposed agricultural adjustment of development policy for Canadian agriculture called Farm Plan. The main purposes of the program were to assist farm people in the development of commercially viable farm business and to assist other farmers to take advantage of non-farm income, employment and retirement opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that they planned to achieve the first by means of the second. This plan was opposed by all 10 provinces and all major farm organizations.

A Federal-Provincial Technical Committee was set up to discuss the proposals set out in this program. Provincial Ministers agreed there was a need for a National Small Farm Development program, they also agreed Mr. Olson's proposed plan did not adequately take into account the diverse needs of Canadian agriculture.

The committee of officials from all 10 provinces agreed to examine the plan and to suggest alternatives to make the plan more acceptable and useful. Details of the program the 10 provinces wished to see included in a National Small Farms Development program were presented to Mr. Olson in February of last year. This plan proposed by all the provincial Ministers of Agriculture representing four political parties was rejected by the Federal Government after a year's negotiations, Mr. Olson had not budged an inch from his original position.

Mr. Speaker he announced his plans to go ahead with their Small Farm Development program. You will notice he changed the name, but the program still contained the objectionable features of the original plan which had been rejected by all the provinces as well as by all the major farm organizations.

Just before the former Federal Minister of Agriculture rode off into the sunset as a result of the federal election last fall, he was speaking in Peace River, Alberta. He said, "His biggest mistake during the last four years was not rejecting immediately some of the recommendations of the federal reports on the future of agriculture in the 1970s." The Task Force Report is not the Canadian bible on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Farm Development program as it now stands is still a big mistake. It is designed to carry out those main recommendations, namely, to reduce the number of people actively engaged in farming. In the Farm Credit Corporation offices they have a little green and white pamphlet which tells you who can buy and who can sell under this federal wonder program. Who can sell? Only a farmer who is presently engaged in active farming. Farmers who have had to retire because of age or ill health and rented their land out, because they were unable to sell it — not them — they are not actively engaged in farming. This means for every person who takes advantage of this aspect of the program, there will be one less farm.

Who can buy land under this program? Only a person who is presently head of a family farm unit. A young man with some livestock and some machinery won't be eligible to buy land, just the farmer on an already established unit. Not the young farmer wishing to make a start. This means that there won't be a corresponding increase in the number of farm units under this aspect of the program. It is not designed to establish any new farm units. It is designed to phase out a few of the present ones.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the subsidies offered under this program. There is a \$3,500 inducement offered to sell to an eligible recipient. Now there is nothing basically wrong with offering a grant to the small farmers who will be eligible to sell under this program. The maximum net worth is

\$20,000. If this represents a farmer's total life savings, he can certainly use the \$3,500. However, if you examine the details closely you will realize that the program is heavily weighted toward the selling aspect. Mr. Speaker, for those buying under the program there is only a special credit arrangement which is apparently a low down payment and interest at ordinary Farm Credit Corporation rates. At the present time the rate is 7 per cent.

Let's consider, under the Small Farm Development Program, a young farmer, say 30 years old, who buys a farm for \$16,000 with a down payment of \$200 and finances the balance for a period of 25 years. Using the repayment terms under agreement of sale, interest only for the first year and then 25 equal annual amortized payments of principal and interest of \$1,356. His total cost, providing he does not miss any payments would be as follows for a \$16,000 farm: Payment of \$200; Interest on balance of \$15,800 for one year, \$1,106; 25 payments at \$1,356 would amount to \$33,900, making a grand total of \$35,206.

Now if this same farmer, instead of buying this land, decided to rent, and if he had the opportunity to rent from the Land Bank at 5 per cent he would be paying an \$800 lease annually, subtract that from \$1,356 payments and he would have \$556 left which he could invest in a savings plan which would net him a net pension at the end of 26 years or at an age of 56, of \$312 a month, or \$38,186 minus \$100 for fee would net him \$37,240. If he lived to 66 years it would net him \$55,860. If he lived to 76 years, it would net him \$74,480 or if he lived to 86 years, it would net him \$93,100. Mr. Speaker, how much more security would he require? It makes the Federal Small Farm Development program look sick.

Now, I've already said, I have no quarrel with a retiring farmer receiving an additional grant of \$3,500 but if the grant to sellers of land is given because the Federal Government is concerned about the one or two quarter section farmer not having sufficient equity to retire on, why aren't they also willing to extend it to those who were forced to retire last year, or the year before but have been unable to sell their land until now? Call it incentive or what you will. It's still a bribe to reduce the number of farm operations in this country. The most suspect part of the whole Small Farm Development program is the reluctance with which the Federal Government is releasing the details. They were apparently not too proud of their intentions because they did not publicize this program until after the federal election.

We have listened to a lot of talk from the Liberals in this province about state-owned land under the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. The way the Small Farm Development program is set up, it is conceivable that the Farm Credit Corporation under the auspices of the Federal Government will end up with absolute control over a large amount of farm land.

Mr. Olson told us the Task Force Report is not the Federal Government bible on agriculture. Mr. Olson spoke with a forked tongue. The Small Farm Development program is designed to carry out the main tenet of that report, namely to reduce the number of farm operators actually engaged in farming.

Mr. Speaker, it is our contention that an agreement with the Federal Government would contain the following elements: First,

vendors making sales to the Land Bank would be eligible for the federal grants; secondly that the Federal Government would second a few farm management specialists to provincial staffs ostensibly to have counselling supervised by the province.

Mr. Speaker, in case I didn't get my message across to some of the Members on the left I should like to take this opportunity if I may, to illustrate it in a simple form of a play. I am very sorry that our Disneyland actor from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) is not in his seat, because I am sure he would be very interested.

Mr. McPherson: — I'll get him, Mike!

Mr. Feduniak: — First I'll introduce the cast. Charlie Brown — playing as Saskatchewan's eligible neglected young bachelor who would like to go farming, but has limited funds; Miss Saskatchewan — as Farm Land Bank; Miss Ottawa — as Small Farm Development program; Mr. Quebec — as the Great French Lover Romeo; Mr. Ontario — as a modest undecided courter.

Charlie Brown has been trying to attract Miss Ottawa's attention for many years with an idea of getting married but Miss Ottawa was just teasing him for years and leading him on. She was paying some attention to Mr. Ontario but predominantly she was giving most of her interest to Mr. Quebec. Charlie Brown was getting tired of being humiliated so long and became very sad. Suddenly, lo and behold, one day in 1972 he met an attractive young lady, a Miss Saskatchewan. She invited him over and they made a hit. Miss Saskatchewan was serious. A marriage was proposed but Charlie could not afford to get married right now so they decided to get engaged, work together and save. In five years they would get married.

When Miss Ottawa heard about this, she got very jealous, she immediately thought that if Charlie Brown marries Miss Saskatchewan they could raise a large family of New Democrats and they would interfere with her plans in the next election.

Miss Ottawa rushes over to our province straight to Charlie Brown. "Why do you want to rush into an engagement and wait for five years before you can get married: I'll marry you right away, you don't have to wait five years. Why in five years you may be dead." But Charlie Brown said to Miss Ottawa, "You had your chance and if I did marry you now, I'm sure I'd be dead within five years. And if I did live, you would divorce me anyway. I'm sure I'll be happy with Miss Saskatchewan."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, when the Land Bank was first introduced in this province I witnessed the first meeting in our area, North Battleford. We had a record attendance. People came who were interested in selling their land and the young farmers were there who were interested in leasing land. Many business people were present also. They were interested too because they know that the more farmers in the district, the better the business for them. This type of a program was very desirable to all groups.

Mr. Speaker, we went to the people and we listened to them. We asked them many questions. I was very proud the way our young Minister of Agriculture answered the questions. Every question was answered straight forwardly and to the point.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — None of this running around the bush!

During the last session the Liberals opposed this Bill at every turn. Well I wasn't surprised. I remember when we introduced the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. They opposed this, they argued that it wouldn't work. They almost raised the roof of these Chambers. When we introduced the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, the Saskatchewan Transportation, the Medicare, they cried blue murder and opposed it all the way. They have and are continuing cheap politics.

Mr. Speaker, the above mentioned are working very well and have been for many years. The Land Bank Bill was passed in the last session of the Legislature. Since then, many people have sold land and now, many young farmers are getting better established in farming. Mr. Speaker, with the Land Bank and the many agricultural programs we are following up with more to come. Mr. Speaker, for these good reasons I move, seconded by Mr. Leonard Larson (Pelly) this resolution, that we establish such a co-operative arrangement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Will the Hon. Member permit a question before he sits down?

I was just wondering if Mr. Feduniak realized that it was the Liberal Government which first started the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and not the old CCF Government

Mr. Speaker: — Order, that is not a proper question.

Mr. Feduniak: — I should like to answer the Member for Morse. The Liberal Party had started the Power Corporation — the Liberal Commission. The Liberal Party also implemented Medicare about 45 years ago but they never enforced it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — So there's a difference between talking about it and acting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks made by the Member from Turtleford with respect to the marital probabilities of Charlie Brown and Miss Saskatchewan. I hope I can add a few comments which may assist in the success of that marital arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the resolution now before the Assembly. Both the Land Bank Commission of Saskatchewan and the Small Farms Development program of the Federal Government, are intended to modify the transfer or tenure of farm land. Neither program results in a restriction on the market place and it should be kept in mind that existence of either program, or both programs, will not reduce the choices open to persons who may not be eligible to participate in those programs.

In both programs changes will occur in the transfer patterns because small farmers will have new access in the market for land and can, therefore, to some degree, compete. They are still at some disadvantage in not being able to complete transactions expeditiously as is the case when cash transactions occur. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly natural.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of an agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in relation to the Small Farms Development program, and the Land Bank Commission, does create a reduction factor in the number of choices open to the vendor of land. An agreement would improve that situation. As for our objective, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to assist small farmers and retiring farmers the situation in reaching that objective would be improved if both those options were available. In effect, Mr. Speaker, the Small Farms Development program transfer mechanism is through an agreement for sale. There is a down payment of \$200 (which is minimal) on a \$20,000 transaction. Payments are amortized over a 26-year term. In both the principal and interest payment under the Small Farm Development program and the Land Bank rental scheme, the down payment is a minimal requirement or non-existent and other land titles need not be mortgaged in either case. Both programs are superior to the conventional Farm Credit Corporation approach, which demands of the prospective purchaser clear titles to other property, or substantial sums of available cash. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, both these programs help the farmer who suffers undercapitalization in relation to his general operations. This is something that is quite common to the farming industry. The choice essentially lies between a greater cash availability under the rental arrangement, or an accumulation of equity in the land parcel. The satisfaction from ownership may seem to many to be an inferior satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, however, I do not believe that that can be ignored for it may well be a legitimate claim on the part of many people and in many situations pride of ownership cannot be discounted as a factor. An agreement between the two jurisdictions would provide both options and integration of the programs might well result in a reduction in administration costs per transfer completed.

In some instances, Mr. Speaker, a farmer might, if an agreement is reached to buy the land where the farm buildings are located, improve his position by renting adjoining parcels of land from the Land Bank. Pride of ownership could be a factor in improving maintenance of buildings and reduce problems related to valuation of those buildings when a subsequent transfer occurs.

The limitation in the Small Farms Development program might well prevent a prospective purchaser from buying out a retiring farmer, but a combination of the two programs might well facilitate handling that property.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give you a specific example, of course without naming any names. I know of a case of a farmer who is 63 years of age, who would like to retire.

Mr. Weatherald: — Is it you?

Mr. Robbins: — No, I'm not quite that old Tom!

Mr. Weatherald: — The Attorney General . . .

Mr. Robbins: — You can make your speech later!

Mr. Weatherald: — I will!

Mr. Robbins: — This farmer, who is 63 years of age, would like to retire. His son is 28 years of age. There is simply no way that son could, without either using the Land Bank Commission approach, or the Small Farms Development program, or a combination of both, secure title or eventual ownership of that land.

Suppose, for argument's sake, that the quarter section on which the farm buildings are located, is worth \$20,000 in terms of the current market. Let's assume that the other quarters are worth \$16,000; \$14,000; and \$10,000. Mr. Speaker, you know we often hear Members from the other side of the House talking about differentiation of prices in farm land. Well surely they are aware of the fact that you can get land worth \$120 an acre on one side of a road and worth \$50 an acre on the other side of the road, and that commonly happens in this province. I could cite many examples that I am aware of the differences in that category.

Let's assume, for argument's sake, that we had an agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in relation to these two programs. The individual I mentioned, could, under the Small Farms program purchase the home quarter section. He obviously would only have to put down a very small amount of money — \$200 and we are assuming that the commitment is for the maximum under that program of \$20,000. Then the Land Bank, presumably, could buy the remaining three quarters from that farmer, permitting him to retire and he must, of course, get his equity out of that land to retire, either in the form of cash or in the form of an annuity. In this way his son has the possibility of securing the home quarter, which he would buy under the Small Farms program and rental of the adjoining three quarters which would provide him with a viable unit.

That, Mr. Speaker, to me would make eminent sense and as we say, both the federal program and the provincial program are interested in the transfer of land, which must occur within the next five to ten years in this province, getting land to younger people, then it would seem to me eminently reasonable to utilize the two programs one in conjunction with the other.

One of our objectives, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the value added of Saskatchewan agriculture. This implies increased livestock production and more processing industries. The Land Bank frees capital which might be tied up in low earning land and permits investment in livestock which will likely bring higher returns per investment dollar. The Land Bank provides a

significant improvement over the conventional Farm Credit Corporation mortgage financing with no requirement for down payment and therefore logically frees capital for livestock investment and general operating.

Mr. Speaker, differences between the Land Bank and the Small Farms program are less significant as both programs reduce the liquidity problem, placing the farmer in a much stronger position to obtain credit for livestock investment. This provision of entry to farmers who are undercapitalized will assist in maintaining the population in rural communities, something, Mr. Speaker, which simply must occur in this province within the next five or ten years in order that we survive in terms of a viable province. This is a goal we all wish to achieve. We assume that we want to achieve that both at the federal and provincial levels and, therefore, co-operation between the two programs makes sense.

The logic associated with the argument that farmers should not be tied up in land in terms of their capital, is equally applicable in this province, a province such as ours where non-agricultural resources are relatively modest and the need for agricultural credit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is relatively great.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, strongly support the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments on the Resolution before us.

I should like to draw to your attention, Sir, the actual wording of the motion before us, with particular reference to a phrase in the first line.

That this Assembly press for a co-operative arrangement between the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission and the Federal Small Farms Development Program in order to make the full benefits of both programs available . . .

It urges the Federal Government to respond immediately to Saskatchewan's request to establish such a co-operative arrangement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion gave an excellent commentary, primarily on a lot of history of the evolution of the Small Farms Development policy, but nowhere really in his remarks, as I listened, did he really indicate that he was very much in favor of the Federal Small Farms Development policy and I couldn't see why he would be pressing for a union of two schemes when he was not in favor of the one and he went on later on in his own remarks to indicate his very strong support of the Land Bank.

Mr. Feduniak: — You weren't listening!

Mr. McIsaac: — I was listening very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I kept waiting for my honorable friend, the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) to indicate why he wanted to see the two programs combined. As I say, as I listened, I could hear no indication at any time that he wanted anything to do with the Federal scheme. He criticized it all the way through.

Now the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) in his comments, I think certainly came much more to the point of the Resolution, in that he did acknowledge and indicate the fact that in Saskatchewan we can definitely use both of these plans; that there is definitely a need to facilitate as much as possible, the very serious question of land transfer from one generation to another.

Now what about the Small Farms Development policy? It was a plan that was released, you heard the history from the mover of the Motion, a plan that was released and announced by the Hon. Mr. Olson in December 1971. Now, at that time, undoubtedly there were things wrong and undoubtedly the present scheme as is being offered could be improved upon from the point of view of Saskatchewan people in agriculture. Dealing again with the two schemes, they both deal with the transfer of farm land and the difference, and the chief difference, is the question of tenure of farm land. The Land Bank scheme, as it's presently before us, does not permit the lessee the opportunity to purchase that land for five years. The Federal Small Farms Development policy is based on, not a lease, or not a rental, Mr. Speaker, but an immediate transfer of ownership to the new owner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition as is well-known here and elsewhere in the province has, from the time of its conception, opposed the Land Bank scheme and that's been well known. We have urged for some time that the Federal Government immediately implement in Saskatchewan the Small Farms Development policy as an alternate means of land transfer to be made available to Saskatchewan farmers. We have also said that if the NDP Government opposite and the Federal Government cannot come to an agreement on this matter, we have urged the Federal Government to go ahead alone and make the program available to the Saskatchewan farmers. Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, it is typical of the Government opposite that they would put a motion on the Order Paper here seeking a co-operative agreement when they have been the stumbling block to that agreement all along.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The Minister himself has said that he wants first right of refusal for the Land Bank of all and any land that may be offered for sale. Quite obviously the Federal Government would question that kind of an approach and that kind of proposal and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the type of co-operative arrangement that is meant in this Resolution well then certainly we will not be supporting this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — We do, and I want to repeat that, wish to see the Federal plan implemented and once again if the Provincial Government cannot come to a co-operative agreement or arrangement with Ottawa, well then certainly I would ask again at this time that the Federal Government do proceed to make this alternate means of land transfer available to Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to outline some of the reasons why I think the Federal Government should co-operate with our Government with their program of the Small Farms Development program and the Land Bank.

The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has just outlined to us that he opposes the Land Bank scheme. He didn't tell us, in this debate why he opposes the Land Bank scheme but he did indicate that there is a problem in making possible the transfer of land from one generation to the next.

To outline my arguments today, I first of all should like to talk about the values and the good points of the Land Bank program and also to talk about what is in it for the Saskatchewan farmer in the Small Farms Development program.

He indicated that we have been opposing the Federal Small Farms Development program and I don't think he is really right there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Our opposition to the Small Farms Development program is also the same as Opposition Leader in this House.

The Land Bank has spread its wings and jumped from its nest and we are standing by and watching this young bird grow. The Opposition is also watching and they are very much indicating. .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — They would like to shoot it down!

Mr. Engel: — That's right . . they are very much indicating that they wish some dreadful accident would befall this bird.

In today's Motions for Returns they have unmistakably indicated that they are hoping this flight won't be successful. Even as the Minister of Consumer Affairs has mentioned they would like to shoot it down. They are saying that we are planning on taking over all the land in Saskatchewan. I haven't made an in-depth study but from listings that have been published, I see that there are only half a dozen farms that have been purchased in my constituency. The Land Bank officers tell me that they have had more than 15 applications for each file. Instead of complaining about not being able to obtain information about the Land Bank, I suggest you go and see how busy they really are and see how much interest there really is in the Land Bank program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — A young man from Moose Jaw was in the city yesterday, or last week I should say, and he was telling me that he had made an application for a farm, (by the way it isn't in my constituency) and he told me that they were one of 17 applications for that particular farm. This young man is a journeyman in a particular trade in Moose Jaw and if his application should

be accepted, and I don't know whether it will or not, he will go back to farming full time and there will be just one more permanent position for a tradesman in the city of Moose Jaw.

The Opposition has complained vigorously about this five-year rental agreement program. That is a feature that the Members opposite are opposed to, but I should like to assure the Members that this five-year agreement gives that young man whom I was talking about elbow room. That is about the length of term he could get if he borrowed money from his credit union to purchase some equipment. Once he has his equipment needs in order, he has farmed for five years and he saved up a little extra, he then reaches a position where he can make a purchase deal on some of the land that he has been renting.

Another point that is in favor of this — now that our Government has introduced a program of assistance to a planned and orderly market — the price for red meat is bound to be stabilized and it will assure this young man that he can plan ahead.

If we had been able to put \$50 million or \$60 million into this Land Bank program last year, we would have been able to launch a program that would have realistically approached the problem. That means that we would have been able to purchase approximately 25 parcels of land in my constituency instead of five. We couldn't do that, Mr. Speaker, because we don't have the resources available in our provincial treasury. And that is why we have this Resolution here before us today.

The senior government in Ottawa is in a position to transfer that kind of money into Western agriculture if it so desired.

I have a copy here of an explanation of the Small Farms Development program and when I first read this I was really enthused and let me quote, I am quoting from the second paragraph.

Under this program, that is the Small Farms Development program the Federal Government has set aside \$150 million.

Ordinarily the Opposition Members stop there. The rest of us have stopped there and have thought, \$150 million for a program compared to a measly \$10 million that the Land Bank is putting into it. And this is why we are saying that this program will not stand alone. I was very interested in this piece of literature, as I mentioned before, when the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson made this announcement. But since that time — may I call the Member opposite this little big bad wolf and I really appreciated that cartoon — went to Ottawa. Since he came back he hasn't been blowing very much about the Small Farms Development program. Do you suppose he cut off all that hot air because they filled him in on a few details of this Small Farms Development program. Let me read the rest of that sentence.

Under this program the Small Farms Development program the Federal Government has set aside \$150 million to be spent over the next seven years.

There are ten provinces, Mr. Speaker, in Canada. If there are approximately the same amount of small farms in each province,

\$15 million per province, spend \$15 million over seven years, that is bad. Really bad! Bad enough for the Minister of Agriculture to lose an election. Fifty per cent more than Saskatchewan, but over a period of seven years!

The land transfer program would continue to be a transfer program to the big operator. Instead of calling it a small farms development program they could have possibly renamed it a 'big brother plan' where the big farmer would be in the position to purchase the land, instead of helping the small farmers, like they suggested they would.

Farm management and rural development services would continue to nail up schools and hospitals like they had during those seven lean years that we have just experienced. This Resolution which I am happy to support today, urges the Federal Government to get on with the talks, to work out an agreement with this program and the Saskatchewan Land Bank, a program that has twice the stride of the Small Farms Development program.

You combine with our Land Bank program a combination of \$3,500 grant to selling farmers, and the Member for Saskatoon just pointed that out very clearly and I won't go into detail but if the Federal people would mean what they print, if they would get involved where the action is, we would have a program that works.

We are not asking for something that hasn't been done before. Our Government has worked and will continue to work together on joint programs completely integrated. In the agricultural field we spent some time with Members opposite in a committee and we were looking at crop insurance in Saskatchewan. This program is well received. It is a program that has the involvement of both the provincial and the federal government.

The Federal Treasury is co-operating in that program, and as we are adding more programs and advantages, they are moving ahead with us. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, that this should not be the case with these two programs as well. The combined result will be evident. We will be making a change and a shift in a rural population.

Mr. Speaker, this topic is not nearly exhausted and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 5 — National Feed Grains Program

Mr. Carlson (Yorkton) moved, seconded by Mr. Owens (Elrose):

That this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan initiate negotiations with the Federal Government directed at establishing a national feed grains program which will:

- (1) provide a guaranteed price for feed grains through a Grains Income Stabilization program, such price to take into account production costs;
- (2) establish a Feed Grains Reserve Bank which will guarantee delivery opportunities to feed grain

producers, and which will guarantee a supply of feed grains to livestock producers at all times;

(3) establish equitable price relationships for feed grains throughout Canada.

Mr. Carlson: — Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my speech I will be moving Resolution No. 5, but first I should like to make some observations as to why we need a feed grains program and some of the recommendations as to what it must be designed to do.

Let me first of all point out that Saskatchewan farmers bear the brunt in periods of oversupply, as compared to farmers in either Alberta or Manitoba. We, in Saskatchewan, produce a larger portion of feed grains and a smaller percentage of total livestock than our sister provinces do. Thus, in periods of high production, when the feed grains are sold both through the Canadian Wheat Board quotas and direct to feeders or feed mills, or actually fed on the same farm where it was produced, the Manitoba and Alberta farmers can move a much higher percentage of their crop than can the Saskatchewan farmer. Even within Saskatchewan, there are disparities. In areas with high livestock populations it is easier to move feed grain than in areas with low livestock populations.

This situation creates a desire by those farmers with large stocks of feed grain to move their grain into areas of demand. Some will move directly to feed lots or feed mills, and some will be bootlegged to farmers who have excess quotas. This is both costly in terms of extra transportation costs and unnecessary. It doesn't increase the overall sales. It only increases the volume of sales for those who are prepared to sell at a reduced price. But even for those it really doesn't increase their net return, only increases the turnover in terms of bushels. It does, however, Mr. Speaker, provide for profiteering by truckers, middlemen and for the final sellers to the Canadian Wheat Board, who happen to have excess quotas.

Under the old quota system which was based on the actual acres seeded, farmers were encouraged to seed higher priced grains such as wheat or flax. This problem has been reduced by the new system of assigning acres. However, it still leaves a mixed farmer at an advantage over the grain farmer. A farmer who feeds half of his production can assign all his acreage to wheat and move it out at a lower quota than a straight grain farmer.

Under the present system there is no mechanism for forward planning by the Canadian Wheat Board or the Federal Government. We all remember the various federal politicians, usually lawyers, Mr. Speaker, suggesting how much grain farmers should try to produce. The problem with that system, is that the statements are usually based on politics, rather than statistics. Also, it is very difficult for an individual farmer in Saskatchewan to make his plans as to how much of a certain grain to seed or whether he should fertilize or not, when he has to relate his farm to the gross Canadian production. The other problem is he never knows what the final selling price is going to be.

Under the present situation, quotas are used by the Canadian Wheat Board to maintain a supply of feed grain on hand for domestic use. This forces the grain producer to bear the costs

of maintaining this supply, for the benefit of the livestock people, which is highly unfair.

It is obvious that any policy which fails to provide an outlet for all grains produced within a year or two after production, will create an intolerable situation for a relatively small number of farmers, most of whom will be found in Saskatchewan.

If the Wheat Board holds back on sales in order to increase the price, thus reducing quotas, these same few farmers will bear the brunt of the cost. It is reasonable to assume that the producer should stand costs of this kind, but it should be all the producers and not just a few in Saskatchewan.

The Eastern Canadian livestock producers are not happy with the present system either. Their chief complaint is that the Canadian Wheat Board has tended to treat the Eastern market as a captive market. The Canadian Wheat Board, at times, charged more in Eastern Canada for feed grains than Western feeders were paying, and at times even higher than overseas' buyers.

Eastern stockmen maintain that they do not expect to buy feed grain at a price lower than the cost of production but they do object to paying substantially more than Western feeders are paying. Large surpluses and depressed prices in the West inevitably lead to increased livestock production especially in hogs, with a corresponding reduction in price. This adversely affects the Eastern hog producer who must pay the higher feed costs then sell his product at a reduced price.

I am now going to outline what I consider the objectives of a feed grains program should be and how those objectives might be met.

First of all any program that is developed should be administered by the Canadian Wheat Board and should avoid regulations that would require extensive policing, or that would rely on the honor system.

The Canadian Wheat Board now handles our feed grains and I believe it is logical that they continue to do so. With a new policy and some extended powers they could best serve the needs of all Canadian farmers. I would think it would be undesirable and highly unnecessary to set up a new administration to handle feed grains.

As far as regulations are concerned, I would think they could be kept to a minimum. If an initial price was established before seeding, the farmers would make the decision as to how much of what crop to seed, based on the expected return. The Wheat Board would have to guarantee to take delivery of all feed grains produced, thus eliminating the selling at reduced prices to feed lots or feed mills. They could still sell to the feed lots but they would not likely sell at a price much below what they could get from the Wheat Board. This would encourage feeders to buy local grain and reduce the unnecessary transportation costs.

Secondly, the feed grain producers should receive approximately the same price for their product based on equal quality and allowing for freight rates, handling, storage and selling costs.

This could be achieved if the Wheat Board would guarantee to take delivery of all feed grain produced. Western users will buy from local producers at whatever price they can negotiate, but it would be highly unlikely that this price would be much below or much above the Canadian Wheat Board price.

Thirdly, all Canadian feed grain users should be able to buy prairie feed grains at the same price, with adjustments for transportation and handling. This would seem to me to be fair in that Montreal sets the price for all of Canada in terms of livestock prices.

Therefore, Western feeders must stand the freight cost of the finished product to Montreal and it would be reasonable that Eastern feeders should stand the transportation costs on their feed grains.

There may be some argument favoring freight assistance beyond Montreal to the Maritimes because they, too, sell on a market based in Montreal and their product has to be returned to Montreal.

Any subsidies paid should be paid only to create equality of opportunity and never to create an absolute advantage where none would exist without a subsidy.

Fourthly, domestic feed grain prices would be basically administered prices, therefore the interests of both grain and livestock producers must be respected. The grain producer would not be asked to sell at prices below cost of production, plus a fair return on investment and labor. The livestock producer must be guaranteed an adequate supply at reasonable prices, at least as favorable as those to foreign competitors. Both the producer and the user of feed grains would benefit from a program that would eliminate the wide variations of both supply and demand. They could both do a better job of forward planning that would help stabilize the entire agriculture economy.

Fifth the initial Wheat Board buying price should be announced well in advance of the crop year. This can be used as a tool to encourage or discourage the production of feed grains. Once the price has been established and announced, it could not be lowered but could be increased to encourage delivery. Any losses incurred in operating the feed grains pool should be covered by the Federal Treasury. On the other hand any surpluses that accrue should be distributed to the producers as a final payment.

I mentioned earlier, that the initial price should be used as a tool to achieve the desired amount of production. In setting the price, the Wheat Board must consider three things:

1. They must guard against overproduction and consequently low prices.
2. They must ensure sufficient production to assure a supply for the livestock industry.
3. They must prevent an undersupply which would cause prices to skyrocket and therefore put the users at a disadvantage.

Point number Six. The Canadian Wheat Board would, for various reasons, maintain a supply of feed grain on hand. These supplies may be held by the Board for various reasons and therefore should be treated differently.

First of all there will be a certain amount on hand at all times just to keep the system operating. This amount would be small and not really costly but actually an asset or a necessity in keeping the supply moving. The cost of maintaining this stock could logically be placed on the producers.

Secondly, some reserve of feed grain will be necessary to ensure a supply to our domestic users. This would be a must to protect against the possibility of a lower than average crop or a crop failure in the following year. Under these circumstances it would be reasonable to assume that the users of the livestock people should pay at least a portion of the costs as it is being held for their advantage.

Thirdly, the Wheat Board may make a conscientious decision to hold back part of the supply in order to speculate on a strengthening market in the world market. In this case, the cost should be the responsibility of the Wheat Board and, thus, reflected in the final payment to the feed grain producer.

I have already said that the Canadian Wheat Board must be prepared to accept all deliveries of feed grain produced in any given crop year. This is a necessity to avoid the problem of bootlegging, which I mentioned before. I am sure that it is obvious that at some time it would be physically impossible to accept all grains produced. When this occurs, the Board would have to be prepared to buy the grain stored on the farm with an agreement to have it delivered upon demand. There would have to be a responsibility placed on the farmer to produce the same quantity as the contract would state.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is a real demand for some kind of a national feed grains policy. It is needed not only for the grain producers but also for the livestock people of Canada. I think that the time is appropriate now to act in this direction. The Federal Government has committed itself to some kind of a policy in the near future. The Eastern areas are paying high feed grain prices and should be receptive to a policy that would help stabilize prices and production.

The farmers in Western Canada can see the need for a policy that would help them in their production plans for the future.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member from Elrose (Mr. Owens) this Resolution.

Mr. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of this very important Resolution. It is important because it proposes a program to stabilize the agriculture economy by protecting three important sectors in the industry — the producer, the consumer and the export market.

The producer of feed grains would be guaranteed a cost of production return. The consumer would be guaranteed a fair buying price and supply. The export buyers would be guaranteed a supply to fill their requirements.

Present sales are buoyant and could lead to over-optimism in some quarters, which could in a short time create surpluses. Surpluses without adequate export sales result in 'firesale' prices and below cost disposal gimmicks that create hardships

for the producer. On the other hand a shortage of supplies for export sales creates dissatisfied customers who buy from other suppliers.

Farming in Western Canada has had its ups and downs with bumper crops and near failures, in most cases caused by the weather during the growing season over which there is no control. However, a goodly part of the time the depressions could have been controlled or at least eased by some foresight and planning.

In the early days of settlement the grain producers were at the mercy of the elevator companies and grain trade in a variety of different ways. Grain sales at harvest time was the main source of income, and in order to pay taxes and operating costs and household costs that had built up over the past several months, the grain was delivered as soon as possible after threshing. The result was a glut on the market and a sharp drop in prices. If the farmer was in a financial position to do so and held his grain until early in the new year, the prices would usually recover. Another problem was the lack of boxcars to move the grain out for the elevator system, which resulted in short elevator space and the seller was often forced to sell a high grade of wheat for a much lower grade, and therefore a lower price.

To overcome, or at least partially overcome these problems, the grain growers formed their own elevator companies, but were again faced with the unfair distribution of boxcars to their own elevators. Often during the period of high deliveries and low prices, the grower would take an advance on a car lot of a small amount per bushel sometimes as low as 20 cents. If the grain trade lowered the price of grain below the advance made, the grower's grain was sold and he would receive no more for that particular lot of grain.

One other disaster that I should like to mention, Mr. Speaker, is the depression of the 1930s, a time of relatively poor crops and low prices for the farmers of the West.

I draw your attention to these many problems faced and endured by the Western farmers in a period of free and open markets without plans.

Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pressure and organization, the government of the day was persuaded to form the Canadian Wheat Board, and bring some semblance of reason to the wheat market, by purchasing and selling all the wheat for the western wheat grower, by guaranteeing an initial price at time of delivery and making a final payment after the close of the crop year. Mr. Speaker, the proposal contained in this Resolution, the national feed grain program, is designed to dovetail into the operation of the Wheat Board with Federal Government participation.

Saskatchewan is the chief grain growing province, differing from the other provinces by producing substantially more in proportion to the domestic need than the others, leaving large surpluses on relatively few farms. Past experience proves the need for some type of realistic controls to guarantee prices for the producer to cover the cost of production, and also to guarantee the consumer fair buying prices for his needs at all times, regardless of the supply and demand.

A few years ago, during our heavy grains inventory period, the price of feed grain for the producer was a disaster while at the same time for the consumer it was a bonanza, which resulted in too many farmers rushing into livestock production. In a number of cases extensive hog operations were built, with government assistance, which appeared at the time to be a good investment but too often turned out to be just the opposite, due to poor management and lack of markets for finished hogs. Even with feed grain at firesale prices, the hog producer was in trouble. This feed grains program cannot correct the problems of the hog producer or the livestock feeder, but it could ensure adequate supplies at a stable price which is essential for an economic operation on a long term base.

Mr. Speaker, to alleviate the problems of the producer, the domestic consumer and the export customer, a comprehensive national feed grains policy is not only desirable, but necessary. A national feed grains policy objective should ensure that all producers of feed grain should receive the same price for their product, taking into consideration the quality and location, and they should have reasonably equal marketing opportunities. All domestic users of feed grain should be able to buy prairie feed grain for the same price taking into account the quality and locale. Prices should reflect the interest of both the producer and consumer by protecting the producer from below-cost returns and by assuring the consumer prices at least as favorable as outside suppliers.

Prices for feed grain for domestic use in Canada should be referred to as the 'Western Feed Base Price', and could be determined by an agency such as the Wheat Board, monitoring, recording and publicizing prices paid by Western users. The Wheat Board would sell the feed grain to other domestic users at the Western base price, plus a differential for hauling, handling and other charges. Freight assistance may be required in some instances, but should not result in benefits to the buyer that would effect greater returns than those received in the shipping area. Domestic feed grains prices would be protected by a tariff on imported feeds such as US corn.

To ensure sufficient production for normal requirements the initial price and the potential volume of sales should be announced early in the new year to allow producers to plan their cropping strategy well in advance of seeding time. In fact a long term sales volume should be projected so producers could project a master plan covering a number of years. That would add stability to their own economy as well as assuring supplies to both domestic and export customers.

The pricing of feed grains would necessarily require some acceptable objectives to achieve a price that would protect the grower from disastrously low prices, but sufficiently high to induce sufficient production to meet the requirements of the markets on the one side, and on the other, to avoid prices that would place the livestock producer in a disadvantageous position in the red meat markets. The price should also reflect per acre return to the producer, comparable to other crops grown in the locality.

To further ensure adequate production the acreage seeded to feed grains would not affect the growers' assignable acres for quotas of other crops. The grower would be allowed to assign his total qualifying acreage to crops other than feed

grains. This principle would allow grain producers equal opportunities to share in the markets for crops that may be subject to restricted deliveries in a given crop year.

Grain production varies from year to year, mainly due to two factors, the seeded acreage and the weather conditions. In any given year either factor could create a surplus or a shortage in supply. It is imperative that sufficient feed grains be available at all times to supply domestic needs and to assure export customers delivery of their requirements.

There could, therefore, be times when fairly large surpluses would need to be stored and at all times carryover supplies should be adequate to maintain a reserve for a short crop situation. During periods of surplus supplies, space for storage could be a problem. It should be anticipated that livestock producers who also grow feed grains would, under normal circumstances, grow their own requirements, and have enough storage available for their own needs. Other growers would generally have storage space for their average production but in a year or years of higher than normal yields, delivery opportunities would not be available in sufficient quantities which would force them to provide extra storage facilities. Under these circumstances a farm storage program would become part of the national feed grains program, wherein producers would be paid an initial advance payment for farm stored feed grains, and also a per bushel storage charge, as well as anticipate any final payment after the grain has been delivered to a commercial outlet.

The advance payment could be handled on much the same basis as the policy used for advances on wheat. Extra storage space provided by growers should be eligible for accelerated depreciation allowances similar to that now available to the industrial sector of our economy.

In years of short supplies, the feed grains policy pricing structure should protect the domestic user by fixing the Wheat Board selling price at the Western feed base price plus handling and transportation charges. Such a price structure would eliminate any penalty for the user due to excessive demands in poor crop years. Needed requirements would be drawn from the feed grain reserve supply.

Government supported feed grain reserves can be justified on the grounds that livestock producers cannot adequately protect themselves against short supplies in low crop periods without cutting back on livestock production which in turn would seriously affect many other sectors of our economy and in particular the packing industry and its workers. On the other hand, the grain producers cannot be expected, nor should they be forced to carry the expense of the reserves out of their own resources.

It would be the responsibility of the Wheat Board to assure a reserve stock of feed grains sufficient to supply the needs in times of untimely disaster, keeping in mind that producers would be encouraged to maintain reasonable levels of seeded acreage from year to year by knowing they are assured a fair and just return and markets.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to impress on you and the Members of this Assembly, the importance of this Resolution on a national feed grains policy. Its importance cannot be overemphasized. Every effort to upgrade and stabilize our agriculture

industry must be pursued with the main purpose of making it more attractive and more stable to more people. A national feed grains program will enhance the industry by assuring guaranteed sales and returns to the feed grains producer, by assuring guaranteed supplies at fair prices to the domestic consumer and by assuring a guaranteed supply to the export customer.

Mr. Speaker, planning for the future is a part of the policy of the New Democratic Party. The national feed grains program is one part of the plan and we urge our Government to press for co-operation with the Federal Government to establish such a plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this Assembly to support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is an extremely complicated solution to what is an extremely complicated problem. To attempt to outline a solution in a resolution involving feed grains in Canada is at best very, very difficult.

I would just make two or three comments on the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. I would infer from the comments made by the mover of the Resolution (Mr. Carlson) and the Member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Owens) that the type of plan that they envisage would be a very, very bureaucratic machine at best to be able to achieve the objectives that they desire. I might say that I believe that it is a mistake, frequently implied by Members, that the feeder of livestock is usually the beneficiary from low feed grain. I think actually, and certainly in the operation conducted by feedlots pertaining to cattle, that cheap feed grain is of little help really to the feeder himself of cattle. The reason for it, Mr. Speaker, is that most feedlots continue to operate on a very similar type of margin in both good and bad times. The reason for this is that the lower feed grain is usually priced, if there is a cheap feed grain price, it is usually passed on back to the person in a form of higher price for the calf by the original purchaser of the calf. If the price of feed grain is higher then it usually involves that the person purchasing the calf usually pays less for the calf.

Mr. Speaker, the margin of profit, if you want to call it profit usually of large livestock feeders remains usually fairly constant. In actual fact most fairly large livestock feeders usually would sooner have the price of feed grain at a fairly high level than they would at a very low level simply because many other people then fall out of the business because they haven't the opportunity to sell and there is less competition to buy the livestock. So I think one point that I want to make is that, generally speaking the low feed grain price is a help to the original producer of livestock. This, of course, is the person who once you put down floor prices is generally put at some disadvantage in the economic system too.

Now the other point or observation that I should like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Members have suggested that the Wheat Board be the sole agency for feed grain. Now I am not certain whether they have suggested that producers or feedlot operators be required to make all their purchases through the Wheat Board. I don't believe that this would be desirable simply

because many producers, Mr. Speaker, prefer to line up quantities of feed grain on their own and they have an operation they have been working with for many years, they know other producers whom they are able to make contracts with or know where they can purchase this type of feed grain. They have, Mr. Speaker, these arrangements on their own and it would be a great disruption to their operation were they automatically forced to buy all their feed grain from a type of supplier such as the Wheat Board.

I think the third thing which we must recognize is that any type of a policy wherein the livestock industry rationalizes itself in North America, is that the most efficient producer of livestock would be the preferred supplier for livestock in North America. We compete amongst the 10 provinces of this country, Mr. Speaker, as to who will actually be producing that livestock. Currently it is obvious that livestock, when they are bought as calves, particularly in the cattle industry they gravitate to that area which is best able most efficiently to produce them. This is a process that goes on constantly in the North American market. If you attend some of the large terminal markets, cattle are coming into Toronto from as far away as Florida. There are some from Winnipeg will go to Denver, there are some from Alberta that will go to Winnipeg and at times, depending on prices, there will be some from Winnipeg will be moved to the West Coast.

The result is that if Saskatchewan, as has been suggested by many people, is to participate substantially in the improved markets for livestock that we have to be competitive with not only other provinces within Canada but we have to be competitive with other states of the Union; because if we are not, then the production of livestock will gravitate towards those areas.

This is another factor that in any feed grain policy we must closely consider because it is a matter of efficient production of livestock, because that is where the livestock will be produced. It simply does not hold that you can produce livestock at any price and sell them in North America. You may be able to do that under current conditions because prices for livestock are extremely high. But over a long-term period when you have low periods of livestock prices or high periods, then if you look at North America you will find that both hogs and cattle have rationalized into those areas that were the most efficiently produced and those areas that were best able to produce a good quality product at that particular price.

Mr. Speaker, I have only mentioned briefly what I think are three all inter-related problems that are involved in any feed grain policy. Because of the obvious complexity of the motion and the suggestions put forward by the Members opposite, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 10 – Request Discontinuance of Title ‘The Honorable’

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) moved, seconded by Mr. Guy (Athabasca):

That this Legislature opposes the improper use of the title “The Honorable” by a former Saskatchewan Cabinet Minister, C.M. Fines, now residing in Florida, and that this Legislature requests him to discontinue the use of this title.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, this pertains to a matter that started back in Regina about 1934 or thereabouts. I thought I had it in hand last March 3rd when I made mention of it in a short dissertation in the House. I pointed out at that time that a former Cabinet Minister of this province was making improper or what I consider improper use of the title “The Honorable”. I refer to Mr. C.M. Fines of Fort Lauderdale, Florida. At that time I indicated that this was an honor that I think we all appreciate while we have it. We should like to continue it after our term of office is through, but unfortunately the rules of the game say that when you are defeated or when you are out of Cabinet you don’t carry this title with you.

At that time I suggested that the Attorney General do something about it, and his words were, “I’ll do my job.” Well I was very disappointed to find that he hasn’t done his job and this is strange because the Attorney General is a pretty efficient Member and he does his job well. Now I find that Clarence Fines has hit the news again, down in Florida — I’ll send four or five copies over, I’ll send all I’ve got — I am going to read from this, I think you will find it very interesting. It is Fort Lauderdale News, November 6, 1972. The article is headed up, “Handled Saskatchewan Budget — Box Office man knows money,” by Yolanda Maurer.

You would hardly expect to find handling tickets at the box office at Parker Playhouse tonight the former Deputy Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, Canada. The Hon. Clarence Fines balancing ticket stubs — a far cry from the role he played balancing budgets up to \$200 million for his province.

The present Treasurer, or Minister of Finance will feel that that is small potatoes, but nevertheless that was a pretty big budget back in those days.

The next paragraph really gets me here.

A soft spoken courteous man with horn-rimmed glasses and intellectual looks of a professor (which he was once).

I have know Mr. Fines practically all my life — all his life — and I don’t remember him being a professor.

But he received the title, ‘The Honorable’ for life when he was elected to a Cabinet post in the Province of Saskatchewan.

For 16 years he held the post of Deputy Prime Minister as well as Minister of the Treasury.

Those are pretty imposing sounding titles.

He did it with such distinction that the walls of his den are papered with plaques and awards from his constituents and his Premier.

I should send one of these to Tommy Douglas — I’ll do that. I slipped up on that.

Now the Fines moved to Fort Lauderdale after his retirement from public life in 1961.

As you have figured out by now, this is how . . .

The next paragraph mentions his wife, I don't want to get her involved in it.

. . . As you have figured out by now this is how the Honorable, the 'Right Honorable' got into the act, if I daresay, his wife appointed him ticket chairman and jack-of-all-trades for the production of 'The Women'.

I think he is a bit of an authority on that . . . so I can understand how he could get involved.

The 'Right Honorable' — he is putting in long hours — he complained a bit because it said that it was going to interfere with his three games of golf that he played every week. The Right Honorable will be at the box office window until the eleventh hour balancing his \$5, \$10 and \$25 ticket stubs, just like he used to balance his \$200 million budget some years ago.

Mr. Speaker, that is enough of this nonsense. I think that every Member of the House will support my motion because it is quite evident that improper use is being made of this title. I don't think anyone would begrudge a person occasionally being called "The Honorable", or "Major" or "Captain" or "Speed". I know a chap who works in one of the clothing stores, he was quite a runner, he is called "Speed". It appears that this is more than just a casual use of this title. I just wonder where Yolanda got her information, I have my suspicions.

I think the message has got to Mr. Fines, but just in case it hasn't, I think we should pass the motion. There is a chap down there by the name of Dave Price who gives the Canadian news every morning and all Canadians listen to it because it is pretty important. He tells about the cold winter blast coming from Saskatchewan and makes everyone glad they are in Florida. Here is what he said on February 5th.

I have been somewhat careless in using the title 'The Honorable', I am sorry folks, I'll try to do better in the future.

He didn't mention anything about Mr. Fines, but I have my suspicions that that is whom he is referring to. But just to make sure, I have the program, part of the program of the Playhouse where he was selling the tickets. It is dated January 22, 1973. There is a picture of Mr. and Mrs. Fines, I'll draw to your attention that it is Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Fines and orchestra leader David LeWinter and wife Roseann Davis.

An Hon. Member: — Not the Right Honorable?

Mr. Grant: — No, the Right Honorable seems to have disappeared but I still think, Mr. Speaker, that we should pass this motion and make sure that he doesn't revert to his old ways again and that the people of Florida know him for his true self, rather than his past. I so move.

February 27, 1973

Hon. Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I rise not in defence of the Hon. Mr. Fines to use that title. When I was elected to this Legislature Mr. Fines retired from active participation in politics and government in 1960.

I knew Mr. Fines. Mr. Fines was the Provincial Treasurer for Saskatchewan from 1944 to 1964. A title which is attributed to a Minister as The Right Honorable C.M. Fines was referred to by Members of this House and out of the House during the period when he was a Member of the Cabinet. To me Mr. Fines was a capable provincial treasurer. I think that our present Minister of Finance and Mr. Fines as Provincial Treasurer are both eminently competent. When the CCF had taken over, Saskatchewan was virtually bankrupt and it took a great deal of financial ability to put the province on a sound financial track. This was accomplished by the Hon. C.M. Fines, as Provincial Treasurer.

That Mr. Fines uses the title “Honorable” in other parts of North America other than Canada or Saskatchewan is not the fault or blame of the Government. I don’t rise here to defend him for using this title. To me this is his privilege. I see no reason why I as a Member of this Government should deny Mr. Fines or the Hon. Mr. Fines the use of this title, or why I should support a resolution denying him the privilege. If the people and the Press of Lauderdale Florida feel that he is Honorable, then he is Honorable C.M. Fines.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution deserves careful consideration. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o’clock p.m.