

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
29th Day

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to the Members of the Legislature a group of Grades Seven and Eight students. There are 55 of them in number and they are from St. Paul School, seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Hornung, their teacher, Mr. Demchuk and Father Fry.

I wish to extend to the students a very warm welcome and express the hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be educational and informative and that this will be a day for them to remember for the years ahead.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of students in the west gallery from Peart School, located not too far from our Wascana Centre. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Short. There are 32 in number. I want to extend greetings to them and I hope that they will have a pleasant afternoon and they will learn much from the deliberations here. We welcome you most sincerely.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome to the Legislative Assembly today, 41 students from the city of Saskatoon from St. Goretti School. I believe they are located in the west gallery. They are accompanied by teachers, Mr. Rieger and Mr. Wilde. St. Goretti School was at one time in the constituency of my colleague, the Member from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) but thanks to the redistribution of 1971 I now have the privilege of representing the constituency. I also want to welcome the students to the Assembly. I hope their stay here is both informative and entertaining.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RULING

Bill No. 1 – An Act To Amend The Land Bank Act, 1972

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call Orders for the Day, I should like to announce to the House that two weeks ago today on February 20th, I made a ruling at that time on Bill No. 1 as it stands on the Order Paper. I was requested by several Members who asked if I

March 6, 1973

would withhold a final decision until they had had a further look and discuss it with me. I have re-examined this Bill and my ruling of February 20th stands. I did rule that Bill No. 1 to be a money Bill and out of order.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, on that ruling that you just made, I wondered if I might invite Mr. Speaker to take another look at that for the following reason. Mr. Speaker, I spent a moment or two studying that and if you — I am looking for my Rules of the House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I understood in the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly on Tuesday the 20th of February, your concluding remarks and the remarks upon which you based your finding were as follows:

Under The Land Bank Act, 1972, all land held by the Commission is the property of Her Majesty.

And here is the ruling that Mr. Speaker gave:

Bill No. 1 provides for the selling of this Crown land, it is a money Bill and contravenes Rule No. 30. I therefore rule Bill No. 1 out of order.

As I understand your ruling today, Mr. Speaker, you have confirmed the ruling that you made on the 20th of February. Mr. Speaker, as it appeared at that date was:

Since Bill No. 1 provides for the selling of this Crown land, it is a money Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the reasoning and if that is the entire reasoning upon which you based your ruling, I would respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that you are in error if you are following the precedents set forth previously in other parts of the world by the House of Commons and also the Mother of Parliaments in London. Because, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that particular Bill is an amendment to a Bill which itself provides for the selling of land. Mr. Speaker, we are not doing, and by Bill No. 1 we do not propose to do, something new. What we do propose, Mr. Speaker, is that the sale of land already provided for in the Bill, in The Land Bank Act, 1972, be sold at a different date. More than that, Mr. Speaker, we do not, in fact, provide that it be sold at all. We provide, Mr. Speaker, by Bill No. 1 before this House that the Commission, that is, the Government, which has given itself power to sell after five years, should be given the power to sell after one year. But the power to sell is contained in the original Bill, not in the amendment. Mr. Speaker, we are simply saying, that you the Government, have the right to sell not at the end of five years but if you, the Government, should so choose you have the right to sell at the end of one year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not, as I understand the precedent and the rules, a money Bill at all, Mr. Speaker, if that is the entire reasoning upon which you have found that it is a money Bill. I did not examine other parts of it because I simply examined your own ruling.

Mr. Speaker, Rule 30, which is the one that you have used to base your finding is as follows. It deals with money motions and is in fact tied entirely to the question of whether or not a recommendation is required, and a money Bill, so certified, is one which requires the recommendation. A Bill which does not require a recommendation is not a money Bill. So when we talk of money Bills, of course, Mr. Speaker, we are talking of those Bills which require a recommendation. I submit, at least with respect to your ruling, there is nothing that requires a recommendation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest in any event that that is not a money Bill. It says here in the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly adopted in 1970, Rule 30:

Any vote, resolution, address or bill introduced in the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue . . .

Now, if I stop there, Mr. Speaker, that is not an appropriation of any part of the public revenue. We are not spending Government money, Mr. Speaker, nor do we propose it by Bill No. 1.

. . . or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not impose a tax or an impost, therefore it does not qualify as a money Bill on that ground. Thirdly, it does not:

. . . impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it does not but if it did, Mr. Speaker, you did not make the ruling on that basis.

. . . or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown . . .

Mr. Speaker, we do not propose that money be compounded or released that is owing to the Crown. We do not suggest that the Crown lose money at all.

. . . or to grant any property of the Crown . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we debated this two weeks ago and at that time several Members of the Opposition asked if I would withhold it so that they could come and discuss it with me. There were several Members who made that request. Only one saw fit to come and discuss it with me. That particular Member also discussed it with the legal counsel where I get my advice and there is no doubt that this is a money Bill and I cannot permit a further debate on it. It is a money Bill and I rule it out of order. You can challenge my ruling but that is my ruling.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a word on the ruling. You and I did discuss this, Sir, and I think my hon. friend from Albert Park has a point in that perhaps a more substantial basis for ruling it out of order deals with the fact that this Bill could be construed to be granting property of the Crown if it

indeed were acted on. Secondly, under the terms of the down payment with so much being paid over a number of years, then that could be considered a charge or a loan on the credit of the province. I think with respect to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Albert Park that this latter aspect of it, it is in that regard that this Bill could be considered a money Bill more so than perhaps the original reason you gave. I am not saying that's wrong, but I would argue that one. I think, as you say, Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting kind of case because as it stands, if no action were taken under the Bill, well then, of course, it wouldn't be an infraction. The Bill is presented with a view that action would be taken that that land would be sold under the Bill, and of course the minute the land was sold under the Bill, under the terms of sale, it would then become an infraction of this rule.

Mr. Speaker: — Rule No. 30 says in part from where the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) left off:

. . . or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of the province . . .

That part I read out two weeks ago. If land is being sold for cash or on time it is a difference and over 25 year amortized period, as Bill No. 1 says, it is a charge upon the credit of the province. While I didn't use one sentence of Standing Rule No. 30, I quoted the entire section and I ruled that Bill No. 1 was out of order.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might make one suggestion to your honor, to you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the point that you are making. You are saying in effect it is sold over a 25-year period. Clearly I agree that that credit causes a considerable shadow of a doubt on my argument because my argument is directed to the ruling which you gave.

No, Mr. Speaker, as it appears in the House of Commons in London, the certification goes before it is passed on for signature and I wonder if you, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't consider that it would be out of order not in advance but subsequently. If it approached third reading, Mr. Speaker, and had not been properly amended to eliminate that objectionable clause, then, Mr. Speaker, it could not be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor for signature for the very reason that it was in fact a money Bill. I don't want to give you an extensive argument because obviously you don't want to hear it, but I do wish to refer you to page 789 and 790 and 791 of Erskine May, which deals with this entire question and the time at which you make your ruling. Because, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has not had the advantage of argument on second reading, nor amendment in Committee of the Whole. It may well be that when it is presented to the Lieutenant-Governor for his signature it is no longer a money Bill and no longer requires your certificate. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we follow the practice in the Mother Parliament it would not be certified at this stage but at the end.

Mr. Speaker: — Before a Bill can get second reading in this House it either must have the recommendation or not be a money Bill. That has been the rule that has been established here for many years. This is a money Bill and I have ruled it out of order.

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, could I just comment for some information. I don't want to appeal the ruling, I just want to ask for some information. I understand that if a money Bill is introduced recommendation must be received, right? Why would you let this appear on the Order Paper when the recommendation was not received?

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member is well aware of the fact that when a Bill is given to the Clerk of the Assembly, a Member gets up and asks for leave to introduce a Bill. The Speaker doesn't have that Bill until it is printed. The Bill, in most cases, is not printed when it comes for first reading but cannot obtain second reading until it has been printed. That is the time when the Speaker has a chance to have a look at it and, therefore, the Speaker at that time has to rule on it. If we go to the bottom of Rule No. 10 which I quoted before it also says:

. . . may not be presently entered upon but shall be adjourned until such further day that the Assembly shall think fit.

That's not the quotation we had here. These Bills cannot be considered by the Assembly until they are properly in order.

QUESTIONS

Strike By The International Union Of Elevator Constructors

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). This House is probably aware a nation wide strike by the International Union of Elevator Constructors against elevator manufacturing companies is now in its sixth month. This strike has delayed or halted about \$800 million worth of construction in Canada, some of it here in Saskatchewan. There have also been recent indications because of the long duration of the strike that certain unavoidable hardships are being felt and maintenance is being neglected. Several provinces of Canada have taken some action in this regard and I should like to ask the Minister of Labour what action is being considered by his Department to cope with this situation that is hampering Saskatchewan's construction industry and endangering those using public elevators in this province.

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the Member will know that the negotiations in connection with this work stoppage have been taking place not in Saskatchewan but it is a national contract and the negotiations are currently in progress in Ontario. In the Province of Ontario one of their foremost people in the field of industrial relations, Mr. Dickey has been made directly responsible for the negotiations. We have been in touch with them on a regular basis and we have indicated to them that we want them to keep us in touch with current developments. At this particular point in time it will be known that a number of provinces have sent wires suggesting a course of action and calling for an inquiry into the matter. We were in touch with the Ontario authorities who indicated at that time that they felt that an inquiry would be premature and it would probably inhibit the negotiations as they are currently being carried on.

Accordingly, we feel that the most expeditious course of action is being taken keeping in constant touch with the Ontario people. Recognizing that the work stoppage has had some implications with respect to construction that isn't being completed as a result of this dispute, we are hopeful that there will be a resolution of the problem in the not too distant future.

An Hon. Member: — . . . you are doing nothing.

Halfway House – Howard House

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor).

In the news over the weekend there was an indication that a sort of halfway house in Regina being operated under the title, The Howard House, was going to be discontinued because of the termination of some Federal assistance that they have had for a period. I was wondering since it seems to be of public concern and this house was serving a useful purpose, if the Minister would explain to us why his Department didn't see clear to participate in the continuation of this very worthwhile service.

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member is referring to the John Howard Residence in Regina which was established some two years ago, I believe, or a year and one-half by a grant from the Government in Ottawa. We are somewhat disappointed that the grant is being ended. From our Department's and the Government's point of view we were looking at a number of programs for halfway houses – this is not the right terminology – but community correctional centres. We have established a new one in Saskatoon and they are looking at more. The problem was that for the most part the John Howard Residence, while serving very good function, was serving mostly federal prisoners and not provincial. We felt it should be carried on but should be carried on by the Federal Government.

Psychiatric Services in Yorkton

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday and I understand that the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) asked the question of what arrangements are being made to ensure continuity of psychiatric services in Yorkton as a result of certain resignations in the staff that have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure him and the Members of the Legislature as well as the community of Yorkton that the Department of Public Health and Psychiatric Services Branch have made arrangements to ensure that necessary psychiatric services will be provided. As of today an additional psychiatrist has joined the staff at Yorkton on a temporary basis. The psychiatrists who have given notice will not be leaving until the end of the month. In the meantime we are arranging to transfer two members from other branches. On the 30th of March, a new psychiatrist whom we have been trying to recruit, will be

joining the staff at Yorkton, a further one will be joining the staff on April 4 and a third one on April 9th. We have ensured that services will be continued in the usual manner.

Two-price System of Natural Gas

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Minister of Industry if the Government has calculated the cost to the Saskatchewan people which will arise from the two-price system for natural gas or the increase in cost which has been imposed by the Alberta Government.

Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — In answer to the Hon. Member's question, Mr. Speaker, we will take his question and look into it and provide an answer tomorrow.

Mr. MacLeod: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We wonder why the Government has taken so long because the Government of Manitoba, the Hon. Minister in Charge of Consumer Affairs, Mr. Mackling, has already calculated to the penny the average cost to homeowners in Winnipeg. He states it to be \$17.50. We wonder if the Government of Saskatchewan shouldn't hurry itself a little bit to find out what may happen here.

Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising the Member for Albert Park is wondering, he often is. He certainly has a right to do that. I just may say that I am surprised that anyone can calculate to the penny what the cost of two-price system for gas in Alberta will be to any particular consumers in Canada.

There are several possible prices for gas, depending upon whose projections you wish to look at, or whose calculations. I have received all kinds of estimates, as high as more than 50 cents per Mcf for gas, and that's not the price that the Hon. Member is particularly referring to I think in talk that emanates from the Government of Alberta. I refer the Hon. Member to some of the things I said during the course of the Budget Debate on the implications of increases in transportation costs and wellhead prices for gas so far as it applies to Saskatchewan consumers, the customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. MacLeod: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No, we can't have a third question. You have had a question on a follow-up.

Mr. MacLeod: — I just wanted to get a supplementary from a different Minister.

Mr. Speaker: — No, you have had a question on the supplementary, that's all we can allow.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 239

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 239 showing:

- (a) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan had an appraisal done of the assets of Intercontinental Packers Limited prior to its purchase of shares in the company.
- (b) If so, the name of the one who made the appraisal.
- (c) A copy of any such appraisal.

Mr. Guy: — I would suggest to the Legislature that this information is of vital importance to the people of Saskatchewan. We heard more than a week ago the announcement by the Premier that they are investing some \$10.2 million of the taxpayers' money in the purchase of a meat packing plant which from the surface looks to be a bad deal for Saskatchewan people.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) made it very clear at least four or five days ago, the type of information that we would be requesting. The Government has had plenty of time either to decide to give us this information or refuse it. The fact that the debates are being adjourned today would lead us to believe that over a period of time we are going to be refused this information but the Attorney General prefers to do it in steps so that the people of Saskatchewan will not show their anger perhaps as rapidly as they otherwise would.

This is a blatant attempt by the Government to refuse details of a deal that is costing the taxpayers of this province a considerable sum of money. I think that the Premier should be ashamed of himself that he is not prepared to provide this information. If he wishes to amend these motions for returns, he has had plenty of time to prepare his amendment. This attempt to adjourn them until Friday or until next week, I think is abuse of his position as Premier. It is wrong to deny the people of Saskatchewan information which they have the right to receive. We are very disappointed in the attitude of the Government. I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will be disappointed.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two on this. First of all, there is no rejection of information as is suggested by the Hon. Member from Athabasca. I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, that it will be one week tomorrow that the announcement was first made public. I do suggest to the Hon. Members of the House that a period of six days and a weekend period involved is not unreasonable amount of time for the Government upon which to say that we need more information. That can't be said to be excessive in terms of time.

Certainly we didn't get the formal notice of the questions and the exact wording of them in until Friday. I believe they were tabled 48 hours prior to today's date. Again, that is not an unusually long time to ask for further extension.

On our part I don't think we are twisting the rules in any area there. With all due respect to the Member from Athabasca I can say that the remarks made by himself and by others as quoted in the newspapers about this being a bad deal and a

blatant deal, casting aspersions, I would say malicious aspersions in many ways against people like the Mendel family and businessmen like Mr. Gedge does not commend itself to this House very highly. I think the people of the Province of Saskatchewan know the integrity of Mr. Mendel and know the integrity of SEDCO and that the deal is not as the Member from Athabasca would have it believed to be a blatant one. However, having said that, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 240

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 240 showing:

- (a) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan received an investment counsel's opinion or advice as to the true net worth of Intercontinental Packers Limited.
- (b) If so the name of the investment counsel.
- (c) A copy of any such opinion or advice.

Mr. Guy: — I should like to remind this House that I have not spoken at any time since the announcement was made regarding this deal, nor have I said anything to the Press. I wish that the Attorney General would withdraw his remarks that I was casting aspersions against the Mendel family. The Mendel family has not been mentioned during any of the debates for these motions for returns. I think the Attorney General is resorting to his usual tactic of trying to cover up the failure and the lack of co-operation of his Government by bringing in a red herring. I said earlier I have made no aspersions against the Mendel family nor has anyone else on this side of the House.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, we are probably going to get the same treatment on this one. Again I should like to join with the Member from Athabasca in pointing out that I have spoken on this in the House and publicly and outside of this House. What I have said, I will say again, that to pay \$10.2 million for a 45 per cent share of a business that is already here, to invest over \$10 million of the public's money for something that won't produce one new job or bring in any new wealth into this province, looks on the surface like a bad deal. If we examine the public statements, the statements that have been made public and are public property such as Burns and Company, a company that is admittedly four or five times larger than Intercontinental Packers, we find that they make a net profit of something in the neighborhood this last year of \$2 million, over \$2 million.

Knowing what we know about the profits that Intercontinental made when we were the Government, they were borrowing money off SEDCO, we have every reason to believe that their net profits do not exceed \$1 million, in fact are probably under \$1 million — I hope they are over that — but if they are in the neighborhood of \$1 million and using any common sense yardstick of 10 to 12 times net earnings as a reasonable valuation of that company, it doesn't bring the company's total value to anywhere more than \$10 or \$12 million. Certainly 45 per cent of that amount is a far cry from \$10.2 million. In fact this company would have to be showing a profit of better than \$2 million

annually probably closer to \$3 million annually to warrant an investment like this. On top of that we are paying \$10.2 million and we haven't got control from the information given by the Premier. The very little bit of information the Premier has already given us, we have 45 per cent of the company, something like 30 per cent of the shareholders or of the members on the board of directors.

Again, I said at the time and I say again, that maybe it isn't nearly as important as possibly some of the clauses that were included in the agreement, giving those 30 per cent directors representing the Government. They may have some veto powers, they may have some extraordinary powers that ordinary members of the board of directors do not have. We won't know that until we see the agreements tabled.

For the Attorney General to come in and say that he hasn't had time — I would hope they have been negotiating this for some time — I know that they have on record at SEDCO the statements, the last three or four or five-year statements of Intercontinental Packers, that is one of the conditions or it has always been one of the conditions under which SEDCO has advanced a loan. This company has outstanding loans to SEDCO. I am sure they haven't paid them off. To know whether or not it is done, to have an agreement — I would point out that we tabled the agreement of the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill long before we had even concluded it and we tabled it after a request was made by the then Leader of the Opposition and now Premier. The entire contracts were tabled and as a result of that the then Opposition, the NDP, came into this House fulfilled their responsibility and mounted a very serious and reasoned attack on that deal. That was their responsibility and they were given information. To come into this House six days after they have paid out \$10.2 million for an on-going plant and say we haven't got the information for you, or we want to amend it so that we can somehow twist and turn the truth isn't good enough. Don't tell us you haven't got it, if you haven't got it you should have it. Of course you should have it, I know you do have it, long before you ever signed the agreement and finalized this particular deal with Intercontinental Packers.

Again, I should like to point out as the Member for Athabasca did, we have not criticized the Mendel family nor have we criticized Mr. Gedge. I have said, and I'll say again, that if Mr. Mendel was able to sell 45 per cent of his shares in Intercontinental Packers for more than it was worth to the NDP, more power to him. But more is the stupidity and the irresponsibility of the NDP, if in fact he did. We don't know whether he did or not. Maybe when they table the statements, the contracts, the Government will be able to show us and the people of this province that that company is in fact worth \$23 or \$24 million. Don't talk to us about their gross assets, we want to know first their net assets and we also want to know their earnings and that's what a company is worth. They may have all kinds of assets written up or written down or any other thing, but it is what that company is earning that is the yardstick and the acid test of what the company is really worth.

I join with the Member from Athabasca in regretting that the Government has not seen fit to give the information without us even asking, when they came into this House and so proudly announced that deal. At the same time they should have laid on the table all the documents in connection with that so

that the public of this province and the Opposition of this province could have a look at it. Then we could say, it is a good deal or it is not a good deal. Even had they paid just exactly what this company is worth, I would question whether it was a good deal. Why we need to take the people's money of this province and invest in an on-going deal, I am sure the Government is going to get up and say it was threatened by a foreign buyer, it was going to be scooped up by someone else. Then I suggest when they table the information, I hope they also announce publicly exactly what foreign buyers were standing in the wings waiting to scoop up this very profitable and very fine organization, to haul away out of this province or take the management out of the Province of Saskatchewan or out of this country. Tell us that information, don't try and kid us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that they will table this. This particular debate we are now on is whether the Government received an investment counsel's opinion or advice as to the true net worth of Intercontinental Packers. If so, the name of the investment counsel and a copy of such opinion or advice. Again I would remind the Hon. Members that both the deals that I was involved in the pulp mill, we were asked for, rightly so, and we tabled the advice that we had on the feasibility of the mill and the viability of the mill, the feasibility of the supply of the wood and every other study that had been done in connection with the development of both the pulp mills, the Prince Albert one, the one we put into successful operation and the one that was cancelled by the present Government. I think they had every right to ask for that information, they did and we tabled it. They asked one year later for a statement of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill and we didn't give it to them. They argued and I have the debates here. I won't bring them in now because I don't know whether they are going to give us a statement or not. I hope they do. At that time they argued, the Premier the then Leader of the Opposition argued very strongly.

Again, I say I hope they are going to give us those statements. They shouldn't try to say they haven't got them because they have. They have had them on record for years. I hope that they are not stalling and they are not going to amend these and use their overwhelming power in this House to amend these or to defeat them and deny the Opposition, and that is not the important thing, deny the people of this province a full disclosure of every aspect of this deal so in fact we can judge whether it was in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two points. First of all it is hardly a comparable situation, the present one we are considering, that is our relationship with the Intercontinental Packers Company now and the fact that we have information on file in SEDCO about the affairs of borrowers of SEDCO. Now it has been a well established practice ever since SEDCO came into existence in the early 1960s and all during the years that our hon. friends were in the Government, that the affairs of a client of SEDCO, a borrower of SEDCO, would not become public information. It is hardly fair for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) to say, well, we have the information on file because SEDCO has lent money to Intercontinental

Packers in the past therefore we can just bring in the information that is on file in SEDCO and table it in the Legislature as quickly as that. Surely, the Leader of the Opposition is not saying that from now on people who borrow money from SEDCO should have their affairs made known to the public through the Legislature. I am sure he is not suggesting that. I am sure he is not suggesting that we can proceed simply because of that fact that Intercon, in the past, has been a borrower from SEDCO.

The second point I wish to make is simply that while we have the information in various forms in the Government that is being sought by these questions there is a matter now of dealing with the people, the management people, and the Mendel family in the Intercontinental Packers organization and that slows down the communications a bit. We have had to relay these questions on to those people and consult with them before we formulated in our own minds what response we should make to the particular wording that is set out here in these motions moved by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

The final point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not the intention of the Government to withhold information. We intend to make all of the information known to the Members of the Opposition, to the people of Saskatchewan, so long as: 1. That disclosure does not jeopardize the commercial success of the Intercontinental Packers organization. 2. Does not put us at a disadvantage in any of the dealings we have with other people in the meat packing business or other people who may approach the Government about business prospects and joint venture prospects. Now we intend to make the information available. We regret that some of the communication has slowed down because we have partners in this particular situation that are not located immediately at Regina.

I may say that it is my information that Mr. Mendel is out of the province this week. We are anxious to consult with him and that process of consultation with him and with the people in his organization has not been completed as of 2:30 this afternoon and it is for that reason that we have asked for the adjournment of debate on some of these notices of motion that have been presented by the Member for Athabasca. But I am sure the Members of the Opposition will get a full and fair picture of the deal we have entered into whereby the people of Saskatchewan have become owners of all of the assets of the Intercontinental organization including the newly expanded plant at Saskatoon and including the physical assets of the company here at Regina and the plant in Red Deer, Alberta and the plant in British Columbia. I think they will be satisfied if they are reasonable men, and I hope that they are reasonable men, Mr. Speaker, that the assets of this company, its physical assets, its commercial position, its outlook for market expansion in the future, fully justified the price we have paid for our 45 per cent interest and the terms of our relationship in giving the people of Saskatchewan an effective voice in the meat packing industry which will be important to our farmers and to our people in Saskatchewan for many years to come. This will be available.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make two comments on some of the words spoken by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). First

of all, while we do not expect to be given the information of arrangements between SEDCO and borrowing clients, we do think this is a different type of arrangement than has usually been experienced in most SEDCO deals. In this particular aspect, Mr. Speaker, the Government is a participant or owner in the company that has received the loan. This is substantially different from most SEDCO arrangements where the Government through SEDCO is simply making the loan and they are not a participant in the ownership of the company receiving the loan. Obviously the Intercontinental Packers deal is much different in this respect in that the Government is an owner or the people of Saskatchewan are an owner to the extent of 45 per cent. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, is we hope that I admit that we have not been given any reason today to doubt that the information will be forthcoming. But I just wish to mention to the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the profit and loss picture of all packing house companies, at least the large ones, are all available, the past records of them are all available to anyone who wishes to look. Because these public companies such as Canada Packers, Burns, Swift, etc., Mr. Speaker, are available to anyone across the breadth of the country who wishes to look what their profit picture has been over the last 15 or 20 years. And the application of the price earnings ratio to the profit picture is one of the prime ways of discovering whether the Government paid too little or too much. In respect of too little they made a good deal for Saskatchewan, or in the case of paying too much they made a bad deal for Saskatchewan.

I would suggest to the Government there is no valid reason why the profit picture of Intercontinental Packers should not be made available to the public. Because certainly the profit picture of all other companies is available to the public in the meat packing industry. So I realize, and am willing to accept, that there are some internal operations of any company that should not be divulged to everyone simply because of the competitive reasons. But the profit picture of the company which is very fundamental in ascertaining the price paid is available in this type of industry and I would suggest that at a very early date the Government provide this type of information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with those two comments I believe that the Government will hopefully provide the information at the earliest time possible. I might say that I am concerned at some of the statements the Government has made regarding the reasons for the purchase of the company. The reasons for the purchase of the company seem to be very closely linked, according to some Government spokesmen, including the Premier, that it is based on the reason of keeping jobs in Saskatchewan which may be a fine sounding phrase and I hope has some validity for the reason of the purchase. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is certainly great concern to producers of the primary products of cattle and hogs that the relationship that they will have with the company. Every producer is in the business of trying to get the best price possible for his product and certainly some producers are very much concerned at this time about the possibility of diverting livestock to that company when it is not in their own best and most profitable interest to do so. I think the earlier that we can determine what the Government's policy in this regard is, the better for all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a point

or two on some of the issues that are raised on this motion. There are some interesting points, Mr. Speaker, that are not really being discussed. Whether or not the deal is sound financially is only one aspect of it. Whether the price is right or wrong or whether it is high or low is really only one aspect of this whole Intercontinental deal. My concern is similar to the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). What is the Government really doing in the meat packing business? Are they going to sell, for example, the large feedlot that Intercon operates? Do they want to be in the meat producing business as well? I expect them immediately to urge Intercon to sell that feedlot and get out of it. Because that is vertical integration, something the Members opposite have opposed for a long time. Is this purchase their new industrial policy, Mr. Speaker? A Provincial Government takeover?

I was interested in a remark from the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). He says this will give us an effective voice in the livestock industry. Now is this their answer for any other industry that they want an effective voice in? To get in there and enact a provincial takeover, either buy it out, or take it over and set up their own Crown corporation.

I wonder what was wrong with the existing policy of Intercontinental Packers that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) the Premier or any of the members opposite didn't like? What was wrong with that policy that they felt they had to get into the meat packing business? This concern I have and this is the concern many people in the province have. If they didn't like any existing policy of Intercontinental or any other meat packer, did the Government first consider legislation to bring about any changes in policy rather than taking the move as they have done to purchase that plant? Is this the only approach that they have taken? Is this the approach we can look for in the future? When they wish to impose their policy on the meat packing industry or any other industry that they decide to buy out a successful operation. As has been pointed out many times, we hope it is successful, I think it is a key industry in the province. But it is a move that has spent over \$10 million of public money without any new jobs and I have yet to see and yet to hear from Members opposite really what benefits will be accruing to the producers of hogs, cattle or other livestock from this particular move.

I have yet to hear what policy Intercon had that was disturbing the Government opposite. I have yet to hear any valid reason why we are now launched into buying and taking over any industry that the Government sees fit to change their policy on. I should like to have some of these questions answered, Mr. Speaker, before this debate closes.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, a word or two about this particular motion and the entire debate which concerns us a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, it does appear from the information given to date or hinted to date that SEDCO have made a loan of some size to Intercontinental. Listening to some of the remarks of the Members opposite I am not sure just exactly what they have done because they have not given us enough definitive information.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening, if in fact, a loan was made

is this. The problem is going to develop when other companies come to borrow from SEDCO. The Banks, of course, financial institutions are all prohibited from competing with those industries which they serve. A bank, for example, is not allowed to take and retain land for long periods of time. One of the problems developed in the salt industry I am told, because each of the major banks financed a major salt company with the result that no new salt companies are able to start up very well because banks having adopted a particular company don't wish to compete with companies that they are financially supporting.

That kind of thing can happen in Saskatchewan. What happens if Burns wants to borrow huge amounts of money from SEDCO? Will SEDCO have to determine first of all that this would be harmful to its own operations at Intercontinental? If, in fact, this is occurring then, Mr. Speaker, we find that SEDCO is going down into the market place and is competing with the people with whom it should be supporting. Now, Mr. Speaker, this could be very serious for the people in Regina. What about the employees of Burns? If the Burns Company wants to expand, wants money from SEDCO, what will happen when Burns says, we want a substantial loan to renovate our premises, reorganize our premises, expand our premises? Is it possible SEDCO, in judging the total market, will decide that this might have some disadvantage to Intercontinental? The judgment of SEDCO is being seriously impaired when it first of all makes loans to a company then, secondly takes a major position in such a large company. This could cost many people in Burns and other packers jobs in the future. Now of course, it won't be noticed immediately unless Burns decides the competition and the fair play just isn't there and packs it up. But slowly and steadily there may well be a deterioration in the position of employees of companies such as Burns and Canada Packers and others around the country.

I wonder, for example, what their discussion is on market expansion? I understand from the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) they do have glowing opportunities ahead of them for market expansion. But at whose expense? And at what cost to SEDCO and to the other shareholders? Have they planned and projected additional moneys? Mr. Speaker, we cannot even begin to assess some of the implications of this deal until we get the basic and fundamental answers to the questions raised by the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) today.

If the Government intended to supply this information they should have approved each and every one of these without adjournment on the way down and they should have approved this one. If, in fact, the Government believed in the distribution of information it ought properly, Mr. Speaker, to have discussed this and I am sure they did discuss this when they put the deal together. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I have no faith at all in the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Industry. He says that disclosure will be made provided it doesn't jeopardize their commercial success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness the whole foundation of this company is not so built on sand that it will collapse because of a disclosure of the value of the assets of the company or disclosure of the true net worth of the company matters which would certainly be made available in every other company. When he talks about disadvantage with other competitors, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned. The reason I am

concerned is that the Government has adopted a policy of playing poker with these industries with its hand closed but the hand of the opposition out open on the table. Now that is the kind of fair play that is going to start with this Government and is in fact starting. Mr. Speaker, let them tell the people, let them tell the shareholders of that company what the situation is. The people of Saskatchewan have bought a 45 per cent interest in that company, they have a right to know what the assets are. If this were done in any other way by any other company it would have to have appraisals and the clearance of the securities commission. There is no reason why the Government shouldn't live by its own rules.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Hon. Member's motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I won't repeat what has already been said. In reply to the Hon. Minister, he says that he hopes that when the assets of the plant in Regina is known and the one in Saskatoon is known and the one in Red Deer and the one in British Columbia, we will be pleased and we will support it.

All that I can say to the Hon. Minister is that this is the reason why he should make this information available to us just as quickly as possible, so that we can be pleased with the efforts of the Government if it appears that we should be.

I gather by the fact that no one has adjourned this debate that they are going either to vote this motion down or allow it to go through. I suspect that they will allow it to go through and this raises another question. Why are they prepared to provide this information regarding investment counsel when they would not provide the information providing appraisal and regarding the audit. So I think the answer is probably very simple, they did not ask for any outside advice of investment firms who are experienced in this type of a company. I think that this in itself is sufficient to make the people of Saskatchewan suspicious that the other information that we have asked is information that should be provided at the very earliest possible date.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 9 — Establish Grains Income Stabilization Program

Mr. Kaeding (Saltcoats) moved, seconded by Mr. Larson (Pelly):

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government to proceed immediately with legislation to establish a grains income stabilization program for prairie farmers, the program to provide for:

1. A guarantee that total grain receipts in the prairie region will not fall below 1.2 billion dollars during the 1972-73 crop year, and that this figure be adjusted in subsequent years to take into account costs of production;

2. The establishment of a Stabilization Fund for the purpose of this program with contributions from producers; consumers, through a two-price system for wheat; and the Federal Government, through an annual contribution from the Treasury;
3. A payout from the Stabilization Fund in any crop year that gross receipts fall below the guaranteed minimum, with distribution on the basis of a minimum price for all grains, the minimum prices to apply up to a certain maximum number of bushels per producer.

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity at this time to open this debate on a resolution with respect to a grain stabilization plan which I will be moving at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, you may wonder why we are introducing this resolution at a time when grain sales are high and when prices have returned to more satisfactory levels. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we feel this move to be necessary at this time. Farmers and farm organizations on the Prairies are not naïve enough to have confidence that without some means of stabilizing their long-term income that these high prices and good delivery opportunities will continue indefinitely. The history of the grain trade and weather patterns over the years just do not bear out such a prediction. Almost every other organized group in our society has built into their income position, some mechanism whereby they can maintain their income at least to the point where they are able to keep up to the rising cost of living. Industries base their prices on their cost plus mark-up which will guarantee them a return on their investment.

Tradesmen through their unions are able to negotiate wages and most of them are covered by contributory pension and superannuation plans. Professional people also through their professional organizations bargain for and receive continuous increases in salaries and fringe benefits. With many of these people the question is not, will we receive a higher wage, but rather, how large will the increase be?

And society has accepted this philosophy, Mr. Speaker. One of the few remaining areas where the owners are not in a position to bargain for increases to cover their increasing costs, are the producers of agricultural products. Some of these, through marketing boards and commissions, have been partially successful. However, in the main, farmers have been at the mercy of the weather and of the available markets and in many cases handicapped by oppressive governments.

With the phenomenal increase in the prices of machinery, fertilizers, chemical and other agricultural inputs, the present high cost of land, and the high interest rates has resulted in agriculture becoming an extremely high cost, high risk, industry.

With the extremely high cost of inputs into the agricultural industry, we can no longer afford to live with the violent fluctuations of farm income that we have experienced in the past. Almost every other sector of the economy has built into economic operations some mechanism to counteract these

March 6, 1973

uncertainties, whether through production controls, unemployment insurance, or union bargaining. We cannot, and should not, be expected to stand alone unprotected from the many hazards of the industry.

The violent price fluctuations affect not only the grain farmers directly, but have a very unsettling effect on the livestock industry as well. The old adage that cheap wheat brings cheap meat has been proven true too often in the past. If we are to build a stable and viable agriculture in Western Canada it must be based on a stable income plan which relates directly to the cost of production. Instability in the agricultural industry leads inevitably to instability in the community surrounding it and to the service industries which are dependent upon it. We saw ample evidence of this in the last few years when the severe drop in income on the farm, resulted in hundreds of businesses in small towns and, in fact, Sir, in our cities going broke because of lack of purchasing power in the hands of farm people.

Even beyond the prairie region industries suffered because farmers were unable to purchase combines, tractors, fertilizer and other basic requirements resulting in layoffs in many industries.

Mr. Speaker, when discussing the long-term instability of agricultural income, it might be well to go back over some of the history of the grain industry in western Canada. Some of us, including the Hon. Members from Melfort, Pelly, North Battleford, Touchwood, Swift Current and others, including yourself, Sir, will recall the market crash of 1929 and into the early '30s, when the price of farm commodities fell to the lowest price in history, when wheat sold for as low as 18 cents and oats was down to 6 cents per bushel. I can recall my father, who incidentally was not a gambling man, having delivered a carload of wheat to the elevator at that time, when the price was around \$1 per bushel. He had it in storage hoping to get a few cents more and eventually sold it at 30 cents.

They will also recall those early days in the '30s, when not only were farmers faced with drought and grasshoppers, but an almost unbelievable price for whatever produce they had to sell. I can recall in 1935, I was just a young man, having a real good crop on our farm. We started cutting the field and my father stopped to look at the heads and I saw his face become grim as we went around the field. At the end of the field he motioned to me to pull out and lit a match and burnt the whole field, rust had ruined the whole crop.

In 1937 drought took its toll and we ended up with 700 bushels of wheat and a silo full of Russian thistle to feed our herd of over 100 cattle. I recall my father phoning the livestock shipper and arranging to ship a carload of young stock and old cows because we had no feed for them. We received \$900 for 30 head, and we were lucky, Sir. Some neighbors were billed for freight to cover the cost of moving the cattle to market. The price paid for the cattle was not sufficient to cover the cost of freight. Then, of course, came World War II, and as always in war, our society flourished on the suffering of others. Prices climbed and so did production. When I took over my father's farm in 1946 after the war was over, I received over \$6,000 for a carload of flax. But as always this was caused by the speculative market and the next year we were down to less

than half of that figure again.

In 1954 and 1955 we went to the other extreme with rainfall of 26 inches per year, and we only seeded about one half of our acreage. Rust again hit the prairies that year and we ended up with a few hundred bushels of No. 5 and No. 6 wheat and some soggy musty barley, which the ducks had left behind. Only a few good haying days saved many of us from financial disaster that year.

Drought struck again in 1961 and production of wheat on the Prairies dropped to 278 million bushels, the lowest in many years. Over one half of the municipalities in the province that year qualified for PFA payments. And then in 1970 we had LIFT, when the weather man didn't ruin it for us, Mr. Lang got into the act and managed to find a way to louse it up for us. Final wheat payments dropped drastically from \$1.84 in 1968 to a new long-term low of \$1.58 in 1972 just this last year. In the 1960s farmers experienced fluctuations of net farm income in the order of 40 per cent. In the early '70s fluctuations as high as 100 per cent were recorded.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country are not convinced that now the prices have once more returned to realistic levels and now that grain is moving in huge quantities again, that our worries are over.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in 1970, when the original proposal for the grain stabilization plan was introduced by Mr. Lang, that he attempted to con the farmers of Western Canada into accepting a very unacceptable plan, by tying it to a hundred million dollar carrot. Thank God the Western farmers had the good sense to resist that \$100 million temptation in spite of their desperate financial position, and stood firm in rejecting the proposed plan which would have guaranteed them poverty over the years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have entered a time when we can evaluate a new scheme free from coercive temptation. At a time when farmers and their organizations can look at all the implications of a new plan, free from the tensions and urgency for immediate monetary relief prevalent at that time.

As well, we now have a climate in Ottawa very much changed from a year ago, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden the Liberal minority Government has discovered that people live in Western Canada and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Whelan, has committed himself to assist Western agriculture. Isn't it amazing, Mr. Speaker, what 31 New Democrats can do in Ottawa? All at once they understand our needs so well, that they have appointed another defeated Liberal candidate to be the Western Agricultural Co-ordinator. I am glad that they did, Mr. Speaker. We can only hope that this truly means that they are going to listen to Western farmers.

For this reason, I ask all Members of this House, including the Members opposite, to join with us in an attempt to get the Federal Government to accept a new proposal for a Grain Stabilization Plan at this time. The farmers of Western Canada have too much at stake there for us to be playing petty politics over a program of this kind. Let us move forward to a new deal for Western agriculture.

The objective of a new stabilization program must be to provide the Prairie grain sector with a level of net farm cash receipts, which would bear some relationship to net cash receipts, in other sectors of the economy.

For this purpose of this Resolution, we are proposing that the level of gross income for the six major grains in the Canadian Wheat Board region should be set at \$1.2 billion for the year 1972-73. And, that the figure for each ensuing year to be set, taking into consideration the increases in cost of production, which would guarantee to grain producers net cash receipts equal to an established figure.

The proposed figure of \$1.2 billion is arrived at through a very complex formula, worked out by experts in our farm organizations, and our Department of Agriculture, and I do not wish to take the time of the House to outline the specific details. However, this base price has been determined to be sufficient to cover the cost of production, plus a reasonable margin to cover investment and living cost.

The formula would determine the level of net cash receipts required to meet all costs. The Stabilization Plan would guarantee that at no time would the net income of grain producers fall below a certain percentage of this parity level, let us say about 85 per cent. During any year in which net cash receipts fall below this predetermined level, the Stabilization Fund would pay out to Prairie grain producers an amount equal to the short fall between that level and the actual farm receipts realized in that year.

Adjustments would have to be made in each year to take into account changing patterns of production and changes in the acreage seeded to the major grains. Payout from the fund should be made to individual farmers on the basis of dollar value of sales through commercial channels up to a maximum of \$15,000.

Because it should not be the purpose of this plan to subsidize unduly large farming operations, we feel that it is necessary to set this upper limit. In order to avoid serious fluctuations in individual cases due to weather and insect damage, etc., the qualifying sales should be calculated over a period of three to five years and payments based on the average sales for those years.

As an example, if a producer's average eligible grain sales are determined by the formula to be \$8,000 annually for the qualifying period and the short fall of Prairie grain income was determined to be 15 per cent below the minimum, then the payout to the individual farmer would be 15 per cent of \$8,000 or \$1,200 for the year.

We feel that this Stabilization Plan should be a contributory plan in which contributions are made by the producer, the Government of Canada and by the consumers, through a proper two-price system. Producers would contribute through a deduction at the time of sale to the Canadian Wheat Board a suggested figure of 2 per cent on gross receipts to a maximum of \$300. This maximum relating to the maximum payout of \$15,000. Above any deduction over the \$300 figure would be refunded to the producer at the end of the year.

Sales of grain made through any commercial channels, other than the Canadian Wheat Board, would not be subject to deductions and would not be eligible for payments from the fund. This provision should help to discourage sales outside of the Canadian Wheat Board, and therefore, add further stability to the feed grain market. The Federal Government would either make an annual lump sum payment to the fund, based on approximately \$2 for every \$1 contributed by the producer checkoff, or they must be prepared whenever there is a year in which a payout is required, to place sufficient dollars into the fund to enable it to meet its obligations. We would hope that they would opt for the annual lump sum alternative.

Consumers would contribute to the fund through a realistic two-price system for wheat. At the present time, the Federal Government has established a price for domestic wheat at \$3 per bushel and this is considered satisfactory. However, at present, domestic processors are able to obtain wheat from the Canadian Wheat Board at a price of \$1.95½ per bushel, which under the present price for wheat constitutes a consumer subsidy of approximately 65 to 70 cents a bushel. We feel that the cost to the mills should be set at \$3 per bushel and the cost passed on to the consumer of the product in the normal matter. The amount the domestic price exceeds the average export price for the year should be transferred to the stabilization fund.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when the original Stabilization Bill was brought forward, that part of the program called for the elimination of The Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, under which the Federal Treasury pays storage charges on the amount of wheat held in storage in commercial channels above a base figure of 178 million bushels. This has resulted in payments to the Canadian Wheat Board in the past years of from \$30 million to \$60 million per year.

We would support the removal of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act only if it was replaced by a more comprehensive storage plan which would pay storage on a normal reserves stock of all six of the major grains based on what would be considered a safe reserve supply of those grains to guarantee that there would be sufficient grain on hand at all times to meet both domestic and export requirements.

We feel that the maintenance of this reserve is extremely important to the economy of our nation and is a means of guaranteeing our overseas customers that we would be able to meet long-term commitments. Therefore, the cost of storage of this reserve should be a charge to the Federal Treasury. Since the markets for oil seeds and feed grains has become almost as important a part of our export as wheat, they should be covered in the same way as wheat.

One of the problems with the proposed plan is that it would appear that the producers, that had a series of poor crops through drought, hail or whatever reason, would be at some disadvantage. However, thanks to the return of a New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan, a good comprehensive crop insurance program is now available to all farmers of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaeding: — This should do a great deal to offset that lost income

under those circumstances. In addition, we would encourage the Federal Government to actively promote an effective International Grains Agreement to come into effect in 1974. Such an agreement should cover, not only wheat, but feed grains as well and should include maintenance of adequate reserves and adequate minimum and maximum prices for world transactions.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined just a few of the reasons for presenting this Resolution at this time and have given only a general outline of the program we would support. Other speakers, no doubt, will elaborate more fully.

We do not contend that the Stabilization Plan, as proposed, should be considered a complete solution to the farm problems. Many other programs will be needed to bring an equitable and stable income to Western Canadian farmers. Programs such as: a national feed grain policy; marketing development programs; credit programs; programs to provide for viable farm units, such as Land Bank and FarmStart; a more equitable national freight rate structure; an international grains agreement.

These programs, as well as others, are urgently needed. We, therefore, urge the Federal Government to meet immediately the provincial governments concerned, together with the main farm organizations such as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers' Union and the United Grain Growers, to formulate a genuinely acceptable Grain Stabilization Plan.

Because the farm economy of Western Canada can no longer be expected to function normally, with the violent fluctuations of farm income we have experienced in the past, and because we are convinced that we can never stabilize the economy of Western Canada until we have stabilized the income of prairie agricultural producers; because we feel that agricultural producers should no longer be exposed to the vagaries of weather, price and export fluctuations to the extent that they have been in the past while other sectors of the economy are sheltered through contributory unemployment insurance plans, superannuation plans, pension plans and many other mechanisms; and because we find ourselves in a political climate where the Federal Government appears to be more than usually responsive to the needs of western agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has now come to move on this Stabilization Plan.

Therefore, I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, there have been three stages in the life of the NDP regarding a grain stabilization program. The first stage was that they never thought of the idea until the Federal Government brought forth the basic plan, at least none of them had ever mentioned it or made a speech on it or even suggested vaguely such an idea as a basic grain income stabilization program. The second stage was that they thought it would benefit their own political hides to oppose completely and totally any such plan that was put forward. Which they did, and now take credit for it, although I think it would be better for the farmers of Saskatchewan if this plan was now in operation. The third stage, Mr. Speaker, was, after first not ever having

thought of it and then sabotaging it, now they are going to take credit for any new one that comes in. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about some of the aspects that a plan would now have, if it were in operation in Saskatchewan.

First of all the plan as envisaged had a two per cent contribution by the farmers of Saskatchewan on their sales and a four per cent contribution by the Federal Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, according to my calculations, although I don't expect them to be right to the last cent, I think that this would come extremely close to approximately 6 per cent of \$1.2 billion now in grain sales for this current year. Of this amount \$25 million would be put up by the farmers of western Canada; \$50 million would be coming from the Federal Government into this plan, Mr. Speaker. In other words in the current crop year \$75 million would be put up into a fund, two thirds of which comes from the Federal Government and this basically would be a year in which the stabilization fund would not be paying out contributions, but which the fund would be growing at the rate of about \$75 million, to come back to the farmers of western Canada at some time in the future when sales fall below the 10 year average.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think \$75 million put away now, with \$50 million from the Federal Government, would be a very good nest egg for the future when things are not as bright in the grain industry as they are today. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite say they take credit for sabotaging a plan which could do so much good for the farmers of Saskatchewan in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, this must be hypocrisy at its worst.

Today, they bring forward a plan that basically has one or two changes which if the old plan had been in operation these adjustments could have been made. They suggest a cost of living index, Mr. Speaker. Well, true, a cost of living index would be a good thing. It would be a real sweetener for the plan and I think that if we had had a basic plan, had the plan in operation, quite possibly today this could be incorporated and added as time went along.

Mr. Speaker, basically the amount that they suggest of \$1.2 billion guaranteed, I am sure that this year in western Canada our repeats from grains are running above this so really they are not suggesting any higher level of activity than what we currently would have had had the basic plan been in operation. It should not be too surprising, I think, the confusion exhibited by the New Democratic Party on this issue.

My colleague from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) not long ago, Mr. Speaker, had a map presented by the Federal candidate in Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain and, of course, also the map presented to us by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) which we accepted as an authentic map. This was substantially different from the map presented to us by the NDP candidate, Mr. Buck, in Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain. Mr. Buck didn't like the map the Member from Arm River had — the accurate map. He thought there was too much of the Federal constituency which didn't have any rail lines going to be taken out so he threw in some, just to make it a little bit more palatable for his political campaign. Well, we took him up on that during the election campaign But that wasn't his only mistake. He thought he would show the farmers of Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain how they could save money by being in the Grain Stabilization Plan so he worked out a calculation

on the back and he started off with a stabilization fund of \$100 million, Mr. Speaker. Then he paid to the farmers 2 per cent, based on 800 million bushels of grain, so he had \$100 million, then he took 2 per cent of 800 million bushels and he got \$16 million, subtracted \$16 million from \$100 million and got the \$84 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to find how you can get \$16 million when you take 2 per cent of 800 million bushels. But not to be outdone as a candidate, Mr. Speaker, he did some arithmetic calculations to get the answer that he wished and he figured out how you could have \$100 million, subtract 16 million bushels of wheat from \$100 million and get \$84 million, so his calculations would look good to anyone who didn't happen to read it too carefully. So this was the type of political campaign that we came to expect from the New Democratic Party when it came to a grain stabilization plan. It was a very dishonest type of campaign and while it may have been politically successful, it certainly hasn't done the farmers of western Canada very much good, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the suggestion put forward by the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) today. Now he tells us that the cost to the mills in Canada — and I have heard other spokesmen of his Party on the same wicket — the cost of grain today which is set for the mills at about \$1.95. Well, he said, this should be paid for by the consumer, Mr. Speaker. Well, the truth of the matter is that the Federal Government is putting up the additional amount of money and by putting up the additional amount of money, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is really subsidizing the cost of bread to every man, woman and child in this country and I, for one, am very happy that the Federal Government is trying to keep the price of bread reasonably low, as low as can be had, while giving the farmers a fair return, Mr. Speaker, but apparently the Members opposite would much sooner see that the total cost of wheat be paid by the mills and transferred on to all of the low income people across the country. Now fortunately the Federal Government has not taken the advice of the Members opposite and I hope they continue the subsidies so that the price of bread can be held at a lower level than otherwise would be if the mills were paying the full price of the cost of wheat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the temporary wheat reserves. Another great cry about how much money they were going to save the farmers by retaining the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. Well, this year I don't have the statistics. I don't believe they are available as yet, Mr. Speaker, but under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, the payments they will make to cost of storage across this country will be exceptionally low this year, Mr. Speaker, simply because the amount of grain in storage that is not being moved at a very rapid rate and quick turnover is extremely small, Mr. Speaker. So the amount of money that is being saved by the farmers of Saskatchewan, by the Federal Government making contributions under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, will be extremely little this year and yet the NDP tells us they have really saved the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. True, back in the days of high storage costs, Mr. Speaker, the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act was fairly substantial and certainly in the last two years it has been extremely low and will likely continue to be so for the next few years.

It is, Mr. Speaker, a very unfortunate thing that the NDP decided for political purposes, to sabotage the Grain Stabilization Plan, and because they were wise enough to know that the plan was basically a good honest idea, after it had served their useful political purposes, they decided to change directions completely and now advocate the very same things they set out to sabotage in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these points and because of the type of dishonesty that I have already exhibited as published by the NDP, that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 12 — Death of the Lakes in the Qu'Appelle Basin

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park) moved, seconded by Mr. Weatherald (Cannington):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that emergency action be taken to prevent the death of the lakes in the Qu'Appelle Basin: (a) by implementing immediately, the recommendations which the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Board feels will have a major impact on the management of land and water in the Qu'Appelle Basin and which should be implemented without delay, and (b) by giving immediate assistance to cities and towns, particularly Moose Jaw and Regina, to provide for the treatment of waste.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I will be moving the Resolution as it appears on the Order Paper relating to the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Board report.

Mr. Speaker, this report was started in 1970. It was completed in 1972, but the Minister, of course, did not make this public until late January, 1973. And since then, Mr. Speaker, the Government has been standing around with its hands behind its back. Now a number of groups, Mr. Speaker, including the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw have some pretty legitimate concerns about that report, the economic concerns and ecological implications. The cost to the city of Regina for the immediate sewage facilities is more than \$2 million. Regina, at the present time, expects to receive \$200,000 from the Provincial Government towards this effort and \$333,000 from the Federal Government. The remainder of approximately \$1.5 million must be provided by the citizens of Regina from their own resources. This, Mr. Speaker, at this time is virtually the entire effort being made in Saskatchewan to solve the Qu'Appelle Basin problem. At the present time almost the entire burden of carrying out the recommendations is being undertaken by the city of Regina. Regina is being invited to provide a sewerage treatment facility at a higher level than any other major centre in Canada, without any reasonable contribution from the NDP Government of this province.

Now the citizens of Regina are willing and more than willing to co-operate. They are willing to pay more than their share, but they should rightly refuse to pay the total, the high cost that is being imposed upon them through the inaction of this Government. The estimate of \$2 million is only the initial cost. That is the cost which is expected to be spent this year

March 6, 1973

for the projects now being planned, with future expenditures the total cost will probably exceed \$7 million. It is totally unreasonable to expect Regina to pay 75 per cent of that huge cost I urge the city to make preliminary plans, but I hope the city of Regina will refuse to proceed with the actual purchase and the actual installation of the equipment until a more realistic approach is taken by the Provincial Government.

Our farm population, too, has some serious concerns about the report. The suggested zoning has caused a great deal of discomfort and concern to them. The possibility of rezoning with the probable loss which the farmers face, is a threat which must be ended immediately. They fear that they may lose part of their income and there is a threat that their land values will be reduced.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that this Opposition and the Liberal Party will not tolerate the use of zoning as a form of expropriation without compensation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — We can, and we must expect farmers to co-operate and I am sure they will co-operate, but the unfairness of zoning, which reduces land values to the detriment of the owner, has long been recognized. Into this situation the Government has made virtually no worthwhile contribution. If by their inaction, the Government is saying that the city of Regina must, out of its own resources, clean up the pollution which it is creating at this time; if they are saying through their inaction that the farmers must clean up the pollution which they are creating, then we reject the position taken by the Provincial Government. The position of the farm population and the people of Regina, in this respect then, is very similar. The farmers and the city taxpayers are being faced with these huge expenditures to rectify a situation which governments have condoned for years. The Government has made, or may make, the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw, and the farm population, victims of past government failures.

Mr. Speaker, the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report provides a blueprint for progress, but it also provides an opportunity for injustice. To prevent that injustice, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the farm people, cottage owners, city residents, each and every concerned person, just stand shoulder to shoulder and they must demand action by the Government. The most legitimate concern, of course, is the long-term benefit to people of Saskatchewan from having an unpolluted Qu'Appelle Basin. That is why we consider this matter to be of supreme urgency. The common good must prevail and this common good is a provincial responsibility.

The recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Valley Study Board must be carried out as a common effort under the leadership of the Provincial Government and financially supported by the Provincial Government.

I, therefore, recommend that the following action be taken:

1. The Province of Saskatchewan must immediately guarantee that Regina and Moose Jaw will receive substantial financial assistance for their advanced sewerage treatment project. This

guarantee should be forthcoming immediately to permit the installation of these facilities in the current year.

2. The Government should consider setting up a Qu'Appelle Basin authority, similar in structure to the Wascana Centre Authority. Such an authority, a Qu'Appelle Basin Authority, would consist of the various and all the various concerned groups. It would provide for the co-ordinated development of the valley.

Now this authority must have Government direction, must have leadership and it must have financial support from the Provincial Government.

At the present time authority in the valley is fragmented between the Department of Public Health, Department of the Environment, Department of Agriculture and various other agencies and branches of the Government. Above all this Qu'Appelle Basin authority must not and, of course, would not be used as an excuse for inaction by this Government.

3. The Government must commence a program to purchase land necessary to carry out the long-term objectives and recommendations. This program, if commenced immediately, would within a reasonable time transfer all necessary lands to the Government for the purposes of the Authority. In cases where farmers would have to restrict their operations they would be paid for the reduced use of their property. They must be compensated for their reduction in income.

4. Assistance must be provided for such towns as Lumsden, Fort Qu'Appelle and Lebret, villages like B-Say-Tah and Katepwa.

For this program, Mr. Speaker, the total cost will certainly exceed \$15 million. There is ample justification for this kind of expenditure by this province. Northern resources are fine but frankly they are not readily available to the people of Saskatchewan. The Qu'Appelle Basin would provide not only an outstanding tourist attraction but it would make these attractions available to the ordinary citizen of the province. The Government must recognize that use of lands must not result in the destruction of our natural heritage for future generations. We must recognize that use of land gives no inherent right to destroy the basic structure of that land. A man's name on a title entitles him to no more than stewardship of that land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have already lost much time. We must move decisively and we condemn this Government for its failure to demonstrate any effective leadership. The New Democratic Party is undoubtedly standing around waiting to see how the political winds blow before undertaking courageous, decisive action in principle. Very frequently we have seen this Government fail to act because it said the Liberals had failed to provide plans or studies. The shallowness of these arguments and these excuses are now exposed. Here we have a complete study with clearly defined goals and precise recommendations, Mr. Speaker, inaction is inexcusable. It demonstrates the functional weakness of the Minister and the Government. This Government will stand condemned by future generations for its failure to act. I, therefore, move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I really don't know if I am 100 per cent in favor of this motherhood Resolution or against it because it is really not too coherent the way it stands. Now the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) criticizes the Government for sitting on its hands. Apparently we have done nothing for about four months, we sat on the report for two or three months and he says it is shameful. But I should just like to point out that we, as a Government, are not going to jump in with our heads first into the water before testing it like the Liberals did with the Big River Sawmill.

The report points out that Regina City is responsible for about 57 per cent of the pollutants, Moose Jaw 13 per cent and it mentions the Moose Jaw Air Force Base but it doesn't peg a percentage on it. I think the people of the province must remember that the Moose Jaw Base is about half the size of the city of Weyburn. But anyway this left approximately 30 per cent of the harmful pollutants into the Qu'Appelle system coming from the rural people or the farmers and the smaller towns in the Qu'Appelle system. I think it is time that we set up our mobile labs to monitor more correctly the pollutants coming into the system because I know a lot of the farmers are greatly concerned that in fact they really aren't polluting the system and on checking some of these visually I am convinced that they aren't. I think that we have to have some time to get enough of the mobile monitors going around checking the different tributaries before we start acting on some of these things. It is pretty tough to sit in the House and let the Liberals say that we should be going as fast as we can on implementing the recommendation referring to the cottage wastes because time and time again they criticize this Government for being so headstrong that we don't listen to the people, we just take any direction that we want and yet this recommendation says that uniform regulations for disposal of wastes from cottages be developed. Now what I would interpret this recommendation to mean is that the Government should set out the standards and enforce them right now. But I can certainly hear the cries of the Opposition if we took this attitude and forced the people in the Qu'Appelle system to put in their sewage tanks with compulsory pump-outs on a two week basis beginning April 1st or something like this.

The sad part of the Liberal Resolution is that it doesn't point out any specifics that we should be acting on. It just simply says that we should be acting on the recommendations that the study thinks are necessary to implement immediately and they haven't recommended . . .

Mr. Cowley: — They haven't read the report.

Mr. Hanson: — I doubt whether many of them have read the complete report. You know he talked about the disadvantage of zoning and the hardships that the farmers would be placed under and the rural people along the valley, but I should like to point out that these people have had 70 years of the advantages of living in these valleys with only a couple of bad years with flooding, but these people have had prosperous conditions, they have high yields and low assessments. I don't think it is totally the responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan to bail these people out if zoning is necessary.

The Hon. Member said in his recommendations that we should guarantee substantial financial assistance to the cities and I am just wondering whether the rest of the people of Saskatchewan think that they should be contributing more than 10 per cent to rectifying the situation. Now the people that move into Regina make the conscious decision of what advantages they are going to receive by moving into the city and many of us from the country, who move in here while the Session is in progress, do find that we have some advantages in living in Regina but we also have some increased cost. I don't think that you can expect the people of the province to bail the two cities in question completely out of the water. It is only sensible in my opinion that we look at providing 10 per cent assistance and we are presently negotiating with the Federal Government to see if they can come up with more. If they think that it is in their best interest to come up with a larger percentage of assistance to the cities, then this Government will take a similar attitude, if we really and truly believe that this is a national resource that is in the interest of all the Canadian and Saskatchewan people.

Now, I think that we don't want to get too far off the subject because in mentioning the Resolution that the Liberals have presented to this House, they call for immediate action but they don't spell it out. I am not so sure that we should take immediate action on building the new sewage treatment facilities in Regina. I should just like to read from the report by U.T. Hammer from the Department of Biology in the University of Saskatchewan. Maybe if some of you were listening when I spoke earlier in the House on the Budget, I made mention of some ideas of using sewage water as irrigation and I should like to give a few ideas out of this report by Dr. Hammer.

In the city of Melbourne, Australia they have a policy which turns their waste water into wealth. The city of Melbourne is about 2 million in population and they have set up an irrigation area which covers approximately 42 square miles. The city itself produces about 100 million gallons of effluent a day and these people in Melbourne are able to reduce their sewage disposal cost down to 62 cents per person per year. The way that they do this is they have this area of land covering 42 square miles and it is divided off into 20 acre plots that are flood irrigated at different times of the year, plowed under two feet deep and then grassed. They then graze the cattle and sheep there. I believe they have 11,000 acres used in this feeding program. It is flooded to a depth of four inches deep every 18 days. They have 19,000 head of cattle and 50,000 sheep on this area on a year round basis. Now, during the winter the flood irrigation grazing method won't function so these people have lagoon systems and they use a grass filtration system during the winter months. Now this may only work for a half of the winter months in Saskatchewan but I think it is worth looking at some of these other ideas. That city, as I said, reduced their sewage disposal costs to 62 cents per person per year and I think Regina should look at a system such as this.

We have the land available outside the city, we have the low rainfall in the summer and the high evaporation rate. I really don't think it is that impracticable and the thing that we must remember is this system used in Melbourne does not put the nitrates and the phosphates back into the water system to any great degree. So really is it worth jumping on the bandwagon and socking in \$5 million to build treatment facilities

March 6, 1973

for Regina and Moose Jaw when these really may not be meaningful solutions to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to do enough research on this project and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 105

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lane (Lumsden) for Return No. 105 showing:

The number of representations that were made by the Executive Council of Saskatchewan to Her Majesty's Ministers of the Government of Canada regarding rail line abandonment in Saskatchewan in the year 1972. (a) If any, the dates of such representations and to whom they were made. (b) The manner and form of such representation.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — In regard to the proposed motion No. 105 showing, in order to give more extensive and accurate information, I wish to propose the following amendment and therefore amend by deleting all of the words after the word 'representation' in the first line and substituting the following therefor:

Or contacts made by the Minister or official of the Saskatchewan Government to any Federal agency or authority regarding grain-handling or rail line rationalization or abandonment in the year 1972 and what were (a) the dates of such representation for contacts; (b) what agency or authority of the Federal Government was involved.

I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General).

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like time to study that amendment so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 108

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 108 showing:

In the rural Municipality of Maple Bush No. 224, 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 the following amendment for the reasons that have been stated in this Legislature on a number of occasions in the past by:

Deleting all after the word ‘showing’ and substituting the following:

In the Rural Municipality of Maple Bush No. 224, as of January 21st, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (k) 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.

I so move, seconded by Mr. Romanow (Attorney General).

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, again the Minister is refusing to give the public the amount of money that has been paid out under the Land Bank. We have information of land where they are paying four times the assessed value and five times the assessed value, six, seven and eight times the assessed value. We have got the information that shows they have paid three or four times what people in the area think land is worth. This may be wrong.

Mr. Faris: — How do you know?

Mr. Steuart: — Well if it is wrong, how do you know it is wrong?

Mr. Faris: — Table it.

Mr. Steuart: — Are the Members opposite saying, Mr. Speaker, that they know? Because if they do know then the Minister is telling his back benchers if he ever gets around to waking them up to tell them anything. He is telling them something that he is not telling the public. So I say the public don’t know. Does anyone else know? I presume the Minister knows. I hope he does. But if these facts aren’t right then get up and tell the people what you are paying for this land. As a matter of fact it is very interesting that none of these transactions, at least I am told, have been recorded – usually when you make a transaction you can go and check it in the court house and find out the price. We can’t find that out there. Just the other day we got the application form and the application form for lease. In fact I am told it was just today and I am told the Press didn’t even have it until today. I am also informed that up until a day or two ago, there hadn’t been any decisions made where the farmer indicated whether he wanted his son or close relative to have the land and this followed the regulations laid down in the Land Bank as in the case of Mr. Wolf. I think that was the name,

the one who had his picture in the paper, the first transaction that was made.

Outside of those deals people haven't yet been informed whether, in fact, the land has been leased to them. They are very concerned about this holdup. They want to know if they have got this land. If they have, in fact, been granted the lease to this land so they can make arrangements to get ready to farm it this spring. That is beside the point. Perhaps there is some technical holdup in the Minister's office or in the administration of this plan. But the point is that there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for the Government continuing in its stubborn and arrogant refusal to say what they are paying for land. The excuse that this will maybe effect the price of land – it has already affected the price of land. To say that it is not the public's business, it is only the business of those people who sell the land, is nonsense. The minute that anybody sells something to the public purse then it ceases to be only that individual's business.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Why didn't you give the price . . .

Mr. Steuart: — We did. We gave the land whenever you asked for it, we gave the price. It was no secret, it was common and public knowledge what we sold land for.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — You did not.

Mr. Steuart: — It was common and public knowledge what we leased the land for. And to compare the selling of Crown land, very little Crown land, as compared to the buying of private land to the tune of \$20 million a year, by the end of this year it will be at least \$30 million, is to compare apples and oranges. So again, Mr. Speaker, I continue to press, as we will every time one of these motions is brought forward, to ask the Government to tell the public what they are paying for this land. They are going to find out eventually. Tell them now. I can't really understand why they insist on taking this stubborn attitude because they are causing far more trouble. If they would tell the price of land and announce it; if they have nothing to hide, if they are paying fair prices for the land; if they are treating everyone the same. If they are not in fact treating their friends better than the people who aren't friends of theirs. If they are not in fact treating their political friends differently than other people. Then table the information; there is nothing to hide. Why if the price of land in a normal transaction there should be something to hide I can't understand. Land transactions are made every day and it is common knowledge. You just have to go and check the Land Titles Office to know what price is paid for farm land. Why the Government takes this attitude is beyond me. Unless, as we suspect, they have something to hide.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member permit a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of accusations made and particularly from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in regard to different prices being paid for land that is being purchased by the Land Bank Commission. Three and four and five

and six and seven and eight times the assessed value. Three and four times the price that he says people in the area say this land is worth. If, in fact, he is receiving this kind of information and if, in fact, it is accurate, I ask the Member if he is referring those people to contact the Land Bank Commission or if he is prepared to table that information in the Legislature so appropriate action can be taken?

Mr. Steuart: — Sure, you bet I will bring it in tomorrow or the next day and I will read it out and I will give you the description of the land. I will give you the rural municipality; I will give you the price that they think was paid for it. I can't vouch for its accuracy because nobody really knows. All we know is what the individual says . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What are you laughing at? Do you know how much they are paying for land? Do you know Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) how much they are paying for land? Do you know?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — No.

Mr. Steuart: — No. Well then . . .

Hon. Mr. Messer: — A consistent formula.

Mr. Steuart: — It's a consistent formula. Then table what the formula is, tell us what you are paying for land. Are you paying three times the assessed value or four times? Certainly I will bring that information. It will be a pleasure.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, there is just one other matter in this connection that I would bring to the Minister's attention, in view of his invitation to provide him with details.

There is a piece of land, I believe to be a half section from reports that have reached me on the weekend, up in the rural municipality of North Battleford, and again this is as reported to me. It was up for sale, it was purchased by a member of his party and was purchased prior to the actual operation of the Land Bank. It is right in the neighborhood and the district of the present director of the Land Bank and this is why it has caused a good deal of concern in that particular area. The reports are that this land was sold and the person that bought it in turn resold it to the Land Bank for a profit, within a space of a very few days.

Now this is the kind of rumor that I am sure the Hon. Minister (Mr. Messer) doesn't want to see spread around. It is being spread by everybody regardless of political faith in that particular area. There is a good deal of uproar and concern over it. It is the kind of thing that could be avoided that need not even take place if the Government saw fit to make available just the very brief details of purchases so far of land, be it in any municipality. Be it the one we are debating on or any other one for that matter.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister should reconsider his

policy of not making these facts known until a year from now. If he could come up with some policy whereby at any given time so many days after the deal has been concluded that the facts would be made known, the very basic facts of the deals. But this is one that, as I say, has caused a good deal of concern. And I think rightly so. In light of the fact that the present director resided very close to there, was aware of all these arrangements that were purported to have been made. I would ask the Minister at this time if he would be good enough to check into that particular sale.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Member cannot speak on this debate.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Just answering a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks on the question we have before us. The main reason why the Minister of Agriculture and his Government is refusing to answer the question on price, they say, is because if they make it known it will inflate the price of land throughout the province, that prices of land will rise. I understand that this is their main argument for not answering this question. And yet, this afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture stands up in this House and says that they have a regular formula as to what price is being paid for land. Which in other words means that the Government has decided as to what a fair price for land is in this province. If they have made this decision, if they have made this formula as to what the price of land will be in Saskatchewan, then why should they be afraid to give us that formula. Why should they be afraid to say, look, we have decided to pay so much an acre for land of this particular type of land. They shouldn't be concerned or afraid that this is going to inflate the price of land because they decided this formula, they have set a price and if they are happy with that kind of price throughout the Province of Saskatchewan then they should be happy with letting us know what that formula is and what that price is that they are paying. I can't see the logic to their argument. I can't see the logic where disclosing this formula will increase the price of land in Saskatchewan.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why they are not answering it is because they do not have a formula. As I said when we debated other questions like this at an earlier time that in the price of land, a formula for one particular Party stripe might be a different formula than for another particular Party stripe. Or there might be a different formula for a section of land that this Government wants and wants it badly. So it is going to pay a premium for it. It might be a piece of land that the individual is forced to sell because of hardships and this type of thing. The formula doesn't apply there. They will come in and get that land for as little as they can. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the price per acre that this Government is paying for land in this province is of great importance especially to the people of this province. As well he wants details of things that have happened and of irregularities that have happened. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago I tabled some irregularities. I pointed out these irregularities to the

Minister of Agriculture. To this date I have not received one answer, not one answer as to how those irregularities happened and what corrections he is planning on making in regard to these irregularities. Mr. Speaker, there are rumors going around this province about what is happening and it is the inaction of the Government opposite that is causing these rumors. People want to know what price is being paid for land. Sure, the Government Members accuse us of starting these rumors. It is always nice to accuse someone else. But if they are concerned about those rumors and if they want those rumors stopped then why don't they answer the questions so that those rumors can be stopped, Mr. Speaker?

Amendment agreed to.

Debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment on closing the debate. It is quite evident that the Government is going to refuse to answer these questions. It is going to refuse to answer the remaining questions.

Mr. Speaker: — I must remind the Member he cannot bring up any new material. He can only answer statements made in the debate. You can't bring in any new topic.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, I hope that that is all I am doing. I am pointing out that by the passing of this Resolution that the Government has refused to answer the question which we have asked. They have taken, again, the arrogant attitude which has been quite evident ever since they have formed the Government. That they themselves are the ones that know what is best for the people of the province. That they themselves are the ones that when big brother decides what the people should know, big brother will let them know. But if big brother doesn't feel that they should know, big brother won't let them know.

I feel it is very regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that they have taken this attitude. They are not prepared to stop rumors which they have caused. They are not prepared to disclose to the people of this province how their tax dollars are being spent. It is a very regrettable state of affairs that we have a Government in this province that takes this kind of attitude.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Welcome To Brownie Pack

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group in the Speaker's Gallery. Fifteen lovely young girls up there from the Brownie Pack from St. Luke's area. They are here with their two leaders, Mrs. Carol Abbey and Mrs. Ann Roland. I should like to welcome them to the House on behalf of yourself, Sir, and the Members to your right and the Members to your left and hope they have an enjoyable day here. They are going to tour the House for the rest of the day. They have just come from school. I should like to welcome them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the Hon. Member in also welcoming the Brownie Pack who are with us here this afternoon. I know that all Members of the House, as the Member opposite has already said, hope that the fine young people that we see there will find this visit with us worthwhile and exciting and that they will remember it for some time when they have experienced what they will experience here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 109

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 109 showing:

In the rural Municipality of Huron No. 223, 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 (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I move that Return No. 109 be amended similar to the amendment that I just moved to Return 108 only substituting the Municipality of Huron 223. This will be seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment it is obvious that the Members opposite simply do not want to listen to the reasons that the Government has given in regard to its non-revealing of prices or values that they will be placing on Land Bank land at this point in time. It is either that reason or else they are deliberately continuing to pursue a planned campaign to do everything possible to confuse or to undermine the operations of the Land Bank Commission in the Province of Saskatchewan.

They already know the gross amount of money that is being expended for land by the Land Bank Commission in Saskatchewan in a given fiscal year. They already have the opportunities to go to the Land Titles Office and find out what sums of money are paid for particular pieces of land after the transactions have been completed. They already know that we have told them that at the end of the fiscal year of the Land Bank Commission as soon as is practically possible, we will be publishing the locations of the land and the values of that land as set by the Land Bank Commission. We have already told them on numerous occasions that we have a formula that applies to all land purchases that the Land Bank Commission is involved in in the Province of Saskatchewan. The formula applies generally across the province. They have chosen not to recognize that formula or our endeavors to tell them what that formula is all about. They can look at the Order-in-Council that established the regulations which outlined the formula which is now in use. They

can talk to any employee of the Land Bank Commission and they will be able to relate to them that formula. They choose not to relate to any of these factors, Mr. Speaker, because they continue to attempt to sabotage the Land Bank Commission by spreading rumors about the province. Rumors with no justification whatsoever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — They tell us, Mr. Speaker, that we are arrogant and the Member from Morse continues to follow that pursuit.

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Can't even spell it.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — That is probably true. And they continue to say that we pay excessive prices for land and that all they are asking for is to have the values of the land that the Land Bank Commission has purchased made available to them, so that they can continue to expand that campaign that they have mounted and obviously are going to continue to pursue. Because they know that when you look simply at the location of land and as stated in this Legislature before, without relating to improvements, to the kind of farmstead that is established on that land, that we will in some instances be paying two or three times the assessed value of the land. In other instances we will be paying seven or eight times the assessed value of the land. And I know it is obvious from all of their actions that they want to take that information and where we pay seven or eight times the assessed value, they will say we have chosen to pay this simply because we have picked a person out that we think we should be giving more money to or because we want that piece of land, and not tell them the full statistics and the full information that will relate to the pricing of that land.

The Land Bank Commission, Mr. Speaker, has been in operation for something over eight months. We are purchasing in excess of 400 parcels of land. Most of those are still to be finalized. And there is no way that the Members opposite can legitimately say that we should be releasing those files for public information and for public scrutiny until the seller has had the opportunity to decide finally as to whether he is selling the land to the Commission or not; as to whether those who are interested in leasing the land have had an opportunity to negotiate with the Commission, make application to the Commission and finalize an agreement with the Commission in regard to the said parcels of land. After those transactions are completed then we would have no argument in making available to people in Saskatchewan and the Members of the Opposition the value that we are paying for land.

Now the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) made reference to some information that he tabled here last week or several days ago indicating inconsistencies of the Land Bank. I think he was referring to postings of land that were made in the Western Producer that in fact had not been purchased by the Land Bank Commission or that had been interpreted to be a direct descendant transfer. That information he gave had some validity but the only error that had been made was a human error in the Land Bank Commission in mistaking a parcel of land that had been purchased by the Land Bank Commission with another parcel that

had not been purchased. Consequently an error had been made in posting the land. I don't think this can be considered as the Land Bank Commission trying to misinterpret what the activities of the Land Bank Commission are. It was simply a human error, but even on these minute details where errors can be expected to be made in regard to posting lands and allocating lands, it is obvious the Members of the Opposition are jumping on them and trying to emphasize them to mean something that they really do not mean.

So, I again, sum up in saying that if they were to show that they would in good faith use the kind of information that they are asking for now, we may have some further sympathy in regard to giving that information to them. But it is obvious that they are continuing to undermine the Land Bank Commission and the program it is administering so that we will continue to say that there will be no information given until the Land Bank Commission has finished its fiscal year and then publication will be made listing the locations of land and the value that was paid for those lands at the time of purchase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, the Minister of Agriculture mentioned that some of the errors that had been made and errors which I had pointed out, were human errors. This can be expected and this, of course, in some instances can be excused. I should like to thank him for finally giving me that information. But as well, Mr. Speaker, the information that has been answered we are in agreement with it. We do not have any quarrel with what happened in terms of the advertisement which was placed in the newspaper. As well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture and this Government would answer the questions which we have listed on the Order Paper we would not have any quarrel with some of the actions they are taking. I think the fact that when information is denied, suspicions can be aroused and rumors and the type of thing that they are accusing us of spreading would not be rumors in effect. The truth would be known and the whole problem would be solved.

As well, the Minister talked about trying to protect the transactions which are not completed at this time by allowing the price that is being paid to be known or made public. Mr. Speaker, what difference should this make? If the Government has offered an individual a certain price for the land and that individual should all of a sudden change his mind, the Government has stated that they will not dicker for land, that the price that they make is a firm price, then what concern is it of theirs whether that individual finds out what price is being paid. Are they putting themselves in the position that if the individual, after they have made a firm price to that individual, all of a sudden comes along and says, look a private individual has offered me \$10 an acre more, is the Land Bank going to come along and say, okay we want that parcel of land, we will pay you that \$10 for it? If the offered price has not been made public they are in a position to do it, Mr. Speaker. This is why I think that there are a lot of questions that have to be cleared up. I think a lot of the rumors which the Government Members opposite are saying are being spread throughout this province would not be spread throughout the province. Truth, Mr. Speaker, is one of the best means of answering any questions or stopping any rumors. If the Government wishes to

stop these rumors I urge them to tell the truth in this matter and let us have this information.

Here as well, you know, they said that they would be spending \$10 million for land. That's what happened last year and yet they spent \$13.4 million, I understand. They said, we know how much we are spending but we also know how much we spent on the sausage factory. Well, we don't know whether it was a good deal or whether it was a bad deal because they have denied us information there as well. They are telling us that they are going to be spending \$20 million this year for the purchase of land. How do we know it might not be \$25 million or \$30 million that is finally spent. So before we get any information they will have spent between \$30 million and \$40 million for land in this province and then they say they will make the information known to us.

Well, if the cost of land per acre in 1974, which is the earliest that we will receive this information, is going to affect transactions today, won't it affect transactions just as badly in 1974? As I said the other day, does that mean that in 1974 the Government is not going to purchase any more land in this province? Because if they are not going to purchase any more land in this province, then they are going to make the price of land per acre that they are paying today, public. But they are going to be going out and buying land, I imagine, in 1974 if it holds up to the true socialist philosophy so that the price that will be made public at that time, won't that effect the price of land that they are buying in 1974?

The reasons that they are giving for not answering these questions are hollow reasons, Mr. Speaker. They are grappling in the dark for some justification as to why they are denying the people of this province the information which we have requested.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, there are other agencies of Government that negotiate for land, particularly in the Department of Highways. They negotiate and when I was the Minister there were roughly 1,000 negotiations per year and whenever questions were asked about what was paid for a certain piece of right-of-way, the Government of that day did give the information and I don't think that this Government would be afraid of giving us that information. It is public funds and the criteria that should be set out, as the Minister has stated, that if land that is assessed for \$1,000 a quarter that we pay \$3,000 or three times the assessment. There must be a definite criterion so that farmers know that they are getting the same price in the Rosthern constituency as they are getting in the Bengough constituency, and that is all that we are asking. I can see no reason why a quarter section of land that is assessed at \$1,000 in Rosthern and assessed at \$1,000 in Bengough shouldn't have the same price, regardless of who is farming it or what area it is in.

The Department of Highways usually when we were looking for the right-of-way, we would try to get the consensus of roughly 60 per cent of the people to agree to a certain price that our negotiators negotiated for. If we could get 60 per cent this is what we would agree to and make a contract with the farmer. If it was less than 60 per cent our people would go back and

give a better offer, but usually the negotiators had very good success with the farmers and there was no secrecy about it. If anybody wanted to know what farmer A got as compared to farmer B, this was available to him. But there was no such a thing that if all things were equal that one farmer would receive \$70 an acre and the next one would receive \$100 an acre.

I think I know what the Minister of Agriculture is referring to, there are definitely many areas where all things are not equal. There are some farm lands close to a city, the Department of Highways negotiated for a higher price. This was so prior to 1964, it was done during the 1964-71 Government and I am sure that this present Government is not going to give every farmer the same amount of money. So we have every reason to expect that there will be differences in the price per acre that this Government has been paying. When we look at the prices that are going to be paid and if we don't go and take a look at buildings, and we also have farm buildings, they vary greatly in value. All of these things have to be taken into consideration. I would think that if the Department of Highways is not shy in giving us the amount paid for the right-of-way on a certain highway, then I see no difference between the Department of Highways and the Power Corporation and the Telephone Company who negotiate for the right-of-way, they tell us what the price of land is, what they have paid, why should they withhold information that we would like in the case of the Land Bank?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Would the Member permit a question before he takes his seat? Would it not be fair to assume when you relate to the highway right-of-ways and the values that have been established for the farm land that was to be used for those purposes, that the information that was made available to this House, in all instances the transactions had, in fact, been completed before the information was made available or were you in the practice of giving information to the House as you were negotiating with the farmers for the highway right-of-ways?

Mr. Boldt: — I would say that the negotiations for them were completed or the final settlement was made. Certainly you have got some haven't you, that's the ones that we want, no others.

Mr. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — I think the Member for Rosthern, as usual, is oversimplifying and trying to mislead the House. There are records and I don't think it pertains exclusively to those seven long, tedious bad years either, where the Department of Highways has certainly paid many and varied prices owing to various circumstances. I am satisfied as well that there is some evidence around that the average was not always adhered to and I have quoted some of these after the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat had tabled them, where some ridiculous prices were paid on bad advice from people who were not competent. These are all part and parcel of the highway settlements. I suggest, and it has always bothered me, that the inconsistencies of policy where the individual who was holding the Department of Highways up, usually wound up with more money than the 60 per cent that were willing and agreeable and good citizens, trying to be helpful. I am not blaming anybody for that, I am saying that that is usually the way it worked out and the Minister would agree with me.

The unfairness was, that the people who were uncooperative usually were paid more.

But that has nothing to do with the Land Bank. We are not buying land here for a public right-of-way because if the people don't want to sell to the Land Bank, they don't sell. If they don't want to rent from the Land Bank, they don't rent. But if we want a piece of land for the Department of Highways we jolly well take it by expropriation if we have to. Now this is a vastly different ball park we are in. So, I don't think that the point of the Hon. Member is very well taken. This is really no proper or useful comparison.

This Government takes a position, and it is a very proper one, where the privacy of dealing between the seller and the buyer ought not to be in the newspaper while these transactions are being undertaken and for a period afterwards. There are certain privacies to be honored. When I sell my farm, regardless of whom I sell it to or whether I sell a horse or a cow, if somebody asks me what I got for that critter I usually say 'cash'. That's my business. When somebody comes up to me and says, what did so and so get for his particular farm from the Land Bank or asks the Minister of Agriculture, I think the Minister of Agriculture would certainly be breaking a confidence if, while these transactions were still fresh and while he was still making settlement for his taxes, preparing his estate, to make all these private things public would be totally unfair. It would put a damper on the whole proposition, on all the proceedings, Mr. Speaker, if we were to sacrifice their privacy and this is exactly what the Members opposite would like to see happen. They want to have people back off from dealing with the Department of Agriculture. That is their only interest. Their actions have indicated this even if they haven't said so, that they wanted to sabotage the plan.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the kindest thing I can say about that is that it is a bunch of hogwash. When a person wants to sell anything if he doesn't want to tell anybody what he paid for it or what he sold it for, that's his business, private business. If you do business with the Government, it changes things. There are times we admit when it is not in the public interest to reveal certain information concerning Government transactions. When you set out to buy \$30 million worth of farm land in this province it is the public's business what you paid for that. I discussed some information that was given to us and the Minister of Agriculture asked me to table it. I will bring it in to this debate and on this particular motion, so I ask leave to adjourn this debate.

Motion for adjournment denied.

Mr. Steuart: — No! I love that when they stand up and shout that No, so arrogantly Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted to adjourn the debate of course was to get some information. I said something when I spoke on this last motion concerning the price of land. I said some of the information had been given to us and the Minister asked if I would table it and I said, "Yes, I would." The natural place to table it is in a similar debate, that is why I asked for permission to adjourn this debate. This is the first time this particular debate has been up. It will make no difference at all to the procedure and the business

March 6, 1973

of this House if this debate were adjourned because we would carry on to the next one and this would come up in four or five days under adjourned debates, and I would table the information I had and it would be available to the Minister and we could carry on with the next business. But again, it is typical of this Government, the arrogance of the Minister of Agriculture, using their majority to try and stifle a normal debate. If they want to do that that's fine, except they may find out that they can't stifle normal debate.

I have here some Debates and Proceedings that I should like to read to the House for awhile. They have to do with a similar request put forward asking for information when we were the Government. I should like to read what the Members opposite said about this when they were in the Opposition. If I may, I am sure the House is in no great hurry, Mr. Speaker, they want the debate to continue . . .

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Is it in the deterrent fees?

Mr. Steuart: — No, it is in the other debate, Mr. Speaker.

Now I will just read what the Leader of the Opposition had to say. The occasion was in the Third Session of the Sixteenth Legislature, Debates and Proceedings, Official Report, 1970. The Speaker, the Hon. James E. Snedker . . .

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Who?

Mr. Steuart: — Who, Who? At that time, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition had asked for certain information. I will read what Mr. Blakeney had to say. March 17, 1970, page 960, Debates and Proceedings.

An Hon. Member: — The green book!

Mr. Steuart: — Right in the green book, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Blakeney said at that time:

The order asked for a statement of the net profit of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may question what the net profit of the Prince Albert Pulp Company has to do with the price of land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I will get there in a minute. As soon as I read it it will become very apparent to the Members opposite what Mr. Blakeney, the then Leader of the Opposition, had to say. I repeat:

The order asked for a statement of the net profit of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited. As I understand it the Government of Saskatchewan is a 30 per cent shareholder of the company. It is difficult to think of a company in which the Government of Saskatchewan is a 30 per cent shareholder in respect of which the Government of Saskatchewan has guarantees out which exceed \$50 million, being a private matter.

He was referring to the fact that the Government then had guaranteed a note for \$50 million, of which they had the collateral of a pulp mill. He questioned then how a matter of \$50 million of a possible government investment could be a private matter.

Mr. Kramer: — Good point!

Mr. Steuart: — Fine point. We make the point how \$30 million of the taxpayers' money expended in land can possibly be a private matter. Mr. Blakeney went on on that occasion, he went on to say:

The facts are that the total capital provided by this company or provided to build this pulp mill, approximately \$50 million is capital in respect of which there is a Provincial Government guarantee, \$5 million a contribution by the Federal Crown. Another approximate \$8 million of working capital is provided pursuant to a Provincial Government guarantee, and \$3 million of the equity capital is provided by the Crown. So far as I am aware, the sponsors have put in less than \$10 million out of the total of some \$65 million or \$70 million. I have no quarrel (Mr. Blakeney said) with the particular method of financing. I am just saying that under those circumstances I suggest that the profit and loss picture of the Prince Albert Pulp Company is a matter of great public concern, particularly if we may be faced with a \$50 million contingent liability.

In other words what the then Leader of the Opposition was saying, that in view of the fact that the Government had a contingent liability and it was only a contingent liability it wasn't even necessarily and never will be a liability directly payable to this province, that it was a matter of public concern.

Here we have \$30 million already committed and God knows how much in the future and the Minister of Agriculture says it is not a matter of public concern, it is not the public's business, it is private business.

Mr. Blakeney went on to say:

I can't imagine a circumstance under which it would not be available to the Government nor could I imagine a circumstance under which it would not be in the interest of the Company to make known its profit picture. May I advise Hon. Members that in the only comparable position that of the steel mill, the financial figures of Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Company Limited were readily available.

He was then pointing out that when they were the Government they made a similar deal or a similar type of deal with the local steel mill that they had, in fact, told the public.

The same situation prevails here. It can in no way jeopardize the farmer who sold his land, it can in no way jeopardize the man who is leasing the land. As a matter of fact once the individual who leases the land, calculates the five per cent, he just has to work backwards and he will know how much they paid for the land, it will then be his information and he can make it public. Why the Government persists at this time in refusing to make this information public is beyond me. They are

March 6, 1973

adding to the fuel, they are adding to the fires of controversy across this province and if they say we are sabotaging this Land Bank Plan, I say that they are sabotaging the Land Bank Plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Blakeney went on on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is very interesting. He said:

I would have thought that the Government would be anxious to make known to the public that the pulp company is doing satisfactorily and that the public's investment is not a risk.

The same thing holds true here. Surely the Government, here's Mr. Blakeney now and he will love to hear some of his words, there are several pages of them here yet.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Read it all . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Wait till I get down a little farther.

That the Government in this position would follow the advice of their then leader, who still is the leader, and want to clear up any doubt in the public's mind and make this information available.

Mr. Speaker, I would go on here quoting the Premier. He refers later on in the same speech:

I am sure that the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would accept the appropriate amendment so that the financial statement would cover the last financial period for which there are audited statements. But having said that, I would suggest that the information asked for is very appropriate information. It is information of great interest to the public and ought to be made available.

Now that was you speaking, Mr. Blakeney, I should like you to know, speaking back in 1970. It is quoted on page 961, Speaker Hon. James E. Snedker, still Hon. at the time. I hope he is still Hon. at this time.

I won't read what the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) said at that time. He disagreed with the Leader of the Opposition. Then Mr. Berezowsky got up, a very honored Member of this House. Let's see what he had to say about this. I don't know, but on the next page the Premier said, "Flip flop." Oh, he didn't say anything very interesting. Mr. Berezowsky told the Premier not to interrupt at that time.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that what Mr. Berezowsky said, what the Premier said, what all the Members on that side said on that occasion, is exactly what we are saying today. It is in the public interest and I can't understand why it is not in the public interest to make the price of this land known. The Premier shrugs his shoulder and holds up his hands. He can stand up in this debate, and I don't think he has spoken in any of these debates. If he would stand up in this debate and tell this House and tell the public why it is not in the interests of

the people of Saskatchewan to know how much they are paying for land, what they are doing with \$30 million, \$10 million last year and \$20 million this year of the public's money; how it can possibly affect the individual who sold the land. He is not in the farming business any more. He is retiring presumably. Although I should like to question that with some of them.

I still, every now and then, take a look at that first deal that was consummated – if that's the proper word – where they had a picture of Mr. and Mrs. Wolfe, then they had a picture of young Mr. Wolfe – he looked very young. Mr. and Mrs. Wolfe said they thought they would stick around and do the cooking and the housekeeping for young Mr. Wolfe. I have a very funny feeling if you go out you will find that Mr. Wolfe senior has an excellent price for his land which he will invest at 8 per cent. He will then rent the farm back in the name of his son for 5 per cent; he will continue on farming; the son will run around and do the chores. Mr. and Mrs. Wolfe will carry on doing the farming, I suspect and they will all live happily ever after, I hope.

An Hon. Member: — Have their cake and eat it too!

Mr. Steuart: — They really are going to have their cake and eat it. They will make 3 per cent on the money of the people of this province and maybe five or ten years down the road, he will really retire and the son will take over. Maybe I am wrong, maybe the young man takes a very, very young picture. He looked like he was about 17 or 18, he might be a little older, I don't know.

Mr. Hanson: — Did you read it?

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, I read it. I don't know, I don't remember. Do you remember how old he was? How old? I am sure you have got him registered as a good member in good standing. I am sure you know how old he is and how old his mother and dad are.

You weren't in here, Mr. Premier, but I was speaking on the debate just before this. I stated some figures that had been made available to me from the country about the price of land, the price the Land Bank was supposedly paying for land. The Minister of Agriculture rose, I sat down, and he asked me to table these figures. I said yes, I would. When this debate started I rose and said I would gladly table these figures in this debate since it is exactly the same debate on the price of land. An amendment has been made every time we have asked for information about Land Bank transactions. We have included the price offered and the price paid for the land. On every one of them the Minister of Agriculture or someone on that side has risen and offered an amendment deleting the information or deleting the clause, the request for the price of land. Of course, using their majority over there, they have voted these amendments in and voted our motion down. I asked for leave to adjourn the debate. Mr. Messer – not sitting in his place and I don't know if that has any meaning or not – shouted "No" and jumped over in his seat immediately and using their majority of the Members present, although there are about as many of their Members missing as we have here, they voted down our right to adjourn. So I am carrying on the discussion as long as I can. I hope some

March 6, 1973

of my other Members are ready to speak, and I am sure they are. If they are not, I wish they would get ready.

I don't know if there is anything in the latest issue of the Liberal that has anything to say on this question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mind you, Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent article here by D.G. Steuart on another subject, which . . .

Hon. Mr. Messer: — . . . not really relevant . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Not really very relevant, no. There is the membership list if you would like to know how well we are doing. We are not doing really that badly. There is a very good article in here I will recommend for your reading, "Death to the Succession Duties" it is called, by George Loken. I think it is a very apt title.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave again to adjourn this debate. I hope I am given right to adjourn this debate, because I would like to bring those figures in.

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — I thought you were going to keep on.

Mr. Steuart: — I can carry on if you want, but I don't want unnecessarily to hold up the proceedings in this House. But this may be the last time that we have a resolution like this before the House and I want the opportunity to bring in those figures that were given to me. Talk about them, discuss them and, of course, I will table them. If the Minister wants, at that time or have someone else adjourn the debate so they could look at those figures, they may be all wrong. I have no way of knowing if they are true or not. They were sent to me or given to me by a farmer from that district, the particular district under review, and they have the rural municipality; they have the land title; and they have whom the land was sold to and they have the description of the land. They have the price that they say in this area this land was sold for to the Land Bank. Now whether it is right or not I don't know. This is the problem. Nobody knows. I presume nobody knows, but the Minister. Maybe the Premier and the Cabinet and the people in his own Department know what they are paying for this land.

I don't know why, I still don't know why, Mr. Premier, you refuse to give the price of this land. If they have nothing to hide, if they are paying, the Minister of Agriculture said a little while ago, they have one formula. They have a formula that is applicable right across the province. If they have, tell us what the formula is. Tell us what the price of land is if there is nothing to hide. If the formula is wrong, if the formula is a bad formula, if it is paying too much, I am sure it wouldn't be too little for the land, they wouldn't sell it. If they are paying too much for the land then surely that's the public's business to be debated in this Legislature. If they are not paying too much for the land, and if, in fact, they are applying that uniformly, if they are not giving better preference to their friends or different preference in one part of the

province, if they are paying the same price for the same quality of the land all over this province. If they are paying similar prices for land of similar productivity then they have nothing to hide and, in fact, I think they have everything to gain by saying, look here is the information.

Why they insist on hiding this information or refusing to divulge it, I can't understand unless, in fact, they have something to hide. Now this is about the seventh or eighth resolution we have had asking for this information. I challenge the Premier, I challenge the Minister of Agriculture, if they have nothing to hide to make this information known. Up to this point they have refused to do it.

Mr. Speaker, we can only conclude one thing. The Minister of Agriculture has not informed this House of the truth. He has not informed this House and the public of the situation the way it really is. He is, in fact, not applying a formula equitably all over this province. That is the conclusion we must come to. If these are not the facts, then I have yet to hear it in the ramblings of the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) or in the very scant explanation, the almost arrogantly scant explanation that the Minister of Agriculture has given to us any time we have asked this question. He has hardly bothered to give an explanation at all. The explanation that has been given just doesn't hold water. It doesn't make any sense, it doesn't hold up.

So, Mr. Speaker, because I do have other information I think is pertinent to this debate and pertinent to this argument, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to say at this time that I know what the Hon. Member has in mind. There are four more resolutions on the Order Paper identically the same. The Member has had one adjournment or asked for an adjournment which was refused by the House.

Beauchesne makes it quite plain that an adjournment motion is in order at all times, but if it is refused it cannot be asked again until some other business has transpired. The position we find ourselves in now as far as the minutes of the House is concerned, no additional business will have transpired. Therefore, I would have to rule the second motion for adjournment out of order, unless the House, by unanimous consent, wishes to allow that to be done. They can do it by unanimous consent. But I would suggest that there are four more motions and rather than get ourselves in procedural wrangles, any of the discussions can come up on a succeeding motion. I don't want to appear to be arbitrary, but actually this motion now is out of order.

Does the Member have unanimous consent to adjourn this motion at this time?

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, just to clarify a point. Perhaps you could identify the matter that . . . Mr. Speaker, I am very patient in these things.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — If I may assume that order has been restored to the Assembly. I assume that Mr. Speaker was referring to the adjournment motions which appear on page 2 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan adopted in 1970, which reads as follows: Rule 4:

The motion to adjourn the Assembly shall always be in order but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been held.

Mr. Speaker, rule four uses the words 'some intermediate proceeding' and it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there was a proceeding that occurred in between, namely, a very lengthy and very elucidating speech by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that I may become fully familiar with the rules of the House, I thought perhaps I might look at this very same question as it was raised in the 18th edition of Erskine May on Parliamentary practice published by Butterworth and Company, Publishers Limited, with offices in Sidney and Melbourne, Toronto, Wellington, Auckland. This is the 18th 1971 edition. The editor was Sir Bernard Cox.

Mr. Speaker, the heading is under questions and the disposal of an adjournment of the House or debate. I refer to 369.

Mr. Speaker: — What motion is the Hon. Member discussing? I am at a loss to know.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I am discussing the ruling that you just made.

Mr. Speaker: — I made no ruling. The House made the ruling.

Mr. MacLeod: — Oh, Mr. Speaker, you made a ruling as I understood it.

Mr. Speaker: — The rules of the House are quite plain, that there is only one adjournment and the Members can only ask for one adjournment. And if you look over the report of the Standing Committee which was brought in in 1970, you will see that. Prior to that time it was always the rules of the House, if they had wanted to be enforced that if a Member asks for an adjournment of a debate and is refused, he immediately lost his right to speak any more.

But in revising the rules in 1970, we eliminated that that they could have one adjournment. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked for an adjournment which the House denied, not the Speaker, but the House denied. Then when he asked for a second one, that is contrary to the rules and I so pointed out when I said I would be prepared if the House gave unanimous consent. The House did not do so.

Therefore, there is no debate because there is no rule of the Chair.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, are you saying that it is out of order but you consider it in order to be placed before the House with the unanimous consent of the House. Is that what you are ruling?

Mr. Speaker: — What I ruled was that according to the rules of the House I would have to rule the request for a second adjournment out of order, but if the House was prepared to say unanimously that he could have the adjournment, the House has that right to make that decision. But the House did not do so. I think we have nothing before the House in debate and I can't entertain a debate unless I have a motion.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that point, but are you saying that it is understood in the rules of the House and in the report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures of the Assembly. I have a copy of that which is dated December 1969. If so, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Speaker would kindly direct our attention to that part of the report which you are using as the foundation of your present ruling, which, in effect, is that it is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I would suggest that the Hon. Member read on page 25 of this report — the adjournment of a debate, and the recommendations — that a Member who has lost the motion for the adjournment of a debate shall not thereby be precluded from continuing the debate provided that he does so forthwith. And then there were reasons set out for it.

I cannot entertain this. The question now before the House is on this amendment which was moved by the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, there is a title here in the Saskatchewan Liberal and it says, 'Liberals come out fighting.' And it is a cinch, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to fight on this particular issue.

As the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, the Opposition has a great deal more information. As a matter of fact we have one report of the price of land which we are now checking at the Land Titles Office. It happens to be in this municipality. And because it is in this municipality it is very important that we have the opportunity of debating on this particular Resolution and not one of the other four, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, because of that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Adjournment negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 13
Messieurs

Steuart
Coupland
Loken

Boldt
MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac

McPherson
Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw)

Guy
Grant

Weatherald
MacLeod

NAYS — 37

Blakeney
Dyck
Meakes
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Kramer
Thibault
Larson
Kowalchuk
Baker
Brockelbank

MacMurchy
Pepper
Michayluk
Byers
Thorson
Whelan
Kwasnica
Carlson
Engel
Owens
Robbins
Tchorzewski

Cowley
Taylor
Matsalla
Faris
Gross
Feduniak
Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Hanson
Oliver
Kaeding

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you how delighted we are to see you all back here after a very pleasant supper.

Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30 this evening, we were talking about the Minister of Agriculture's refusal to provide information to the House and to the people of Saskatchewan regarding the price of land being paid by the Land Bank.

I just want to summarize for a very few brief moments exactly what this means. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this refusal means that no one in the Province of Saskatchewan will obtain this information until 1974. In other words by the time the Minister has determined that he has the privilege of deciding when the end of the year of the Land Bank will be, he says then it will take another 90 days. There is no way that this kind of information can be provided to the House during this Session. No way that the people of Saskatchewan will know exactly what the Land Bank is paying, if it is, indeed, causing a great deal of difficulty in the escalation of land prices, it will be two years after the Land Bank has been in operation before the farmers of Saskatchewan know the true implications.

I say that that is not the right way for this Government to act. This is not the right way! I should also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that around the Province of Saskatchewan there is a great deal of indication that the Land Bank is already having serious implications on the price of land.

Many farmers and real estate agents are suggesting that the price of land has gone up as high as 10 per cent. If this is true, then the Land Bank is certainly having a very major impact on the price of land, particularly for those farmers who want to purchase land for sons who don't qualify for the Land Bank. It means that they are going to have a great deal of difficulty obtaining land.

The Minister has also indicated that he has established a formula. If this is true then surely he can provide that formula, tell us its relationship to the assessment in the province. If this is a fact, then he has established a price.

And that price is an equal price for all the farmers in Saskatchewan. And yet there is a great deal of concern among the people of Saskatchewan that this is not the case, that there is not a real formula.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about another matter that is equally as serious, but it indicates, again, the Minister's refusal to provide information not only to the Members of the House and to the public, but to the farmers who have applied for leases. The date is now in the 6th or 7th of March. Within three or three and a half weeks in southwestern Saskatchewan many farmers may well be preparing to go on the land to seed. Yet nowhere in the Province of Saskatchewan can you find an applicant who has been informed that he has received a lease from the Land Bank.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Do you want to bet your salary on that?

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, I don't know, but we haven't been able to find any.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — There's a lot of things you don't know.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, I wish that you would tell us. That is exactly the point that we are making. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point that we are making. If the Minister of Agriculture would only provide this information.

For example, I know of another illustration of a three quarter section of land bought in my constituency by the Land Bank Commission and 18 farmers have applied for it. One farmer — it is three quarters of pasture land — a farmer has already had a three year lease on it. He has obtained another three year lease, except on the condition of a sale. During the past three years this man has built up a heard of cattle somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 to 90 cows. If that lease land is taken away from that farmer, or not allocated to him, that means that that man has to sell his cows and quit farming. And yet he has not been informed as to whom that land is going to be available.

In other words, the whole Land Bank has operated in an atmosphere of secrecy and subterfuge. There has just been no information provided. And the fact that the Minister refuses to provide information to the House tonight, this afternoon, over the past three or four weeks, is adding confusion, it is causing misgivings, it is adding suspicion, it is adding concern to all the farmers and to all the people in Saskatchewan.

When you start dealing with \$30 million of the taxpayers' money, \$30 million, Mr. Speaker, surely then the people of Saskatchewan have the right to know exactly how it is spent. I have a few other comments and tonight, seeing that I have a great deal of time at my disposal of about two and one half hours, I thought, Mr. Speaker, I might start to review some of the history of the Land Bank.

Mr. Speaker, you know ever since the Land Bank has been instituted in Saskatchewan, the rural people in the province have been subject to a constant barrage of NDP propaganda. It has

been expensive, it has been contradictory, it has been misleading and, in many cases, it hasn't even told the truth.

The purpose of this campaign was to promote and salvage the Land Bank Plan for the NDP because of an election promise. Most people suspect that this Land Bank Commission is a very costly enterprise. First of all we know that the administration of the Land Bank is costing the people of Saskatchewan \$1 million this year. That is the information provided in the Estimates. One million dollars, as we know, Mr. Speaker, in administration costs. We know as well that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are subsidizing the interest rate of 5 per cent. This, Mr. Speaker, we wonder if you took that \$1 million, that 5 per cent subsidy or that subsidy over above five per cent, and gave it directly to all farmers, assisted them in the purchase of land and the outright transfer, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would be cheaper.

I should like to review very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the history of the Land Bank. We are not sure when the NDP first decided that they were going to turn around and seize the farmers' land in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we are not sure why they decided that they wanted to take over private ownership and when they decided to turn it into state ownership, but if any of us go back over a period of time, we know that we can go to the days of 1969, for example, when they passed a resolution at their convention, urging that the NDP Government take over the private ownership of the land in the Province of Saskatchewan. We know that the Waffle movement has for many, many years advocated, very definitely, without any ifs or buts about it, that the land was a public resource, that land belonged to the state, that there was no way in which private individuals should own land within the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it was rather interesting at that 1969 convention, the fight that went on between the unionists, such as Len Wallace, and the NDP delegate from Regina East. For example, John Burton, Jack Messer and Alf Gleave, were the farmers in the Party. But the unions wanted, Mr. Speaker, to turn around and advocate without any ifs or buts about it, the state ownership of the farm land. Some of the farmers were reluctant to accept that, but eventually the NDP bought it and came up with this one great idea called the Land Bank.

Mr. Speaker, the funny part of it is that we find now that they have put this Land Bank into effect. It has decided without any ifs or buts about it, to refuse to explain to the people of Saskatchewan just what this Land Bank Commission and this Plan is costing.

For example, when we talk about the Wafflers, you remember that John Gordon of Moosomin, a Waffler, quoted the Agricultural Minister, Mr. Messer, as saying during a closed session that he would see to it that the Government made the leasing of the land more attractive than the option to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that he has made it attractive. He certainly has discouraged the farmers from buying the land. Not only has he discouraged them from buying the land, he has made it virtually impossible. First of all he has put the limitations of a \$60,000 net worth on it. Second, he turned around then . . .

Hon. Mr. Messer: — What's that got to do . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — First of all, because you say he has to pay cash for it, then you turn around and say you have to pay a cash rental, you have to pay the taxes, you have to provide the crop insurance.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — . . . Land Bank . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture is not interested in farmers owning their own land.

What did Don Faris the MLA from Arm River have to say. “If the Liberals come out with an option to buy it will destroy us at the next election.” And believe me it will destroy you at the next election. It is destroying you now, because of the fact that you refuse to provide any kind of information to the farmers of Saskatchewan in relation to the Land Bank Commission itself. You absolutely refuse to give them the cost of the land, you refuse to make public or even to inform farmers whether or not they are going to be able to lease the land. Mr. Speaker, you have caused this suspicion in the country.

My purpose in supplying this background, Mr. Speaker, is to make one point very clear to start with. Some NDP have stated it publicly and some privately, but they agree in principle. The NDP in Saskatchewan wants to take over the farm lands of the province and wants the land to be owned by the state. They do not want to have it owned by private individuals.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Steuart or slavery!

Mr. MacDonald: — That’s right, Messer or slavery! In order to make it sound better the present Minister of Agriculture states it is not really slavery just sharecroppers. The same kind of sharecroppers that exist in other parts of the world, which have all proved an abject failure.

Mr. Hanson: — Where?

Mr. MacDonald: — Where? Behind the Iron Curtain, that is where this idea came from. The Minister of Agriculture likes to keep saying, you know I am changing the land tenure system in Saskatchewan. We are changing the land tenure. We are making it easier for people to get on the land and start farming.

The only way he is changing the land tenure system in the Province of Saskatchewan is by making absolutely certain that no private individual will be able to buy land in the future.

I wonder if any of the Members who own farm land wonder what will happen if in 10 or 15 years from now, if this NDP Government continues to buy \$20 million worth of land each year, and after purchasing \$20 million worth of land each year, they turn around then and have withdrawn from the marketplace a very substantial portion of the available land for sale. What happens if they have two or three sons coming along and they want to buy land?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would like

March 6, 1973

to remind the Hon. Member that Motion before us deals with the land in the Municipality of Huron No. 223.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the municipality that I was referring to.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! This deals with the land in the Rural Municipality of Huron No. 223 and the Motion asks for certain things dealing with the land in Huron which may or may not be under the control of the Commission.

The amendment deals with the same municipality. It does not deal with the overall principles of the Land Bank, and, therefore, I think we have to come more to the Motion that is before us because there are several motions on the same topic and we cannot debate the same issue twice. I would ask the Member to please try to confine himself closer to the Motion.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, surely on a Point of Order, you are not saying that there may be different principles of the Land Bank applying to the RM of Huron than there are to other municipalities in the province.

It seems to me if we accept your ruling in this regard, we are saying that there could well be some 300 and some odd different sets of rules for the Land Bank. Surely, that wasn't the legislation that was brought in. The Land Bank itself doesn't spell out any different rules for different municipalities. And surely, whether we are debating RM No. 223 or 224 or 194, we are debating the Land Bank activities in that municipality. As such, surely we can discuss the principles of the Land Bank as they relate to that municipality which, I believe, is no different than any other municipality in the province.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member will realize that the rules of the House are that you can't debate the same issue twice in the same Session. We have had several motions on this, therefore, we cannot debate the same issue in every motion that is before us. We are debating them for the different municipalities. I realize that this is a Motion which is hard to confine and I am asking the Member to stay as closely as possible to this. I realize that at times it is pretty difficult. But we cannot debate the same issue on several motions. I think that Members will agree on this.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly intended to keep my remarks related to the RM of Huron No. 223.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to read that Motion so that I make certain that everybody in the House understands it.

In the Rural Municipality of Huron No. 223 as of January 25, 1973; (a) the number of applications to sell land to the Land Bank Commission.

And, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about that. About the number of farmers that have applied for land in the RM of Huron, that as of yet have not received the information as to whether or not

they have received that land or are going to release that land, that here it is time now that spring was here, it is time to purchase seed, it is time, if you are a new farmer, to start buying machinery, to get prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go on the land in southwestern Saskatchewan. You can look out a window and as far as the eye can see and you see no snow. There have been many occasions when that part of the province has been seeding land on the 1st of April, and yet they still don't know, Mr. Speaker: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; who sold land, and so forth. The number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved.

Mr. Speaker, we want to know exactly how many Land Bank transactions have been carried out, what the price of them are and so forth. This deals with the whole umbrella. Under (b) the number of purchases that have been completed. Under (c) (i) (ii) above the land number of each quarter section; acreage cultivated in each quarter section; the acreage of native grass in each quarter section; the acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; assessed value of each quarter section; the price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. Speaker, those resolutions are very broad because they discuss the whole complicated idea of the Land Bank, and I will try and restrict my remarks to the RM of Huron, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when we have to go until 9:30 on this one Resolution. So I will try my best. I know that I have a great many of my colleagues who are also interested in speaking on this, so I am just going to make a couple of comments and then I am going to give them an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to say that there are rumors, very unpleasant rumors, very unpleasant rumors, people are suggesting that the Land Bank is paying too much for certain sections of land, or certain parcels of land. There are rumors that the Land Bank is paying too little for certain parcels of land. There are other rumors, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain farmers who are trying to buy land and who are being outbid by the Land Bank and that this in reality is inflating the price of land.

There are also rumors, Mr. Speaker, that the Land Bank is giving that lease or has made a commitment on that lease, to a certain Party supporter and that it is not really open to competition among all farmers. I suggest that there is one certain and sure way to stop those rumors. All those people across the way have to do is stand on their feet, accept this motion without an amendment, make it known to the people of Saskatchewan, and I am sure that then there will be no more rumors because they won't have anything to talk about.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that we will go out and help the Government quell those rumors. We will go out and stop those rumors from spreading. We will tell the farmers of Saskatchewan the truth about what they are paying for the price of land. We will take those Orders for Returns and we will publish them in the Saskatchewan Liberal, showing exactly the price of land they are paying. We will do everything humanly possible to stop those vicious rumors that are now circulating around the Province of Saskatchewan.

And I want to say to the detriment of the NDP that is a

very unfortunate thing. Because this Land Bank, if it is going to work, if the Land Bank is going to work, the one thing it has to do is to build up confidence in the people of Saskatchewan.

I tell you, the way you people are acting in refusing to provide information to the public, is in no way building confidence among the farmers of Saskatchewan. In fact, I would suggest it is doing the opposite. It is building distrust, not only among the farmers, but among the rural and municipal people, among the city people.

Don't suggest without help – you don't need any help. All you do is to put a cloak of secrecy around your transactions and exactly the same thing is happening with Intercontinental.

Oh, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to digress. I want to stick to that RM of Huron and I don't want to digress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just been nudged by my colleague behind and I have done my allocated period and I should like to say now that I hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) will reconsider his amendment. That he will please support the Opposition in their original Resolution, not only in this one but in all of them, so that everybody in Saskatchewan will know what the formula is. Everybody in Saskatchewan will have confidence in the honesty and the integrity of the NDP and the NDP Government and that we will be able to stop these rumors that are circulating around the province once and for all. Once again I tell you, we will publish them in the 'Liberal.' We will make absolutely certain that they don't go any further.

Hon. Mr. Cowley (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member permit a question. I wonder if the Hon. Member could tell my why all the rumors seem to be in the Member of Morse's constituency (Mr. Wiebe)?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — What I would like to suggest to the Provincial Treasurer seeing he gave me an opportunity to answer the question – that what we have is 120 questions – we have exactly the same number of questions as there are municipalities. But when you objected to us jamming all of them on the Order Paper that first day, that we want to make certain now that you get an opportunity to clear these off because tomorrow we will have a bunch more municipalities. But I should also like to tell the Provincial Treasurer that this is just typical this RM of Huron. This RM of Huron is typical of all municipalities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I just didn't want the Member for Milestone to have his way and have all the say this evening. He said that they were going to monopolize the whole evening and I figured I may as well have a few words to say.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if there ever was a need for sincerity and honesty, I know that it should be from that

side of the House. That's where it is lacking.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — You know I have been listening with disbelief to the debate on the Adjourned Debates on questions asked by the Opposition and I say, in disbelief, because I recall quite a number of years ago when the certain Member from our side of the House had to ask questions, I remember the bemoaning there was about that, how much it was going to cost for the civil servants to provide the answers, how many hours of work, etc.

Our Ministers on this side of the House are willing to provide the answers — you are going to get the answers, except for those that are confidential in nature and even then, as the Minister has already indicated to you, they will be forthcoming.

Now I have been listening to these questions, questions regarding the Land Bank Commission and . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . and disbelief.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Yes, I do Sir and I hope the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) will take cognizance of that kind of a thing and tell the truth himself once in a while.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Disbelief, Mr. Speaker, because really many of the words I heard uttered from that side were innuendo and attempts at falsification and fabrication by the Opposition and it shows how desperate these Liberals are to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Minister has clearly stated and clearly enunciated, why this information is not available as of right now.

Mr. Steuart: — Why?

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Releasing information during negotiations is never done. That, indeed, information of this type may prejudice land prices as has been indicated; that this information will be available at a later date and I agree with him wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker.

Now, my personal contact with people who have sold their land to the Land Bank — my personal contact with people is there are only (to add to what the Minister has said) these people with whom I have talked, or rather they talked to me. I don't go enquiring as to what they sold their land for but they have talked to me and they have indicated that they would just as soon have the price for what it was sold for to be held confidential. Now there is nothing sinister about people wanting it that way. Everyone knows that it is inevitable that in the final analysis the prices of each parcel of land will be known, even to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker. But their intent is very, very obvious. It is strictly political.

All of the arguments that I have heard the Liberals use in this Assembly, prove one thing, that they are not too sure that they have done the right thing by opposing the Land Bank scheme,

March 6, 1973

Mr. Speaker. They are just not too sure! Indeed, I am sure that they are uncertain as to their stand. The fact that the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) got up this afternoon and spoke in a mildly conciliatory way is real evidence that they are uncertain. They are so uncertain that they really don't know, they really don't know what they are arguing, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I have heard some of them argue away back, saying, 'you know you paid too much for some land' and in the next breath they are saying, 'you know you haven't paid enough,' and in another breath they are saying, 'we really don't know.'

Mr. Lane: — We don't, that's what we are trying to tell you.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, future history will record it. I am certain that the Liberals of Saskatchewan took the wrong road when they decided to oppose the Land Bank.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — And they will, I say, they will live to rue the day that they decided to take the negative position. Their Members will be counted by the people of Saskatchewan and I assure you there won't be too many of them to count. However, Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am very happy that they have taken that kind of a position. I was very pleased to hear the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) speak the other day — loud and clear — that the Land Bank program won't succeed because it doesn't work. In other words he is putting himself into that position where he is saying that it's just no good. He seemed to have taken a phrase out of the late Premier's book. They have taken a step, Mr. Speaker, from which they cannot return and I am very glad of it.

I, for one, want to be counted on the side of the Land Bank.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — I don't want Liberal hangers-on saying two years from now, "Me too, me too."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Like they did in Medicare, Mr. Speaker. Like they did in Medicare. By this debate they have nailed their colors to the wall.

Mr. Steuart: — We will nail your hide to the wall.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Yes, and against the Land Bank and we've staked out ours as well. We have staked ours as well. I agree, I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will approve our choice in the long run.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — The people of Saskatchewan have the final say. The people of Saskatchewan will have the say in regard to these questions.

Mr. Speaker: — I must advise the Member that we are discussing the Resolution as it pertains to Huron not the whole principle of the Land Bank.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't got a Hansard to read from like the other gentleman, but I have prepared a statement here so . . .

Mr. Lane: — Table them.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — The people of Saskatchewan will have the say in 1975, Mr. Speaker, and it won't be the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), or the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), or the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), or any of these people. The people of Saskatchewan are patient people when it comes to questions of this type. They are patient people, they will recognize the truth and all that rumor mongering by the Members to your left, Sir, it will all be assessed for what it really is. That it is nothing but hot political air.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse stated about the regrettable state of affairs this afternoon when he was speaking in this debate. And my comment is, indeed, it is regrettable that Liberals who should be criticizing and looking at the whole question of Land Bank in a constructive manner, only seek to befoul and distort and becloud the issue and seek to destroy, when, indeed, they should be doing as we are, looking for solutions for the problems of the farming community, looking for assistance in the transfer of land, making it easier to transfer the land to young people without the burden of a perpetual debt on their heads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) this afternoon brought out some problems regarding a half section of land and he made quite a bit of a to-do about it. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that there are numbers of problems that are being dealt with. However, if you want evidence of satisfied customers, I can, and so can many Members of this House, get you dozens of letters stating their high approval of these transactions.

The people who have contacted me have had the highest regard and praise for the Land Bank. The one thing that the Land Bank's purchases have done is to stabilize land prices. Now we have been told just a moment ago, by the Member from Milestone, that the price of land has increased. May I say this, there is probably some evidence of some increase, but may I say, what did the Liberals do when they were in power in '67, '68 and '69? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. Neither did the Federal Liberals do anything. It was pitiful to see some old people, sick people, who had toiled a whole lifetime trying desperately to sell a half section, asking for a reasonable \$15,000, then \$14,000, then \$13,000, then \$12,000 and I know of one couple who sold for \$8,000 because they had to sell it. That was during the Liberal

March 6, 1973

years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lane: — Who?

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — I know of them and you know of many of them also.

Mr. Steuart: — Who sold their land for that kind of a price?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Now where were those all-fired up Liberal friends of these ordinary common people at that time? Where were they? I ask you, where were they? What did you do to assist these people? Nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing.

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — On a Point of Order. I think this gentleman has gone far enough.

You called the Member from Milestone to order regarding the Resolution. At no time has this gentleman spoken about the RM of No. 223 and there is no way how we will accept that ruling and we are going to rule all over the place.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think I asked the Members to stay to the motion and it is very difficult for this Chair to try to keep to the motion when they say, “Well this pertains to the land in this municipality,” and I am asking all the Members to stay as close as they can to the motion, realizing it is difficult.

Mr. Boldt: — He hasn’t spoken . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Pardon? I have had the problem all evening my dear friend.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I would like you to call him to Order just like you did the Member for Milestone.

Mr. Speaker: — I put him to Order.

Mr. Boldt: — But he doesn’t listen to you. Have you lost control of the House? He doesn’t listen to you.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I want to ask all Members to stay as close to these motions and don’t go over the whole deal of the Land Bank because these motions deal with specific areas, not with the whole motion.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I wrote these remarks out I had the very paper before me which I consulted very closely when I was writing this.

May I say again that the Liberals did nothing to help the seller and nothing to assist the buyer as well during those times, Mr. Speaker. So if the Land Bank Program succeeds, Mr. Speaker, there will be no tomorrow for Mr. Steuart and his Liberals, I assure you. Not just for 20 years, but forever.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Member is straying away from this motion. We are on too much of the overall principle and not on this motion.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Very good. Finally, I want to make the final remark . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. If it would assist the House we would accept an adjournment so that the Hon. Member could sort out his notes and perhaps we could deal with it later.

An Hon. Member: — You've got to have holes in the head.

Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a number of words and finish my number of comments that I have started and this will be in order because I have heard about the rumor mill for the last couple of days, and may I say this, Sir, that the rumor mill generated by the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and aided and abetted by his colleagues on this question of the Land Bank, has to this point, served one purpose and that is to distribute Liberal propaganda to distort the real issue, Mr. Speaker, and that's all that's been done.

The Liberals are scared of the success of the Land Bank. Their performance in this House proves it. The people of Saskatchewan will judge the real issue. Yes — the success of the Land Bank. Two years from now, Mr. Speaker, the people will judge, by their ballots, and it will register the results and if anything, the ludicrous Liberal charges being spouted here today, will only serve to polarize and firm-up their acceptance of the Land Bank Program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to this motion. The Opposition has been hammering at us for this information that they want and after listening to the Opposition Members shouting and lamenting and putting on an act, it makes me wonder what they are trying to prove. They have been repeating themselves again and again. Some of them spoke for lengthy periods but said nothing, particularly the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald).

The Member for Milestone had a problem to speak about the farm Land Bank. He spoke about Members and Wafflers and everything but the main question which was to be what prices were paid for land. That wouldn't make any difference to them if they had this information and the figures. Now what would they do?

Mr. Speaker, the Members were told several times that our Government will have a complete report at the end of the farm

March 6, 1973

Land Bank fiscal year. Now if you would pull those plugs out of your ears I think we would save a lot of time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — The Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) got up and delivered a very dry speech. I will lend him a dollar to buy a quart of oil and it wasn't on the Land Bank. You know it wasn't on the Land Bank. He spoke about highways and when he was the Minister of Highways he was building billboards, not highways and bridges.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I wonder if the Hon. Member from Turtleford could tell us what motion he is speaking on. As I understand it, we are debating a motion dealing with some information with respect to the RM of No. 223. I haven't heard him mention it. He has made some broad references to the Land Bank and some other remarks, but unless he is on a different motion and if he was not on this motion I hope you will call him to order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe, and as I endeavored to say, that the Member should stay close to the motion. The Member for Rosthern did speak, but he used the highways as an example, I think, rather than strolling the highways, he used it as an example and in debate it is permissible to answer what others say in debate, but still it should be to the motion.

Mr. Feduniak: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess they are just jealous because I get up to speak for a few minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — I would suggest to the Member from Wilkie that when your time comes, I will give you all the time you want.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — The Leader of the Opposition made illogical comparisons between the pulp mill deal and the Land Bank. The Land Bank involves individuals. It involves a few farmers or farmers who sold land and it involves young farmers who are going to rent land. Now the pulp mill involves all the people of Saskatchewan. It involves give-away of our forest resources.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — It encumbers all the people of Saskatchewan to the tune of a \$50 million loan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — It involves all the people of Saskatchewan paying for \$15 million of roads. It concerns the polluting of our waters and destroying our fish. Besides many other concessions. But

the Liberals said the people of Saskatchewan were not entitled to the financial statements on this project. Oh, no! How can they compare the two. It is just plain arrogance on your part.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend for one moment to be an authority on the Land Bank, but it appears that neither does the Member. And after listening to the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who had a 15 minute prepared speech, who talked about the Liberals back in 1967 and 1968, who talked about the Federal Government and who mentioned what the Member from Wilkie said. The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), of course, has not spoken in this particular debate yet.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Not officially.

Mr. Guy: — No, he hasn't spoken in this debate, but he went on with what the Member for Wilkie said. Then we had the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) who went on about the pulp mill and about the environment. I think that probably this gives me a fairly wide range in which I can answer some of the comments which have been made by Members opposite.

First of all I think that I should like to say that the RM of Huron, I am sure would be quite concerned to know that for the first time, at least for the first time since they became the Government, that when we had a night sitting that the cafeteria wasn't open to the Members to be able to have their supper.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — When one considers that there are 350 individuals hired in the Government services and another 70 in the executive council involved in planning and research it is surprising they couldn't even come up with the necessary planning to keep the cafeteria open to serve supper to the Members when there was an evening sitting. They were the ones that determine if there would be an evening sitting.

Mr. Feduniak: — What motion are you speaking on?

Mr. Guy: — I am speaking on the fact that the RM of Huron would be very disturbed to know that that happened to the Members on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — That is why I am speaking on it. And I also want to refer to what the Member from Turtleford said about the pulp mill. About the \$50 million loan. If he thinks the people of Saskatchewan are concerned today about the \$50 million loan which was guaranteed and which was never given, compared to the \$10 million cash that has been paid to Intercontinental for 45 per cent interest of Intercontinental Packers, and the \$6 million which was handed on a silver plate to Parsons and

Whittemore. If he is concerned about the people of Saskatchewan he had better refer to those items that have been carried on by the present Government. Because you should be ashamed of them. They are a disgrace to you and your Party and your Premier.

Mr. Lane: — Are you going to fight him in the hall, Mike?

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this motion on the RM of Huron. I don't want to wander as far away from it as Members opposite. I think that everyone in this House and everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan would like me to review the presentation of this motion.

This motion shows beyond anything that we have seen the arrogance of the Government opposite. This motion appeared on the Order Paper of January 26th as a question. And it was made a Motion for Return. But it didn't have to be made a Motion for Return because it was well within the realm of answering as a question. It dealt with one agency and it dealt with one year. And it could well have been answered. But the Government didn't see fit. They wanted to postpone the answering of this question. Then on January 30th, more than a month ago, it appeared on the Order Paper as a Motion for Return. And it was at that time ready for amendment. But did the Attorney General see fit to bring in an amendment at that time? Did he see fit to prepare an amendment? Or the Minister of Agriculture? They had over a month to prepare an amendment to this motion and they didn't see fit to do so. Why not? Because they have no intention of giving us the information that we want.

Then on February 20th, 21 days later, it came up for debate. It was presented by my hon. colleague from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) in the proper procedure. And after 20 days of having the time to prepare an amendment, did the Minister of Agriculture ask to amend it on that particular occasion? No, no he got his friend from Saskatoon, the Attorney General, to adjourn the debate. There was absolutely no need to adjourn the debate on February 20th after having three weeks to prepare an amendment. Again, it shows that they deliberately delayed the answering of this question to the people of this province. Then on March 6th, another 14 days, two weeks later, it is brought to the House again, today. And what has happened? The Member, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) asked to amend it. Which was fine, he amended it and then we asked to adjourn the debate to consider the amendment and he had the arrogance to say no. And yet, Mr. Speaker, only 15 minutes earlier we had a similar situation where the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) had moved a motion, there was an amendment, we asked to adjourn it and the approval was given by the Attorney General on a motion which didn't have as much significance to the people of this province. So then we have a similar situation five minutes later, where the Minister of Agriculture, the wealthiest farmer in this province, then uses the strength and the power of 45 Members to say no, we won't let you adjourn it to consider the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Who does he think he is, Mr. Speaker? He may own

half of the northeast half of this province. No one denies that. But I will tell you that he doesn't control the farmers in the Huron municipality the way he thinks he does. Nobody does. That shows his complete and utter disregard for every farmer in this province. And it was completely unnecessary. We weren't asking for something that was unreasonable. The amendment was made today. It was a complicated amendment, it was a long amendment, and it was one that could have been presented to us an hour before it came to this House so we had a chance to study it. But did he have the courtesy? It has been done by other Ministers. It was done when we were the Government. We presented amendments and we had the courtesy to go to the person who made the motion and say, here is the amendment we are going to move. This will give you time to study it to see if it is the type of information that you want. But did the Minister of Agriculture have that courtesy this afternoon, after five weeks of having time to prepare an amendment? No, he said we don't have to consult with the Opposition or the people of Saskatchewan. All I have to do, Mr. Speaker, is say no, and my 45 colleagues will back me up, we don't have to provide the information.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I think that it wants to be made known on the records of this House for Members opposite, for the people in the country, for the Press and for everyone concerned that this afternoon the Opposition made a legitimate request to have an amendment that had never been debated before it was adjourned. And we were refused that privilege and on very few occasions is that ever done. As I mentioned it was only five minutes earlier that the Attorney General had the courtesy to allow us to adjourn a debate on an amendment that had never been debated. But oh no, the Minister of Agriculture said, no, we won't give you that courtesy and we won't give you that privilege.

Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason that we can assume that that refusal was given and that was because the Minister is afraid to give the information that we asked for. He hasn't got the courage to provide the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan with the information that has become so vital. And this is part of a pattern that has developed through this Session.

I go back to the Attorney General, who this afternoon showed some courtesy. But earlier in this Session he didn't show much courtesy. We had questions on the Order Paper that he asked if they could stand for one day which, again, has been a practice and we had no objection to it. He asked if it could stand for a second day and, again we took no objection. We said that is fine. A third day and a fourth day and a fifth day they asked to stand questions which normally are answered within 48 hours. We took no objection to this. Because as long as he was saying stand we thought that he was courteous enough to be saying to us that we were going to get the answer the next day. And then on the sixth day the arrogant Attorney General gets up and he doesn't say stand, showing that we are going to get the information, he says Motions for Return debatable. After six days of standing a question he says, Motion for Return debatable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you might fool a lot of people, but you don't fool the people on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — There is only one reason why he stood it for six days. That gave him one week more that he didn't have to provide the information that the people of Saskatchewan were entitled to. Then he brings it up for a motion debatable and then he wants to amend it and he adjourns it again. That is the pattern that has developed from the first day that we came into Session this year. They refuse to give us information on matters that are of the most vital concern to the people of this province.

Mr. Feduniak: — By 15 people.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, we are 15 people and I will admit that we are only 15, but I will tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, we are the last bulwark of freedom.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — All right there are 45 over there and we admit it. There are 45 trying to suppress the information that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — There are 45 of them like sheep following their leader saying, no, we won't give you that information. We don't want you to have the facts. We are the 15 courageous individuals who are prepared to stand up and fight to see that the people of Saskatchewan have the information that they are supposed to have. And it is on that basis, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this rural municipality of Huron . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — . . . that I stand up here tonight and I ask you and I ask Members opposite to allow us to adjourn the debate so that we can secure information that is required for the people of the rural municipality. But, again, you say no, so all I can say is that I support the motion for adjournment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the debate that the Opposition has been carrying on on this motion really does a great disservice to the people of the RM of Huron.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I have here the advertisement from the Western Producer of January 18, listing all of the land that was available for lease except that on a father to son transfer in the province. And let's look at RM No. 223, the RM of Huron. How many quarters were for lease? Not one!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — This is another example of

the Liberal Party of trying to interfere in transfers of land between father and son. This does a great disservice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — This does a great disservice to those transfers which are taking place in the RM of Huron. It is obvious that in the RM of Huron, as in the rest of this province, the Liberals are trying to find something, anything that they can discredit one of best agricultural programs that has ever come into this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — In the RM of Huron, as in the rest of this province and in the rest of this country, the Liberals have done nothing for the farmers. At no time have they done anything for the farmers. And I should like to turn for just a moment and talk about some of the things that were said by that student loan artist from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He is probably applying for another loan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — He was only making \$18,000 at the time, what do you expect?

Mr. Comer: — The Hon. Member from Athabasca got up in this House here tonight and said that this amendment to this motion dealing with the RM of Huron was something they had to have time to study. They had to have some time to study it. There has been motion after motion after motion in this House which is identical except for the name of the rural municipality and number. And the amendments that have come down on those motions have been identical. And if the Hon. Member from Athabasca and his 14 cohorts don't have the ability to figure out that those are identical amendments, I really wonder how they got here.

An Hon. Member: — It's the gerrymander that helped the one from Prince Albert West.

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fairly, I was going to say clever but I don't think it is clever, a fairly cheap subterfuge that the Liberal Party is trying to draw across the face of this Assembly here tonight. I certainly do not intend to support the motion as they presented it. I think the information will be fairly presented by the amendment presented by the Minister of Agriculture and I intend to support that amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter into this debate. Mr. Speaker, there have been some very weak efforts on the part of the Members on the opposite side that touch upon the debate every once in awhile. The Speaker has allowed such comments to get by. When are you going to get an answer, Mr. Speaker? You have allowed comments from the Hon. Member

March 6, 1973

from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) about Medicare. His discussions about Medicare in what the Liberals did with the poor and the sick and the aged, the old ones that he has given before. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Messer: — What about lawyers?

Mr. Lane: — If you want to discuss lawyers, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government Members we can certainly discuss . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — We'll discuss lawyers for a length of time after I get through my speech, Mr. Speaker, because there is a little principle here that the Members opposite have ignored, and that is the right, Mr. Speaker, of the public of Saskatchewan to know where their moneys are going. That is the right that the Government opposite is arrogantly taking away from the 15 Members and the public that we represent. Mr. Speaker, the real issue has been touched by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and that's the right to freedom in this Province of Saskatchewan and what the arrogant Members opposite are trying to do to the Opposition. They have brought in amendment after amendment which takes away all opportunity of the Opposition to get information.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before and I will say it again, it is not going to be the Government Members who decide what's a fair price and it is not going to be the NDP that decide, it is not going to be their political appointments to the Land Bank, including David Miner, Mr. Speaker, who are going to decide what is a fair price and it is not going to be the Opposition who decide what is a fair price. Now, the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, has made the comment that he is afraid to give us the information. He says his sole reason is that we will misinterpret it. He says that the Opposition will misinterpret it. We can misinterpret it, Mr. Speaker, but the farmers won't misinterpret it and that's what he is afraid of. We could spread all sorts of rumors, Mr. Speaker, and it is not going to be the farmer that is going to be fooled. It doesn't serve us one bit of good, Mr. Speaker, to make up rumors about the Land Bank. It is the Party opposite that is getting the rumors started and fanning the rumors and keeping the rumors going to try and encourage people to buy on the high price rumors that are going around. They are trying to keep people interested figuring that they will get more money for the land. They are trying to spread the rumors, Mr. Speaker, that it will be NDP supporters who get the best deal and that is why they are trying to keep that rumor going to keep their waning membership drive going.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue on this is whether the Government opposite intends to give the people their right to know the information of where their moneys are going. That right, Mr. Speaker, is being thrown out the window by the arrogant Government opposite. Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite has stated, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) has stated, that he notices that all the rumors seem to come from the RM of Morse or the constituency of Morse. If it is agreed by the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everybody will take note of the fact that we will endeavor, in the next couple

of days to give the Members opposite an opportunity to debate every rural municipality in the province and we are going to endeavor to answer the critics opposite and secondly, to get the people in these RMs the information to which they are entitled, the information to know where their money is going, the information to know what is a fair price for land and what the deal is with the Land Bank. Because, Mr. Speaker, right now a deal with the Land Bank is a bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan. That is what the Minister of Agriculture is asking us to vote on by his proposing this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Why are they lined up at the office . . .

Mr. Lane: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite have been somewhat hypersensitive about this whole thing and somewhat afraid to give us the answers and they have all avoided the issue whenever they have got up and spoken. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a review of exactly what we are debating here should be of interest to the Members opposite and it could apply specifically to the RM No. 223, the Rural Municipality of Huron, Mr. Speaker. Let's just simply review what answers we are trying to get.

The number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission. That seems fairly innocuous. But they are afraid to give us the answer. The number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved. Again, seemingly simple. What are they afraid of? The number of purchases that have actually been completed. What are you afraid of? The land number of each quarter section involved. What are you afraid of? The acreage cultivated in each quarter section. What are you afraid of? The acreage of native grass in these quarter sections. Again, what are you afraid of? The assessed value of each quarter section. What are you afraid of?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Not a thing.

Mr. Lane: — Not a thing, but let's look at the last question and the price offered for each quarter section. That's what they are afraid of. They are afraid to give us the information and they say it will be coming in due course. Mr. Speaker, if an election is called in the spring of 1974, the information stated by the Government Opposite will never be tabled in this House and no information will be given to the Members on this side of the House. That is precisely what they are trying to do, Mr. Speaker. They are so afraid of what they are doing in the deals that they are coming up with that they are afraid to give us the information.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that we polled the Members opposite, that we took a look and just see exactly where each of the Members stands and what each of the Members opposite, with their supposed New Deal for People, their supposed concerns for the people. Well let's go through and ask each one, Mr. Speaker, how concerned they are for the people in the RM of Huron No. 223.

The first one I think we have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris). What is he afraid of.

Mr. Speaker? Why is he afraid to give us this information that we ask in the Return No. 109? Why is he afraid? Why is the Member from Arm River afraid to give us the price, without a doubt he knows the price of the deals going in his constituency. How is the Member from Arm River certain that the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is getting the same price for his land or the same fair price. He knows, he knows what the people are getting. Well, let's ask and find out from the Member from Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange). Why is the Member from Assiniboia-Bengough afraid? Afraid to tell us what the price is. Has he got some shady little deal going on down in Assiniboia-Bengough that he is afraid of. Is that what he is afraid of? Is he afraid that somebody is buying from the Land Bank or leasing from the Land Bank because he had an NDP membership and is getting a better price? Is that what he is afraid of?

That is the question that is before this House, Mr. Speaker. I turn to the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley), the Member from Biggar, what is he afraid of? What has he got to hide? Are there any deals in his constituency that they inflated the price or deflated the price or that gave a preference to NDP membership holders?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — No.

Mr. Lane: — The Minister of Agriculture says, no. Then why is the Minister of Finance afraid to give us the price, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — He's not.

Mr. Lane: — Well, why not table it, that is all we are asking. Well, let's ask the Hon. Member from Canora, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) we have to ask, what he is afraid of. Are you afraid of some shady deal in your constituency that you don't want the public to know? Is that what you are afraid of?

Hon. Mr. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege please. The Member is accusing me that I am afraid to indicate the prices paid for land in my constituency. This is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. Lane: — We'll certainly give the Hon. Member from Canora an opportunity to stand before this House and tell us in this motion, in this debate, exactly what the prices paid for each quarter in his section, because he is prepared to tell us. He had admitted before this House, Mr. Speaker, that he knows. If that doesn't concern the people from the RM of Huron, nothing else will, Mr. Speaker. Because that is what we are talking about. The Member admits that he knows the prices. The Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) has admitted that he knows the prices. Now surely the people in the RM of Huron are entitled to know, Mr. Speaker. That is what we are discussing and I hope that those Members have the courage to stand up and tell us.

I have just been handed a note, Mr. Speaker, we note the number of Cabinet Ministers missing. Are they all having a meeting in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. Speaker: — It is an interesting debate, but I think we better stay close to the resolution. Some of the Members haven't spoken who have been brought into this debate, they haven't spoken. Let's stay to the motion please.

Mr. Lane: — Well, we are certainly speaking on behalf of the people in the RM of Huron, Mr. Speaker, and that is what is the issue in this debate. Now, it concerns the people in the RM of Huron that the Member from Canora knows the prices to his land . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the Hon. Member and I think he realizes the fact is definitely getting away from the motion. I think we best stay to the motion. We have got several more motions yet to go over and we can't have a repetition of debate on every one.

Mr. Lane: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Member from Canora would wish to compare the prices that are in the RM of Huron . . .

Mr. Speaker: — He has not spoken in this debate. And no Member can question another private Member, you can question Ministers.

Mr. Lane: — I am not questioning him, Mr. Speaker. I am just anxiously awaiting what he has to say in the debate, that he knows. We have certainly given him all of the ramifications of what he can talk about that are relevant to the question here. We will be welcoming and awaiting with a great deal of anticipation the remarks from the Member from Canora.

But, Mr. Speaker, we can go on. What does the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) think about the RM of Huron, if they are getting a fair deal that they are not being told the price and that his Government is afraid to tell them, the people of the RM of Huron, the price of each quarter. We have to ask ourselves why the Member from Cut Knife is afraid to tell the RM of Huron what the price of that land is. Mr. Speaker, why is he afraid? Was there a shady deal that he is trying to cover up here?

Mr. Speaker: — I must rule that type of a debate out of order. I shall have to call the gentleman to order if he insists. I think the Hon. Member realizes that he is trying to prolong the debate which is perfectly agreeable with me but stay with the motion.

Mr. Lane: — Are the Members opposite finished, Mr. Speaker? I think I've got a right to go through every Member of this Legislative body and just find out what their concern is for the people in the RM of Huron, which we are discussing, Mr. Speaker, and which is an issue here. That is the price offered for each quarter section and that is the motion before this House and I am merely asking each of the Members on the Government side what are they afraid of when we are discussing the RM of Huron. I don't think that is an improper question, Mr. Speaker. The fact that I do it on an individual basis rather than asking the Government opposite shouldn't make any difference. That is

precisely what I am doing. I am looking at each Member opposite to find out what they have against this motion, what they are afraid to talk about when we are dealing with the RM of Huron and the real question, the price offered for each quarter section. Mr. Speaker, that is all I am doing. If the Members opposite get a little upset, a little touchy about this whole question, it shouldn't rule out the debate, Mr. Speaker.

We now have to ask the Member from Cut Knife what he thinks. I didn't get an answer about what he thinks about the RM of Huron No. 223 and the price offered for each quarter. What is he afraid of, to tell the people of Huron, Mr. Speaker? Why would he be afraid? Has he got something else that he is hiding that he is afraid to bring out in the RM of Huron? Why are they afraid to give us the answer, Mr. Speaker?

We can go to the Member from Elrose (Mr. Owens), Mr. Speaker. What is he afraid of to tell the people from the RM of Huron? He is hiding his face now, Mr. Speaker, he is hiding behind his desk. Maybe we should ask the Hon. Member from Elrose if he won't give us all the information of the land sold to the Land Bank in his constituency. Why is he afraid to tell the people in the RM of Huron? Why is he afraid to tell the people in the RM of Huron what's a fair price offered for each quarter section. Mr. Speaker, why is he afraid? I thought it was a New Deal for People expressed by the Member. Their concern with the people, Mr. Speaker, and yet he refuses to tell the people from the RM of Huron what their rights are and what the Government is giving for land in that constituency.

We go on to the junior Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), why is he afraid? Why is he afraid to tell the people in the RM of Huron what was the price offered for each quarter section? What does he have to hide? Why is he afraid? Oh, he is leaving the House now, Mr. Speaker. He is really afraid to tell the people of the RM of Huron. Why won't he tell the people from the RM of Huron the price offered for each quarter section? What is he afraid of? We can ask the Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway), what deals happened in his constituency that he is afraid to tell the people from the RM of Huron.

Hon. Mr. Mostoway: — . . .

Mr. Lane: — Well, the Speaker is trying to maintain some decorum and keep you on the issue. He has so far failed, I mean if you want to open it up, we'll open it up.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Hanley is afraid to tell the people from the RM of Huron. He is really afraid and he wants to cloud up the issue by putting things back or what happened under the Liberal Government, which is exactly what the Premier has been doing for two years which is wearing a little thin and his credibility goes down and down.

Mr. Speaker, we can now go back to the Treasury Benches and we can ask the Hon. Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I am going to call the Member's attention to Beauchesne, page 107, 34 section 2:

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman after having called the

the attention of the House, or of the Committee, to the conduct of a Member who persisted in irrelevance or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech.

Now, I am not trying to direct the Member to discontinue his speech but I am saying that it is irrelevant and repetitious. I don't want to impose this rule but I am asking the Member to get to the motion and not be irrelevant and repetitious.

Mr. Lane: — I find it hard to determine what is repetitious, Mr. Speaker, when we are going back and asking each individual Member and every question is different as we go through each individual Member. Now, Mr. Speaker, you call it repetitious. Never, never, Mr. Speaker, is bringing to the attention of the public and to the attention of this House, a wrong created by the Government, repetition. It is never wrong when that happens, Mr. Speaker, and that is precisely what we are trying to do. We are trying to get the Members opposite to reconsider and we are obviously not going to do it with the grasping clutch that the Cabinet has over the backbenchers. We are going to go through and ask each individual to express what they really feel and tell us why they are afraid. We want them to tell us why they are afraid to give us an answer to the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that that answers the objection to the way I was proceeding. I didn't get an answer, he is obviously not in the House, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will he give us an answer to the question on the motion that is before this House? So we will have to move on to another Member of the Treasury Benches and, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he is not in the House, and that is the Hon. Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and why he won't tell the people of the RM of Huron about . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I must warn the Member that I shall apply this rule if this persists, if this continues.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, if I may draw your attention to the first part of the rule — that any Member addressing the House, if called to order either by Mr. Speaker or on a point raised by another Member, shall sit down while the point is being stated, after which he may explain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does seem that the point that you have raised is worthy of some discussion and explanation. This matter is one that this side of the House regards as something of fairly major importance and we wish to underline the importance of this. Consequently I call upon Mr. Speaker to recognize the overriding event that is occurring here tonight. That overriding event as I see it is the pressure by the Government to continue a debate after having placed before us today an amendment for the first time and refusing it.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you speaking on what has happened or on my rule?

Mr. MacLeod: — I come to the point I have in mind, Mr. Speaker. Because of the importance of this matter, because of the importance that we attach to it, we think it is only fair that we have the right not to say where does the Government stand, but to say in

effect, where does the Member for Turtleford stand.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I can't entertain that as a debate on the ruling at all. The Hon. Member has the book right before him and he can read Citation No. 2 and I think the hon. gentleman knows what the words are. I must say that I cannot permit irrelevance or repetition to an overextended point.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, is that in effect, what you are saying as I understand it, is that it is irrelevant for us to demand to know where they stand. Surely not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, we fail to understand why the Government Members opposite are afraid to give us the information that is set out in this Motion for Return. I have read it, Mr. Speaker, and I have gone through each particular part of it and just like sheep all the backbenchers follow the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and do what they are told and not what their conscience dictates.

Mr. Speaker, we have had admissions from the Members opposite that they know the price of land in their own constituencies that come before the Land Bank. Then why, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Feduniak: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Member said that the Members know the price. Now that is a lie because I don't know the price.

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

Mr. Lane: — Is he going to withdraw the statement, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member said that is a lie. He didn't say that the Member is lying, he said it was a lie. Well, he is out of order so I have ruled him out of order.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think that if the Hon. Member said that it is a lie, then whether he is out of order or whether he isn't, certainly he should withdraw it for the benefit of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — If it is indicated that any Member is deliberately lying he must withdraw. But he said that statements made was a lie and at that time I interrupted him and ruled him out of order, because it was not a Point of Order, it was a debating point.

Mr. Lane: — If the Hon. Member would quit being so concerned about fighting the Opposition in the hallways and pay attention to the debate here, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't be having these problems.

Mr. Speaker, we fail to see when Government Members opposite know what prices are, why on earth the people of Saskatchewan can't know. In particular why the people of the RM of Huron can't know the price offered for each quarter section of land. They are entitled to know and they are entitled to know what their neighbor paid. They are entitled to know how they can adjust their own personal accounts and whether they should even be considering the Land Bank. They are entitled to know for that reason. They are entitled to know whether they should even be considering selling to the Land Bank if competitive prices are such that that is an outlet for them.

That supposedly is what this whole program was designed for, Mr. Speaker. And the Minister of Agriculture has the gall to stand up in this House and completely defeat what the purpose of the Land Bank was and that was to supposedly give a fair deal to the people of Saskatchewan. Yet the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, prepare to hide from the people in the RM of Huron what the price was. Why are they afraid? That is the question that we ask.

Why is each individual Member opposite afraid to stand up and tell the Members in this House and the people of Saskatchewan what is a fair price? What they are renting the land for?

These are the rumors, Mr. Speaker, that are going around in the RM. Are they giving better deals to their NDP supporters? They say, no, but how do we know? How do they know that they are not? That's the question and they know the answer. Why aren't they giving them to this Chamber?

Mr. Speaker, the rumors are going around that the NDP are getting better deals for the land. The Government says, no, they are not. I am prepared to accept that but if they know, why are they afraid to tell us, Mr. Speaker? If they all know it why are they afraid to tell us?

In the RM of Huron, have they bought land from young farmers who had overextended themselves in order to get them out of a financial bind? They say, no. How do they know, Mr. Speaker? The question, again, is how do they know? If they know the answers, as elected Members of this Chamber, why, why, Mr. Speaker, are they afraid to give us the answers?

Mr. Speaker, that is the issue, that is the reason for this particular debate. As I said the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) in this debate has said that all the rumors come from the constituency of Morse. It is the Government opposite that is forcing the Opposition to bring in every RM, from every constituency, to show that the rumors that are going around this province are starting in every constituency, every RM around this province, not just the RM of Huron, Mr. Speaker. That is the subject matter of this debate. But they want it opened up in every RM, they want to debate every RM. They want to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that they do have something to fear, that they do have something to hide. And yet they have asked the Opposition to table the Motions for Returns.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have further comments to make in the future. I am going to turn this over to another hon. gentleman on this side, but I urge every Member on that side when they know the answers to these questions, when the Members opposite have admitted in this House that they know the answers,

March 6, 1973

not to keep it quiet to protect their own members. Is that the reason? They know the prices in their own constituencies and yet, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid to give us the answer and are afraid to tell us and the people of Saskatchewan. Freedom is an issue, democracy is an issue and the utter arrogance of 45 Members opposite is an issue in this. I ask, Mr. Speaker, the support of this House on this Motion.

Mr. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe I could wait and smoke one of them out but apparently they are not going to say anything.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why the Members opposite won't let us adjourn this debate. It was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) who moved the amendment and we should have time to consider that motion.

I have never seen a more blatant abuse of power than has been used here this afternoon in all the time that I have been in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Just because you fellows have 45 sitting over there and only 15 here, doesn't mean to say that you can steamroller business over us.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government would not let the Opposition adjourn this debate, not once but twice, they are trying to steamroller the Opposition into submission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — When the Opposition Member asked to adjourn the debate he stated that he had some figures that he wanted to obtain before going ahead with the Resolution, before it was voted on. I don't think this was an unreasonable request, yet the Members opposite wouldn't allow him the time to get this additional information.

If that isn't a blatant abuse of power, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — What are they trying to hide? That is what the people of Saskatchewan are asking. When I heard the biggest little man from Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) try to tie the pulp mill into the Land Bank, this just seemed to be beyond comprehension. I can't see the connection whatsoever. You know, Mr. Speaker, the reason we want these figures is that the farmers are telling us that they know of land in their areas that has been up for sale for several years and the owners have never been able to get the price that they have been asking. But all of a sudden the Land Bank comes along and pays them anywhere from \$2,000 to \$5,000 more than they have been asking. People are wondering what is going on.

The Minister says the price of land is not in the public interest and yet in the next breath he says that it is public

knowledge. All they have to do is go out to the Land Titles Office and they can obtain it. Well, let's get together on this. Either it isn't public information or it is.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government is spending some \$30 million of the taxpayers' money, that money is yours and mine, I think that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know how that money is being spent. As someone has said, the NDP Land Bank will go down in history as one of the most insidious schemes ever perpetrated on the citizens of Saskatchewan.

I was going to say farmers, Mr. Speaker, but I must include all the people in Saskatchewan because they are the taxpayers and they are the ones who are putting up the \$30 million, and perhaps double that, before those people opposite are through. They have a right to know.

Mr. Speaker, I recall some of the Members opposite saying that this Land Bank originated with the Regina Manifesto back in 1933. It is no wonder that they don't want to give the price of land in Huron No. 223. They want to sneak as many land purchases through before people realize what is happening. If this is not the case, let us know what is going on. Let the people of Saskatchewan know what is going on.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture told the people of Saskatchewan how and why he is spending their money in Huron No. 223. And what kind of value he is getting for each dollar spent of the taxpayers' dollar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there should be no reason in the world why they want to hold up this Motion and let us adjourn it. Therefore, I am in favor of the Motion to adjourn.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, this Motion before us dealing with an Order of the Assembly for Return No. 109 is one that I think deserves more serious, more honest, more sincere consideration than some of my hon. friends opposite have been giving this question.

This is a Motion, after all, Mr. Speaker, that is designed to throw a few rays of light on the entire issues surrounding the birth of the NDP Land Bank, issues that so far have been beclouded and enshrouded and in which the Government opposite has done nothing to clarify for not only some of the Members of the House, but all of the citizens of the province.

I think it is noteworthy that we are taking the amount of time on this Motion that we are, and I suggest that it is well worth the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize this point at this particular time.

Since taking office the NDP Government opposite have made a number of rather questionable moves with respect to various things. The Land Bank legislation that was introduced about one year ago, and was then later debated and enacted and made law, has been policy of this province for a good 12-month period. It was introduced late in the session and it was conceived, as someone said, as far back as early in the '30s. It was a part of the New Deal for People. It, along with many

other pieces of legislation that we saw last year, didn't come in until late. And when the ideas had been conceived in a general kind of way we can appreciate that it did take the Government some time to devise and spell out the details. But they didn't spell them out and the scheme has been active and has been operating for close to a 12-month period.

Mr. Speaker, why this question is so important with respect to offers to purchase, price paid, appraisal system and other aspects dealing with the Municipality of Huron, is because this Land Bank Commission deals with a brand new system of land tenure in the Province of Saskatchewan. A system of land tenure that is a total change from the historic approach to land ownership that we have seen in this province and, indeed this country, for many, many years. When we asked the Government opposite to tell us the number of applications to sell land to the Land Bank Commission, the number that were received in this municipality the RM No. 223, we are asking to try and determine the interest that this principle has aroused across the province. We know there are many land transactions going on, of course, across the province through the normal channels, from one farmer, one neighbor to another, through the normal real estate channels that have handled sales of land in this province for many, many years. Surely, it is important that as this new venture is getting launched in the province, that we know how many requests and what kind of interest is being generated by the Land Bank Commission.

I think the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in this debate pointed out that the Motion that we are now debating has been in front of the House, in one form or another, for almost six weeks. Now there is one more aspect of this that is now effective, Mr. Speaker, that is worth considering, I think. Since this Motion was put before the House, this Government has made several other moves that make it more imperative as to why we should get some answers to the questions that are asked.

Just a week or so ago we learned that they are stepping out not only in the land business, but in the livestock business in a very major way in this province. Here are two major bases of the entire agricultural economy, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you, Sir, that this Government has every obligation immediately to give us all of the details with respect to land transactions by the Land Bank Commission in RM 223. Why is the . . .

Hon. Mr. Messer: — For the . . .

Mr. McIsaac: — We do not know that, Mr. Speaker. Of course there could have been room for several dozen transactions since the time the question was put before the House.

Why is this motion before us, Mr. Speaker, with respect to RM 223? Because of the concern, because of the rumors and the apprehension of farmers in the municipality of Huron No. 223 with respect to the purchasing policies of the Land Bank Commission. Now the concerns of the farmers in this municipality, Mr. Attorney General, I suggest are typical of the concerns of farmers of many municipalities in the province. I know, for example, that many of my constituents from RM 410, 411, RM of Buffalo No. 409 and several others, have expressed similar concern with respect to details of the purchasing policy of the

Land Bank Commission. The same can be said for others of my municipalities. According to the paper the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has before him, there are very few municipalities up there that are listed in that particular paper. This certainly hasn't stopped the rumors and the genuine concern that has been expressed by many, many ratepayers of my municipalities who are in a similar situation as the residents of RM 223. While there have been no transactions as reported in the Press there have been many rumors of attempts at transactions at various price offers and so on and so forth.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could have avoided this entire question, this entire motion, this entire debate had he chosen and seen fit at the beginning of the Session to make available to Members the policies concerning the Land Bank and make available to the farmers of this province all of the policies concerning purchase, land appraisal, method of payment and so on and so forth. I suggest, again, that there are many people, many people, in the RM of Huron and, indeed, in other municipalities who are anxious to purchase land, trying to make deals, trying to buy land and as long as and until there are more facts known about the Land Bank transactions some of these people are having real difficulty in closing deals and, indeed, in making deals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is one other key aspect not only is this a brand new agency, it is a public agency. It is one that has been touted by the NDP as a God-send to farmers, it is publicly supported, publicly funded, publicly subsidized and an agency that will undoubtedly seriously affect land transactions in this province until the Liberals form the Government in two year's time. We must open up some of the beclouded secrecy surrounding this entire Land Bank. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way that we can support the Minister's amendment in this respect.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the debate as it has progressed to this stage. It has been a very interesting one from our side. As far as the Government is concerned though it certainly is a debate that might well have been missed without a great deal of loss. The Government Members seem to have operated like stones skipping across the water, occasionally they have touched the surface, but that is about it. The failure to obey the rules concerns me a considerable amount. The courtesy of not allowing the adjournment earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker, is one that is shocking to any of us who have a high regard for the rules of the House and the courtesies that have been developed over the years in this place. All the rules aren't just written in the rule book, Mr. Speaker, many of them are customs developed over the years designed to make the House operate more effectively and for the benefit of the people.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks it is my intention to move a subamendment to the Resolution. In an effort to be reasonable, Mr. Speaker, and in an effort to try to make a breakthrough that will accommodate us with the type of information that is necessary, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, allowing the Government to save some face. Consequently when the motion is in and the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, there will

be no difficulty by the Government to support it.

There are one or two things I should like to consider and touch on before I get to that point however. The Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) went through a series of gyrations and I have some sympathy for him. I recognize that when 75 per cent of your speech is out of order you have some difficulty in following your train of thought as you progress through the speech. Therefore, I shall make every effort to be very charitable to the Member because I recognize the kind of difficulty he faced. It is, however, a little unfortunate that he suggested that our position was uncertain, because, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if he thinks our position is uncertain he hasn't been paying much attention to the position that we have adopted up to now. I recommend to the Member and to others that they listen to what is being said because they may hear a loud voice getting louder and louder as 1975 approaches.

Our position, Mr. Speaker, has been very simple throughout this whole thing, very clear-cut. We have not attempted to hide the position that we have taken, which is this: That we believe this whole Land Bank is conceived for the purpose of assisting farmers to transfer land to others. It is not intended to be a device. If one believed the document misentitled New Deal for People, I believe it is a Nothing Deal for People, but if one believes page 1 of New Deal for People where they say that they would establish a Land Bank Commission to lease the land guaranteeing tenure with option to buy. Mr. Speaker, if the Government had stayed a little bit closer to its election promises they might have had a little less difficulty from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we clearly oppose the position of the Land Bank as it has been stated. But that isn't the question before us today. The question before us today is a question of information. A question of fair treatment. We find it inconceivable. Mr. Speaker, that the Government should not have published something in the order of a schedule of land prices. When the Power Corporation goes out to set a number of poles in people's land they have as schedule of prices that they will pay related to the land assessment. This, in effect, is a purchase of land. They are going to acquire some rights from the farmer, take those rights away from him for the good of the community, for the good of all and they are going to pay. They publish the schedule and there is a right of appeal and the usual procedure. What the Government has done here is operate more in a cloak and dagger fashion. There are going to be some very unhappy people who discover that the land sold by them for \$80 an acre could well have been sold for \$95 or \$100 an acre, if the neighbor, in fact, received that kind of price. The Government ought not to be a negotiator of that kind. The Government ought not to try to squeeze one member of the community, benefitting one, squeezing another.

The entire question before us today is the question of providing fairly, freely and fully, information to the Opposition, not just for our sake, but for the sake of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Our position is not in any way negative. We believe

that the position we have adopted is a step from which we cannot return, as stated by the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) it is a position from which we will not return. We will not turn from that position and we are quite prepared to take our position to the people of Saskatchewan in 1974 or 1975 whenever the Premier has the courage to call an election.

Mr. Speaker, one or two of the Members opposite said that there is some difficulty for us to recognize the truth. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that they are not prepared to trust us with the truth or the people of Saskatchewan. If the people of Saskatchewan cannot be trusted with the truth, then the Government perhaps has overestimated their own abilities and underestimated the ability of the people of Saskatchewan. We do suspect that one or more of the Members of the Government do, in fact, know the prices paid in their neighborhood. We do suspect that one or more of these Members may well have used it for the advantage of his constituents, perhaps with a party card. We are not suggesting that this is known to every Member, but we do suggest and we strongly suspect that it is known by some of them.

One of the basic problems here is, of course, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, in an effort to put an air of reasonableness on it, has said, "We will make all this information available at some time." That "some time" is like the cycle budgeting, it is without a beginning and without an end. Mr. Speaker, it would be the year-end of the Land Bank. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he is attempting to try to sell us and the people of Saskatchewan on a year of indefinite length. We believe that the beginning of the Land Bank may well have commenced very shortly after it was inaugurated and consented to in this House, and that a year would occur some 12 months later. With the efforts of the Government it is very possible, Mr. Speaker, that we are about to see an alteration in the length of time of a year. We may well have expected that a year would be 12 months, or 365 days, give or take approximately a day. We will allow a day on Leap Year. We may well see, Mr. Speaker, the longest year in history. This may well run starting April 1, 1973 ending March 31, 1974 with an indefinite period of time thereafter to prepare these materials, compile the information, print the document and supply it to the Members. This is nothing more nor less than a deliberate attempt by the Government to pretend to make something available at a reasonable date in the future, when in fact they have no intention of providing it at all. Certainly not in 1973, probably not in 1974, perhaps not even until after an election in 1975. Then, of course, I assure, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the day with Members from this side sitting in those chairs across the way will provide the information. We will provide it fully and freely so that the people of Saskatchewan know exactly what the Government is doing. There will be no hidden land.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it would come as some surprise to a citizen of the RM of Huron No. 223 that his little municipality would become one of the last bastions of freedom, one of the real battle grounds . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — . . . going down in history with Wolfe's conquest, with the battle for independence. Mr. Speaker, the people of the RM

March 6, 1973

of Huron must be quietly proud tonight as the information from this battleground is brought back to them.

There was a question raised by one of the Hon. Members, I believe by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) who wanted to know where Huron was.

An Hon. Member: — He didn't know!

Mr. MacLeod: — We believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should provide him with whatever information we have, and we wish he would return the courtesy on occasion. The RM of Huron is situated — the citizens of Huron have had the pleasure which they have accepted of voting for the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — In addition to good judgment, Mr. Speaker, they have been blessed by the opportunity of going down in history as a fair and valiant people protected by 15 strong and valiant people in this House. Towns of Tugaskie and Eyebrow . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . Wounded Knee?

Mr. MacLeod: — Not even Wounded Elbow is in that one.

An Hon. Member: — You wanted to know where it was.

An Hon. Member: — You didn't know.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, you did!

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I watch with considerable interest what appears to be a ping pong ball of a conversation. I certainly wouldn't want to slow it down in any way. If I hinder this private conversation by standing, I'll certainly sit for a moment, but only for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to look at the original motion in its pure form, to take a look at what they have done to it. Now the first part of it asks: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission. That has been altered to the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission. Now, the Hon. Minister failed to indicate any reason why the alteration, unless there is a reason for not appraising all the land for which applications were received. And if it is the intention of the Government to be selective, I rather hope that, in due course, they will either rectify the mistake, rectify the wrong that they have done, or else tell us why they are only appraising a certain portion of the lands for which they have applications to sell.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of amendment we think is made for a no good purpose other than to amend. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not our desire to quarrel with the amendment, if the Government has its heart set on it and in an effort to improve the quality of the answers and to give them a fair scope to

provide reasonable information, certainly far short of what we did ask in the original Motion, we do want to find out a few things. We don't ask them any more to tell us the price of the land. The price offered for each quarter section is not something that we will continue to press for, at least at this particular moment, not until 9:30 or tomorrow.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do think there are some things that would be interesting. We think we should know the amount of the appraisal. It is obvious from the first part of their amendment that they have appraised land that has been offered for sale. And we think in fairness they should tell us what the appraisal was. No reason at all why we should not know what the Land Bank itself thinks the land is worth. We do think, Mr. Speaker, that if there are offers to sell land, if the Land Bank has made offers to purchase land and if these have not been carried out or taken up, we think that surely we should know what is happening and why not.

We wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there was an area in which more was paid for land than the appraised value. And if appraisers for the Land Bank Commission are prepared to tell us that land is worth \$82 an acre and they say that their appraised value is \$82 an acre, surely we are entitled to know if the Government should happen to pay \$92 an acre for it. So while we don't ask for the sale price of the land, because quite obviously we are not going to get it, that is only temporary and frankly we think we are entitled to it and the Government is simply playing games or they would give it to us. But, Mr. Speaker, we think that we are entitled to know those cases in which more was paid for land than the Government appraised the land at.

Now if there were a number of offers made, Mr. Speaker, and if the offers were not accepted because the farmer thought the price was too low, we would be interested to know if any increase in the price was offered to the farmer, and if so, how much. I am talking about how much the increase was. How much the Government seemed determined to pay to grab the land. We think we should know the amount of that increase. And so when I come to the amendment I will be obliged to put something in about that. We think that we should know something about the cultivated acreage that is purchased. We don't want to know the amount of dollars paid for each quarter section in the subamendment. But what we are going to ask for is the total amount of cultivated acreage bought in Huron in each month and we want to know the total number of dollars paid in each month for the cultivated acreage. So that gives the Government a fair amount of latitude. If you paid \$80 for some cultivated acreage, \$90 for others, we won't know that arising out of our subamendment. We will just simply know that in the RM of Huron you will, in fact, have paid, say about perhaps 1,000 acres and that you will have paid a total of so many dollars for that acreage.

The same thing applies to seeded pasture. Same thing applies to native grass. We do think, Mr. Speaker, that we should find out the ratio of the actual purchase price to the assessed value. Surely there should be some reasonable relationship between the two and that this should develop as we discover the pattern across the province.

Mr. Speaker, if land is being bought at three and one-half times assessed value in one area and four and one-half times assessed value in another area, five and one-half times assessed

value in a different area, we should like to know why the difference. Surely to goodness there is a reason, unless the reason is that the assessment is in error. We should also like to know the length of time it takes to administer this thing. How long between the various applications. How long does it take the Land Bank Commission to process these things? We believe that these items are all matters of considerable concern to us. If the Land Bank Commission receives an application the 10th of February, completes it the 20th of August, we might reasonably wonder why the delay. We might reasonably wonder what has occurred in the meantime.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to try to reach some concord and some general consensus of the kind of information that we may reasonably expect to receive not only on this Resolution but on subsequent Motions for Return. And it is to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that item No. 1 and 2 which have already gone by and item Nos. 4 and 5 and 6 and 7, which are yet to come on the Order Paper tonight, are very similar in tone and vein. They ask for the same kind of information.

Mr. Speaker, if we can develop a rational way of asking for and receiving information from the Government we would be glad to adopt that for subsequent motions at this time. Now this doesn't in any way, Mr. Speaker, intend to imply nor do I wish to give any misinformation about this. Mr. Speaker, we believe that we and the people of Saskatchewan are entitled, on a current basis, to have the information sought in proposed Motion for Return No. 109 dealing with the valiant rural municipality of Huron No. 223.

If, Mr. Speaker, the date was troublesome to them, as of January 25, 1973, and that date was chosen because it was the date of the opening of this Third Session of the Seventeenth Legislature, if that date was inconvenient to them, certainly we would have been willing to consider an adjustment to that date. We recognize that certain administrative difficulties might have required that the date be December 31st or for that matter January 31st, presuming that this Land Bank will operate on a regular month. Although one is led to wonder about that having regard to the kind of thing that the Hon. Minister offers us for a year. I have no doubt that he will give some thought to altering the month end to something other than a month end. And perhaps we will be treated to the fascinating spectacle of a month of 36 or 38 days. One never knows.

I recall from history that this type of thing occurred on a previous occasion when a Pope, on one occasion, arrived at a town on a Friday. And in those days the good friends of the Catholic persuasion did not eat meat. And it was, of course, not well that the Pope should arrive at that celebration and not be treated to a feast of meat so he declared the day to be Thursday. So that day week, of course, had two Thursdays and no Friday.

I have no doubt that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will have thought of something of that sort. He will have some difficulty in persuading us that he is of the same eminence and we may even have the impertinence to question him should he attempt to alter the length of a month or the length of a year.

On that same particular topic, Mr. Speaker, if January 25, 1973 were an inconvenient time to provide this information

certainly we would have considered some delay. If the Hon. Minister had undertaken to provide us with the information at a year end and which I presumed all along would have been March 31, 1973. I would have presumed that the Hon. Minister if he acted rationally and if he acted reasonably would have adopted the same fiscal period that has been good enough for the Province of Saskatchewan for quite some time. Surely that same period might well have been acceptable to the Land Bank Commission.

The only other logical date, Mr. Speaker, might well have been December 31st. And if the Hon. Minister is intending to tell us that December 31 will be the year end, because the period coincides precisely with a calendar year, truly we shall receive only a partial year for the first report. But we, on this side of the House and this Opposition acting as always, with complete reasonableness and fairness, would have accepted that without question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will be proposing an amendment here. But before doing so I should like, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to answer the Member if I could just hear what he had to say. And I am sure that the question was very pertinent and penetrating. Regrettably I didn't hear exactly what it was he said but I would be delighted to give him an answer clear and concise.

Mr. Speaker, having as clearly and as lucidly as is possible with the tremendous assistance that one gets in this House – I wouldn't want the Hon. Members to think that I am ungrateful for the help that they have all offered. We certainly do appreciate it. We certainly don't want to make it sound that we are ungrateful at all for all the assistance that has been suggested. I hope, in return, that the Hon. Minister will recognize in our amendment a sincere and serious effort to provide reasonable information without in any way, without in any way infringing upon the privacy of deals that are still impending. Without in any way attempting to undermine a particular transaction in Huron. I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government may well have got off the hook on this one pretty quickly by saying, yes, we will provide all the information you ask because there are no deals. They seem to have said over and over again, or seemed to imply that there are no deals. They haven't bought any land in Huron.

One is led to doubt the credibility of the Members of the Government, when we compare that kind of a statement with their stubborn refusal to provide us with information.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore, move the following subamendment to that offered by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I move that:

Return No. 109 be further amended by adding after the last word thereof the following:

- 1) the amount of each appraisal
- 2) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have not been accepted and the reason
- 3) the number of offers which were for more than the appraised value
- 4) the number of offers which were not accepted but which were increased and then accepted, and in each case the amount of the increase

- 5) the total number of cultivated acres purchased each month and the total amount paid for such cultivated acres each month
- 6) the total number of acres seeded to pasture purchased each month and the total amount paid for such acres each month
- 7) the total number of acres in native grass purchased each month and the total amount paid for such acres each month
- 8) with respect to each quarter section purchased, the ratio of the price per acre to assessed value
- 9) the length of time between receipt of each application and completion of the transaction, identifying the land to which each relates and giving date of completion for each.

Mr. Speaker: — This motion that was just submitted is a motion for Return No. 109 to be further amended. I think the rules are plain that an amendment deals with the motion but a subamendment must seek to amend the amendment.

The motion that I have now before me submitted with suggested further amendment by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), seeks to further amend the motion 109. I have checked the ruling and it, as a subamendment, must deal with the amendment. If the motion itself should be further amended then that must wait until the amendment itself is disposed of. Or if they wish to they can enlarge on the amendment but not deal with the motion. So this is dealing with the motion, so I rule it out of order.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend from Albert Park intended knowing the rules as he does, I am sure it was the amended motion that he intended to amend. I am sure that it was none other than the amendment that he intended to relate the subamendment – at least that is how I understood it as I sat here and listened to him.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I assume that Mr. Speaker having ruled that the amendment which I handed to you, being out of order, does not in effect exist. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker could clarify that because as I sat down, of course, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of only allowing you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member has completed his exercise of his rights to speak on this motion and the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — With respect to this Resolution, the amendment – sorry, are you on a Point of Order?

Mr. MacLeod: — Point of Order. Surely the Hon. Member doesn't presume to speak during the period that I am on my feet discussing the matter with Mr. Speaker. This is a private discussion. This is a discourtesy that is certainly a shame and a shock to me.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Speak to the point before us.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit to Mr. Speaker the following, the amendment, in this form. Now, Mr. Speaker, having handed it in and Mr. Speaker in effect having sent it back saying that that motion is not in order, I would move, Mr. Speaker, this amendment. This is an amendment to the amendment. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment to Return No. 109 . . .

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. He is not on a Point of Order, he is making now a new subamendment to the amendment. He is not on a Point of Order in the sense that he is arguing or trying to explain to the Speaker why Mr. Speaker's ruling initially was out of order or in error. He is now seeking to make a subamendment to the amendment and with all due respect on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Albert Park is totally out of order. He has spoken, he has moved, he has been ruled out of order and I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I was on my feet about to address this House on the question of the amendment itself.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Attorney General doesn't make the rules in this House, you do, Mr. Speaker, and he gets up arrogantly trying to debate the Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Maybe I can clarify. What I have in my hand is the intended motion which was submitted to me and I can only take what is given to me. It was presented by the Member from Albert Park and he then took his seat and then relinquishes his right to speak on this debate at this time. I have ruled it out of order and I cannot accept at this time him changing the wording to put it in order. It is out of order. I rule it out of order.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, with deference on your Point of Order — you are ruling out of order the subamendment, is that right?

Mr. Speaker: — Right.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I question your ruling. I would challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — That's fine with me. The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Is the ruling of the Chair sustained? I declare the ruling of the Chair sustained.

Mr. Steuart: — The opposite vote . . .

Mr. Lane: — You never asked us.

Mr. Speaker: — There were no "no's" came out.

Mr. Steuart: — You didn't ask us with all deference, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Follow the rules, please. If you want it recorded, call for a recorded vote.

March 6, 1973

Mr. Stuart: — Recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: — Well that's fine, but do it in the proper manner and don't always attack the Chair.

Mr. Stuart: — I didn't even hear you call the nays.

Mr. Speaker: — I said, "Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the ruling of the Chair?"

Some Hon. Members: — No! No!

Mr. Speaker: — I said the ruling of the Chair was sustained because there were far more yeas than nays. If you want a recorded vote, the Members know how to get it.

The Ruling of the Chair sustained on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS – 37
Messieurs

Blakeney
Dyck
Meakes
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Kramer
Thibault
Larson
Kowalchuk
Brockelbank
Baker

Pepper
Michayluk
Byers
MacMurchy
Thorson
Whelan
Kwasnica
Carlson
Owens
Robbins
Tchorzewski
Cowley

Matsalla
Richards
Faris
Taylor
Feduniak
Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Hanson
Oliver
Kaeding
Flasch

NAYS – 12
Messieurs

Steuart
Coupland
Guy Loken
Boldt

MacDonald (Milestone)
Weatherald
MacLeod
McPherson

Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw No.)
Wiebe

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