

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**32nd Day**

**Friday, March 9, 1973**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Thibault** (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to the Legislature a fine group of Grade Twelve students from the Wakaw High School. They are led here by their teacher, Mr. Latos and their bus driver and teacher, Mr. Murray Trobak. There are 36 of them and they left Wakaw early this morning. They have visited the steel mill, the Museum of Natural History and they will also visit the RCMP after they are done with the Legislature. I am sure that all Members will join with me in welcoming them and make this afternoon for them one of the finest in their lives. I hope that they can have some very nice remarks to make about the Legislature when they leave here today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I am also very pleased and proud to introduce a large number of students from the Balfour Technical High School in Regina, some 75 in number. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. The teachers accompanying them are Mr. Weichel, Mr. Wahl and Mr. Harder. I am very pleased, as I said, to introduce this group today because that collegiate is my home collegiate. It was where my daughter had the privilege of graduating and many more had the privilege of going through this fine higher school of learning.

I must also say that most of the great football players who joined the Ram teams over the years, were graduates or went to this school. Even the coaches came from there too. I know the Saskatoon Members when they hear the word Rams, they get somewhat frightened. However, I am pleased to introduce them and I hope they will have a pleasant stay this afternoon and that the proceedings for them will be most fruitful.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins** (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of 54 Grade Seven students from the Brevoort Park School in the Nutana Centre constituency of Saskatoon. I understand they are located in the Speaker's Gallery and some in the east gallery behind me. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Dilts and Mr. Sylvester. I understand they have had some tours this morning since they arrived. I hope they will find the proceedings of the Legislature informative and educational and I will be available around 3:15, I believe when they leave the galleries, to speak with them and I hope answer any questions they may wish to put with respect to the proceedings in the Legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of Grade Eleven and Twelve students, some 50 strong, from my constituency from the town of Waldheim. They are here for a couple of days to visit the Legislature and tomorrow they will visit some parts of the city. I haven't met them as yet. They are under the direction of Mr. Lobe, the principal of the school. I am sure all Members will wish them a very pleasant stay in Regina.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Comer** (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Hon. Member for Rosthern in welcoming the students from Waldheim and more especially one of the teachers with them, Norman Schultz with whom I taught for some time.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Student Summer Employment Program

**Mr. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. I believe that he is in charge of the student summer employment program.

This program started off, I think the last year or two years that we were the Government, called STEP — Student Temporary Employment Program — and when the NDP were elected they changed it to PEP. I understand that this year it has a new name and it is going to be called YEP and I think if these birds stay another year it will be called NOPE.

Anyway my question, Mr. Speaker, is, I understand . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — DOPE, from your side.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We will hear from the dope from Saskatoon after I speak if he wishes to rise in his place.

There is talk that this program will not this summer, include businesses or farmers. In other words that it will be confined to government, government agencies, municipalities and non-profit organizations.

I wonder if the Minister could clear this up. I am sure they know their plans by now and a great many businesses and a great many young people that are in high schools and universities are concerned. They want to make their plans and I hope that rather than reducing this plan and narrowing its scope, that they will in fact be enlarging it. I wonder if the Minister could clear the air on that.

**Hon. Mr. Snyder** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member's question. I am not sure where the Member comes by all of his information, but I think that I should say at this time that the matter is under consideration and the Government will be making an

announcement on it shortly. I think it will be well known that there was, I think, an area of dissatisfaction with the program as it existed last year and the year before. I think there is some real question as to the actual job creating activity of the program as it was laid on and administered over the last couple of years.

The Government will be bringing forth a program in the not too distant future and an announcement will be made at the appropriate time.

**Mr. Steuart:** — A supplementary question. I wasn't aware there were many complaints. What were the complaints in general and where were they from?

**Hon. Mr. Snyder:** — I would gather that's regarded as a supplementary question. I think there is some question in the minds of many people as to the job-creating activity of the program in light of the fact that, I think, in one particular instance and perhaps others, the hiring of students under the PEP program provided the opportunity for employers to build up an inventory and lay off staff, otherwise regarded as permanent staff somewhat earlier. There exists a real question as to the actual job-creating potential because of the fact that we have some difficulty in determining whether those jobs would have been available in the natural course of events. As I suggested there will be an announcement that will be forthcoming in the not too distant future and the Member will be enlightened at that time.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, there may have been some complaints that they wouldn't reduce the scope of this program because there are only one or two incidents where this happened, because I would point out that governments can have the same problem as private individuals and so I would hope that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! The Leader of the Opposition can't debate a question he has asked.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### Expansion of Intercontinental Packers Plant at Regina

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I know that all Hon. Members would be pleased to note yesterday's announcement by Mr. Mendel that Intercontinental Packers plans to proceed with the expansion of its Regina plant.

The basic decision to expand the Regina plant was made and announced by Intercontinental Packers last April. We are doubly pleased that the new plans for Regina appear to be even larger than the company proposed at that time. The proposed \$3 million plant expansion will contribute substantially to employment opportunities during the construction phase and when completed the plant will provide employment for additional employees, now estimated at 100.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — It is possible that this number may grow in the future.

The Intercontinental decision clearly reflects the confidence that now exists in the meat packing industry for the future growth and development in Saskatchewan. The climate of expectations now current in the industry is in marked contrast to the lack of confidence which prevailed only two short years ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I believe that I can state that this is only the first of a number of major developments we expect to see in the meat packing industry which will benefit Saskatchewan. Our Government's active support of, and participation in, the livestock and meat packing industries have provided the impetus and framework for a new era of growth and expansion and for increased business and employment activities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — While I understand that all of the details regarding the financing of the Regina expansion by the Intercontinental has not been made public. I will advise that SEDCO approved in April of 1972, a loan of \$1.5 million to be used for plant improvement and expansion. It is also my understanding that a DREE grant will be available for this project.

I am also pleased to note that on the same day that Mr. Mendel made his announcement, Mr. Peter Sakundiak announced that Sakundiak Farm Equipment Limited will undertake a major expansion in Regina, their first for a couple of decades.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — This company makes short line farm implements like grain augers and harrows. It was encouraged in its early stages by a loan from the Industrial Development Fund. We are very pleased to see this new expansion. The new plant will cost over a half a million dollars and is expected to create about 40 new jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, of course, we welcome the expansion of Intercontinental Packers that was announced last April here in Regina.

I don't wonder that they might consider enlarging the plant since they have \$10.2 million of the taxpayers' money tucked safely away in their pocket. I wonder how much they are going to use of the taxpayers' money, given them for their 45 per cent, which we don't know whether it was a good deal or a bad deal, how much of that money are they going to use for the expansion? Will the \$1.5 million from SEDCO be the only loan? Is that the total loan, \$1.5 million of SEDCO money? How much was the DREE grant? What will this do to the Burns Plant?

What word have you got on the Burns Plant?

One of the things that worries farmers in this province today, and I don't blame them considering the compulsory legislation facing them for a compulsory Hog Marketing Commission, is the availability of markets. We have in Regina right now two firms buying hogs. What will this do, the Government intrusion into the meat packing business, to the Burns Plant? Have you any announcement to make about them? Burns are now employing about 100 people and that plant is threatened.

So if Government intrusion into Canada Packers and a Government push towards monopoly buying Intercontinental Packers, may have the effect of forcing Burns out. We don't gain any employees in the city of Regina. We don't gain any employees at all and, in fact, we now have a monopoly set up here as far as the purchase of hogs is concerned and it makes it very simple. If Intercontinental Packers, the people's piggery, is having a tough year they then just reduce the price of hogs after the Hog Commission goes in and the farmers are forced to sell their hogs and deliver their hogs to wherever the Government control commission says they are, and of course we will find no competition and we will find the farmers in a very, very precarious position.

My question is: what does the Government know then about Burns' expansion plans or Burns' rebuilding plans? What about the loan from SEDCO, will it only be \$1.5 million? And does the Premier, now that he is a 45 per cent shareholder in this corporation, can he give the House the exact figures of how much the DREE grant will be in this case?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, it is pretty clear that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, while he says that he welcomes this announcement, by the tone of his questions — the relatively carping tone of his questions — seems to indicate that he really regrets the announcement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — May I attempt to answer the questions one by one.

Our purchase of shares was from the shareholders of Intercontinental not from the company. Of course, they could not sell us any. And accordingly there is no reason to believe that any purchase, any of the money used for the purchase of shares, will find itself into this expansion or any other expansion.

**Mr. Steuart:** — That is what I expected.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — That would have been told you by anybody who had some competent legal advice and I recommend that you talk to the Member for — but perhaps I don't recommend that you talk to him —

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I recommend that you seek some advice.

With respect to the SEDCO loan, I am not aware of any other

application by Intercontinental for any other loan other than the \$1.5 million already approved.

With respect to Burns, Burns as you know had announced that they were going to close their plant. They subsequently reconsidered that and announced that they proposed to build a new plant. We have no reason to believe that Burns is not going to proceed with the new plant. We are aware of the fact that Burns has applied for a DREE grant with respect to the plant. We are aware of the fact that they are examining into the supplies, particularly of hogs, in southern Saskatchewan for such a plant.

I am not in a position to announce whether or not Burns will proceed or will not proceed, but I have no reason to believe that they have withdrawn from their earlier announcement indicating that they would be proceeding.

**Mr. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is my privilege to comment on the Premier's remarks now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, the Premier made an announcement and the Leader of the Opposition made a statement in reply and asked a few questions in closing. I permitted the Premier to answer those questions and we cannot continue a debate on the Premier's statement.

## QUESTIONS

### Report on Family Planning

**Mr. MacDonald** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I have a question for the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek).

I understand that a report on the role that the province should take in the implementation and development of services related to family planning has been prepared by the Department of Public Health and that this report recommends several concrete actions, including the funding of services for family planning.

I should like to ask the Minister, that in light of the fact that his Government has been dragging their feet so badly in this area, and in light of the positive steps that the Federal Government has taken, would the Minister tell us what action he is taking to provide funds and leadership in this area of family planning. And further, would the Minister table the report that makes these specific recommendations?

**Hon. Mr. Smishek** (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Member is saying that the Federal Government has been providing excellent leadership. We should like to see that excellent leadership displayed sometime by the Federal Government. Certainly they have not shown that leadership to date in the field of family planning.

It is true that our Department has been studying the matter of developing a program of family planning. We have received the report. The report is being considered by the Government and in due course the Government policy will be announced.

## IPSCO Shares

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, asking a question about the purchase of IPSCO shares . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Are you asking a question or wanting to make a statement?

**Mr. Steuart:** — It is a question to the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It must not relate to the statement he made previously.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, it has nothing to do with that, it has to do with the purchase of IPSCO shares.

We have in the city of Regina several investment dealers who hold seats in the Toronto Stock Exchange. They employ about 200 people I am told. I wonder if the Premier could inform the House if the some 200,000 plus shares that were purchased were purchased through a firm with offices here in Regina and how much commission was paid? I understand that on a sale of that size the commission could amount to as high as \$70,000 or even \$90,000. Was the business given to local firms here in Regina and were they given the opportunity to bid on it? Were they given the opportunity to make any proposition or was this given outside the Province of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The answer is yes. The shares were acquired through a local brokerage house. They doubtless used other brokerage houses. So far as we know we dealt with only one brokerage house here in Regina. We would have been happy to deal with more, but under the circumstances, if we are going to carry on that sort of activity, it is best to deal with one house.

A commission was paid, the figure you have quoted strikes me as very much higher than is in fact the case but I frankly don't know. I will find out what the commission is and advise the Hon. Member.

**Mr. Steuart:** — The name of the firm?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — We used, I don't know why we shouldn't tell, Houston Willoughby and Company Ltd.

## STATEMENTS

### Housing Starts Decline

**Hon. Mr. Wood** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day could I say a few words. A couple of days ago the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) asked me a question concerning an item that appeared in the daily Press, which I at that time hadn't seen so I was unable to make any extended reply to it. Since that time I have noted the article which indicates with a

March 9, 1973

headline, "Housing Starts Decline by 5 Per Cent Across the Prairies." It goes on to show that in Saskatchewan the new housing starts dropped to 140 in January compared to 254 during December. The first month's statistics also represent a decline in activity from January, 1972 with 218 starts recorded. The Hon. Member pointed this out to me. I do find some difficulty in explaining why in this year with only 140 starts in January we weren't able to equal what we were able to do last year with 218 starts, but I should like to say that it is very much ahead of the 1972 starts when there were 35 in January, or the 1970 starts when there were 18.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — I don't think that taking one month out of a year this way is a very adequate assessment of what is going on in the province.

I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House to an item that appeared in the Regina Leader-Post of November 17th, where it says in a comparatively large black headline — I don't know if the Hon. Member noticed that — it said "Saskatchewan Miles ahead in Prairie House Starts." It says.

Housing starts in Saskatchewan for the first nine months of 1972 shows an increase of 63 per cent from 1971 levels and projected figures show housing starts for all of 1972 to be 26 per cent higher than 1971. The greatest housing increase for the year across the Prairies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — It goes on to say that:

Statistics released by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation show the three Prairie Provinces have an average of four per cent more houses started from January to September, 1972, than for the same period in 1971. Manitoba showed an increase of 20 per cent, while Alberta's 1972 housing starts in September were down 9 per cent from 1971.

Now I do recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this surely doesn't show the whole picture because it doesn't deal with the total number of starts made, but the Hon. Member was making a comparison between the two months in regard to comparing the starts one year with those of another. I thought that he might be interested in that item.

I should like, if I may, to point out that the total housing starts in Saskatchewan in 1972 compared very favorably with those of the year before and the year before that. In 1972 I believe the total starts were some 4,845 in Saskatchewan, in 1971 there were 3,560, the year before that they were 1,743. So they have been coming up quite nicely. There are other statistics that I think are very interesting in this regard, that of the Assisted Home Ownership starts. These are the people, the houses being built under the Federal program where assistance is given to those of lower incomes. In 1972 due to the fact that we were now making a grant of \$800 towards this type of housing starts, there were 1,389 such starts in the Province

of Saskatchewan in 1972.

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, is the Minister allowed to get up and debate at length a question like this. He has been going on and on. Is this in order?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member the other day raised the point in the House and asked the Minister if he would care to comment. The House at that time agreed the Minister should be able to check and come back and comment on the question raised. The Member I think asked for it. I hope that we won't get into too much detail.

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — I just have a few more well chosen words, Mr. Speaker, in making this short statement. In Saskatchewan in 1972 there were 1,389 housing starts in the Assisted Home Ownership portion. This is the portion of our community that is in a lower income bracket and needs help and these are the starts that are made there. In comparison to our 1,389 figure where these houses were built for these people, I mean that those were privately owned, the like number in Manitoba was 152 and in Alberta it was only 386. We were building houses or helping the people that actually need this housing to make these starts. Compared to 1971, which was half under the former administration and we were carrying on their policies we only had half as many starts, 665 in that category. The year before that in 1970, which was totally under the control of Members opposite there was only about one-fifth, 253 starts made in that category compared with 1,389 last year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, we certainly appreciate the answer that the Minister gave us and the amount of research done although it took him quite a long time and I'm sure it was quite a problem for the people in his Department to go back and find the answers to my question but he didn't answer the question that I asked the other day. However, if he had gone back to what happened three months ago, and I have to remind the Minister and Members opposite that it was the Liberal Government that started the program of providing a \$500 grant for housing. You have to admit that. But what he doesn't acknowledge and what I pointed out the other day, Mr. Speaker, is not what happened in November and September last year, we are looking at what is happening today and for the spring when unemployment is higher today than it has ever been in the history of the province. All I pointed out to the House the other day was that for the two NDP provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the housing starts from December to January have decreased by 33 and 45 per cent, respectively, whereas the Province of Alberta, the good, free-enterprising province of Alberta, has increased starts by I think it is 26 per cent. Our problem today is what are you going to do now about a trend that has completely reversed itself, your housing has fallen off completely and now you are facing the fact that you didn't do your planning properly for the coming year. Never mind what happened in the year past, it's what's happening now that is important.

## RESOLUTIONS

### **Resolution No. 13 — Grant to Palliser Wheat Growers' Association**

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone) moved, seconded by Mr. Lane (Lumsden):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to consider a grant to the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association similar to those made to other agricultural organizations and that the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association be encouraged to expand its research and investigative activities.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls for the Government of Saskatchewan to recognize the contribution of the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association to the grain industry in Western Canada.

I want to outline briefly for the Members of the House, the history, the structure and the goals of the Palliser Association as well as to point out their achievements over their short but productive period since their inception.

Palliser is an organization of producers, wheat producers, a commodity group formed by the prairie wheat growers so that the producer himself can provide more leadership to their own industry. It has the distinct advantage of being able to zero in on their own product without the complications of commercial interest or the bureaucratic road blocks of the service industry. It can keep a fixed eye on one product and watch its success or failure from the moment it is planted until the time it reaches the consumers' table. It has without question demonstrated the importance and contribution of commodity groups in the agricultural field. Its major objective has been to increase the actual producer input in grain policy at both the national and international level. It has from the time of formation been non-commercial and non-political. It is made up of farmers who are actively engaged in the growing of wheat. The farmer must hold a permit book. It has a membership made up from every political party in Canada. It has never hesitated to criticize or praise governments or individuals regardless of political affiliation.

Its date of birth was April, 1970, a time when Canada's share of the world wheat market was diminishing. At a time of wheat surpluses, low quotas, poor prices. It was a period when wheat producers were suffering rising costs of production without compensating increases in price or sales. It was formed because a group of farmers could not believe that their own good Canadian wheat could not be sold on world markets when other nations were selling theirs.

The average effort of the Canadian Wheat Board in the world market place since 1958-59 was 368 million bushels including two years of very heavy shipments to Russia. The growth from 1958-59 to 1968-69 was from an average of 294 million bushels to 305 million, a four per cent increase compared with a 63 per cent increase in world demand. This was not good enough, Mr. Speaker, these producers wanted action and they led the way themselves.

Their purpose was to establish a producer organization to promote and safeguard their interest in the production and handling and marketing of wheat. Their membership in 1972 reached 3,200 wheat growers. It is the only farm organization in Western Canada that speaks solely for wheat. A member must be a permit book holder to be an active member or to vote, or to hold office. It is 100 per cent controlled by wheat growers.

The first objectives were to use protein as a criterion of quality for Canadian wheat in describing the product to potential buyers. Protein guarantee was one area of merchandising that Canada ignored completely while competitors had been using it for some time. As a result Canada's dominant position for high-quality wheat was challenged. During the past year Palliser witnessed the segregation of protein by carlot shipments at port terminals. It is reported to be a success.

Palliser believes protein determination should be made on individual deliveries at country elevators. Protein premiums should be included in the initial payment to the producer as an incentive to guide his production decisions. Perhaps this will be the next step.

The second objective was to gain more direct producer influence on the Canadian Wheat Board. They have been long concerned about the overwhelming influence of the service segment on Wheat Board policy. They fought for an aggressive market-oriented effort. This year, Palliser saw the appointment of five producers to the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board. One of them was a member of the Palliser Association. Palliser fought to end the unit quota for wheat at the beginning of each crop year. They felt it encouraged many farmers to sow wheat in areas that could not produce high-quality wheat in order to get cash in the fall of the year. This process helped add congestion to the overtaxed handling system. Palliser also wished to reduce the amount of grain in the handling system. Payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act have always been considered a detriment. Money is being used to help support an obsolete elevator system and does not benefit the producer.

During that first year of operation, Palliser was also interested in educating its members in all facets of the grain industry. Delegations of farmers went to Ottawa, Winnipeg, Vancouver and even the United States in attempts to learn and become familiar with how the grain industry operates and how best to influence it to the benefit of wheat producers. Since that first year, Mr. Speaker, the record of this Association speaks for itself. I cannot hope to enumerate all their activities but I should like to summarize some highlights.

A policy of co-operating with, and keeping in touch with all segments of the industry was developed. Excellent relationships were soon established with the Canadian Grain Commission, the Canada Grains Council, the Federal Government through the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, other farm commodity groups and elevator companies.

Policies either supported by Palliser or initiated by them included: Protein grading, flexible pricing, aggressive selling, overseas market offices and missions, producers on the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board, use of Canadian Government elevators' inland terminals, clean grain 'unit-train' concept,

March 9, 1973

car pooling at coastal terminals, a two-price system for wheat, CGC terminals made alternate delivery points.

Palliser also set up a feed wheat committee, which was instrumental in developing policies which may build up a strong utility wheat crop as a means of diversification away from hard red spring wheat in those areas best suited for wheat production. Palliser's Feed Wheat Symposium, held in Regina in 1971, was the first time plant breeders, millers, producers, Government and grain trade officials had ever been brought together to discuss and form policies relating to a new type of grain.

Palliser also became a member of the Canada Grains Council, and has taken an active role in many of CGC activities. Their last annual meeting was mainly on feed grains, which was a direct result of work their utility wheat committee had done previously in generating interest.

Palliser has made extensive studies of the handling and transportation system, tariffs, etc. They were directly responsible for the CGC system on the prairies to be made open to farmers to deliver grain to them. They were directly responsible for the unit train that went out of the Saskatoon terminal last year through Neptune terminals by-passing the conventional handling system at the coast. They were indirectly responsible for the barley trucking experiment where barley was hauled from farms and country elevators to the CGC terminals at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon.

One of the very interesting activities of Palliser, they organized a trip to Southeast Asia last fall. There were five genuine farmers on this mission, and this is the first time primary producers have made an expedition of this sort. The trip was financed jointly by the Government of Alberta and the Federal Government. Official results of the trip have not yet been published but initial reports show a tremendous market for Canadian grains in Southeast Asia.

The delegates did not restrict themselves to talking about wheat, but also investigated markets for oilseeds and feed grains. They are convinced that there is an almost bottomless market for Canadian grains in that part of the world.

Palliser has focused a lot of attention on the West Coast terminal elevator system, and no doubt is largely responsible for the vigorous effort being put forth by those terminals to increase their handlings. They believe it is wrong to clean grain at tidewater position in urban settings, the grain should be cleaned before leaving the Prairies in order to speed up the ability of the railways to deliver (six days turnaround for clean grain trains versus 21 days under the present system) and in order to improve a thriving wheat-producing industry here on the Prairies.

Palliser is currently pressing for greater producer power in the Canadian Wheat Board, basically through a restructured Advisory Board made up of producers elected by other producers, which would have a certain amount of authority in making Wheat Board policy.

They are also contemplating future overseas business to develop closer rapport between producers and consumers.

Palliser has always believed that the producer and the consumer are the two most important segments of the industry and policy should be made to suit these two groups and not the middleman or service segment.

Premium and/or penalty back to the producer on an individual basis is another objective. Palliser has fought hard for policies to improve and modernize our handling system. They are convinced that the entire handling system is antiquated and needs a complete overhaul. The improvement of the gathering system is a reform that must be given some priority. They have attempted and will continue to attempt to participate in tariff hearings. They believe the present system does not place incentives on improving grain handling. Rather it tends to perpetuate a worn out system.

They are opposed in principle to complete government control of the industry, and the many restrictions imposed on it, such as the prohibition of inter-provincial movement of grain in the Wheat Board designated area. They believe the Wheat Board concept of equity of income has been carried too far. The intent was that there should be equity of income provided it did not interfere with maximum marketings. But the board has placed too much emphasis on equity rather than on marketing.

One of the important duties of Palliser Wheat Growers is to inform the wheat producer about the handling and marketing of his product. To this end a monthly newspaper is sent to all members and annual general meetings are planned not only to conduct the business of the association but to bring leaders of the grain industry to it and request them to report to their members. These meetings which are almost seminars have been very popular with the membership. These have drawn about 25 per cent of the active members to them every year. In addition news releases pertaining to the wheat industry are sent out to Western Canadian newspapers, radio stations, television stations on a regular basis. Copies also go to Western Members of Parliament. Members of the Legislative Assemblies in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and to a number of officials in the grain trade, such as the heads of elevator companies, the Wheat Board, Grain Commission, Grains Council and railways.

Mr. Speaker, this short summary in no way completely outlines the work and achievements of Palliser. However, it does one thing clearly, it indicates that a group of farmers have demonstrated their interest and their ability to participate in the policy decisions that affect them. It demonstrates clearly the farmers themselves recognize the problems that their industry is faced with. It also demonstrates clearly that farmers know what is in their best interest when it comes to the future direction of the grain industry.

All of us may not agree with every proposition they support. But none of us can deny that their efforts have had a major impact on policy. And that they have brought before the farmers as a whole an opportunity for public discussion and education in all matters relating to their industry. It does even more, Mr. Speaker, it points out the importance in contribution of commodity groups in the agriculture sector of our economy. They have given a moral lift to all other commodity groups.

However, the thrust of this Resolution is to point out that they cannot do it or continue to expand their efforts without

help. Last year they operated on a budget of approximately \$50,000 and had a modest surplus of about \$2,000. To expand and broaden their activities they do need support. To date they have been operated by farmers who have not only donated dollars in membership assessment but by dedicated farmers who have spent their own funds and their own time to get Palliser off and running. Last year they received support from the Federal Government and the Province of Alberta for their Southeast Asia excursion. This year the Province of Alberta has forwarded an operating grant without even being solicited by Palliser. It is indeed unusual for another Provincial Government to forward a grant to a Saskatchewan based association with its head office in Saskatchewan. This is particularly unusual when only a small portion of their membership came from Alberta. It is a recognition of their contribution to Western Canada. Surely, then, Members of this Assembly will indicate their support of Palliser by endorsing this motion. I understand that there is now a request before the Government and it has now been passed through the Premier's office. This Resolution will demonstrate to him the complete support of this Assembly.

I have here a list of grants provided by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to practically every agricultural organization in Saskatchewan except Palliser. Mr. Speaker, I tried to count them and there are over 100 agricultural organizations, societies from small and large, to towns, to communities. I could give you quite a list. Saskatchewan 4-H Council, Saskatchewan Agricultural Society Association, Saskatchewan Pork Promotion Council, National Farmers Union, Canada Pork Council, Saskatchewan Jockey Club, Saskatchewan Livestock Board, Regina Exhibition, Melfort Agricultural Society, Moose Jaw Exhibition Company, Kelvington Agricultural Society, Kennedy, Kerrobert, Kindersley, Langenburg, Maple Creek, Maryfield, Meadow Lake, Moosomin, Nokomis, Ogema, you could go on, Mr. Speaker, there have been well over 100 grants provided by the Government to agricultural associations. I think that is good if they are being used in a worthwhile way. I would hope though, Mr. Speaker, that next year when this comes around that Palliser Association would also be included in that list.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I should like to recommend to the Government and to the Minister of Agriculture that he start off with a grant of perhaps \$20,000 or \$25,000 in its initial year. I would suggest that at the end of that year an evaluation be done to assess the impact of the grant for future years and future consideration. I urge all the Members of this Assembly to give this Resolution unanimous support. I would hope it is a non-political resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — This Resolution being passed will then give us the opportunity to assess and decide what the impact of the Palliser Wheat Growers Association does have on the grain industry and the results for the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving this Resolution.

**Mr. Lane** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure I join with my colleague the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in seconding Resolution No. 13.

The resolution is an attempt to ask the people of Saskatchewan to recognize a great contribution to Saskatchewan agriculture that the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association has made.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Milestone has indicated the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association is a commodity organization founded in April 1970 to promote an interest in the production and handling and marketing of wheat. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt this is one of the most aggressive farm organizations in Saskatchewan. The organization's first interest is that of its farm membership. Its aim has been to promote the commodity of wheat and to this end the members have organized themselves.

Mr. Speaker, it is a commodity group. It is a producer organization designed to promote and safeguard their interest as I have said in the production, handling and marketing of wheat.

Palliser Wheat Growers' Association is concerned with the benefits of its membership. It is a non-commercial and non-political organization and speaks for wheat growers only. It believes most strongly in an expanding and expansive agriculture producing effectively with a minimum of restrictions and controls because ours is a market oriented approach. Through their efforts and the efforts of others they have helped achieve the following successes, Mr. Speaker: a market oriented grain industry — more aggressive selling by the Canadian Wheat Board — competitive pricing — protein grading — car pooling at the terminals — the unit train concept — inland cleaning of export grain — the development of the utility wheat program, and a greater producer participation in grains policy. Mr. Speaker, above all I think they have brought to the attention of all farmers and all the public in Western Canada some of the problems that the wheat grower has. And brought to the attention of these very people, Mr. Speaker, the need for change and the need to take a second look at many of the aspects of the selling, marketing and growing of the wheat commodity.

Mr. Speaker, Palliser is the first to admit that much more has to be done. The Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, prides itself on its development of research abilities. The Association wishes to see further studies in the areas of development of new and suitable varieties and the marketing of utility wheat and additional storage facilities to name but a few interests. The assistance to the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association will enable the producer to speak from a position of strength, Mr. Speaker, when presenting their views to those concerned. It will also allow for a better flow of information to the producer himself.

Mr. Speaker, the aims of the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association are the same as those of every Member in this House, the development of the farm economy of Saskatchewan and the strengthening of rural Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, the fact that

March 9, 1973

this organization is producer controlled is more reason to assist them in their efforts. Because, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate development of rural Saskatchewan will rest on the shoulders of the farm producer and no one else. I urge the Government to give consideration to assistance to this farm organization.

Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose in the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association's desire to undertake research and studies is to add some weight to the wishes of the actual producers. Obviously the studies, any studies would be of a limited scope, and would be desirable, for example, to engage the services of a qualified person to assimilate relevant research material and assist and co-ordinate the work of the various committees that the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association has established. These are of course working on various particular products.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Palliser Association fights aggressively for its membership and what it believes should be a greater incentive to give this organization the assistance it needs to continue its good work. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Milestone has listed for the edification of the Members of this Assembly the examples we already have before this House, the precedents of assistance to farm organizations.

Mr. Speaker, we had asked a question of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and a Return was filed. And again for the information of Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, just a short outline of some of the grants that have been given to farm organizations. We have the National Farmers Union, \$15,000; Poultry Council, the Pork Council, the Saskatchewan Livestock Board, Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association have received a couple of grants. Saskatchewan Hog Producers, Saskatchewan Swine Breeders' Association, Saskatchewan Sheep Breeders' Association, the cattle breeders, swine breeders and sheep breeders as I have said, Mr. Speaker, have received grants from the Government opposite. And without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, grants are serving an excellent purpose and assisting these groups to promote their own interest.

Mr. Speaker, a precedent has been set. We urge the Government to recognize the status of wheat in our farm commodities. I urge all Members to assist in maintaining a strong position of all Saskatchewan commodities in international markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of Members opposite for this Resolution. I urge that the Members of this Assembly make it unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, in its very short time of existence the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association has made a great contribution to Western Canada. It is deserving of the support of the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker. A vote for this Resolution will recognize this contribution and urge them on to further contributions in the interests of Saskatchewan, Western Canada and Canadian agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all Members support the Resolution of the Hon. Member from Milestone.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gross** (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Resolution on the Palliser Wheat Growers', I have a few remarks that I would like to make but will reserve them for a later date and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Resolution No. 16 — \$26.4 Million Federal Grant Should Be Paid To Local School Boards**

Mr. MacLeod (Albert Park) moved, seconded by Mr. Gardner (Moosomin):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan: (1) That the \$26.4 million being paid to the province by the Federal Government as new or additional grants on account of local school taxes for the relief of property owners and tenants, be passed on to local school boards; (2) That school boards be notified immediately of such payment in time to reduce tax levies for the current year on property owners by the said \$26.4 million, an average equivalent of 16 mills.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, in the Budget address of February 19, delivered by Mr. John Turner, the Federal Finance Minister, he announced the payment of a brand new grant to Saskatchewan amounting \$26.4 million for local school purposes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — These grants are the equivalent of 15½ to 16 mills of taxes. The Provincial Government has failed to state its intentions with respect to these moneys and we want to make sure that these grants are in fact passed on for the benefit of local school boards. We want to make sure that they are not swallowed up in some other program of the Government. The best way to have the intentions of Mr. Turner carried out is to have these moneys paid directly to the local school boards themselves. This should be done in time to have the local school boards take this into consideration in setting their 1973 tax levies.

I want to quote Mr. Turner in announcing the program from page 21 and 22 of his Budget address as reported. I quote as follows:

The Government proposes that beginning in the next fiscal year the general equalization system should be substantially broadened to include new grants on account of municipal taxes imposed for local school purposes. This is a major advance. It adds a new dimension to a revenue equalization system already far superior to that of any other federal country. One of its main advantages is obvious. It will enable the lower income provinces to come to the relief of hard pressed property owners and tenants who have had to carry an increasing burden of local school taxes. Indeed the increase in equalization grants involved in this measure — about \$190 million in the next fiscal year — amounts to as much as 28 per cent of the local school taxes collected in these provinces. I would hope, therefore to see significant benefits passed on to their

local ratepayers.

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from the paragraph and I will deal with one of two parts which I didn't quote.

I want to stress two important items. First, although the proposal mentioned by Mr. Turner was raised at the Finance Ministers' Conference it was entirely a voluntary offer by the Federal Government. The Provincial Government was unaware of this extra money when Mr. Cowley brought down his Budget here in this House on the 9th of February. Ten days later the province received the promise of an extra windfall of \$26.4 million. And of course there is no provision for this money in the Provincial Budget. Secondly, when this point was raised at the Finance Ministers' Conference support for the proposal was evident among the 'have' provinces as well, of course, as ready acceptance by the 'have not' provinces. This is a generous and reasonable position for them to take.

The \$26.4 million is for the same period referred to in the Saskatchewan Budget brought down on February 9th, by the Hon. Minister of Finance of this province.

Payment may be expected in the coming months. But delay in payment for this period must not be used as an excuse for hiding the payments. These moneys are not to be used as an excuse by this Government to reduce the grants or other payments which it should be making and must make for school purposes. These moneys, this \$26.4 million, is not included in any other Federal payments to the province. These are in addition to all other payments promised by the government, by the Federal Government.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a statement of the distribution of this new grant to the seven provinces. Saskatchewan receives the highest per capita distribution of any province, except for the Atlantic provinces. The Saskatchewan grant is \$29 per capita, the Quebec grant is \$13 per capita. I want to stress this last point, Mr. Speaker, because some politicians in the last Federal election, attempting to make cheap political capital (not any person in our party, of course) tried to tell people that Quebec was getting better treatment than was the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Who said that, Ken?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I don't want to become narrowly political in this debate and, therefore, would like to maintain it on a high level. On a total payment basis, Saskatchewan received \$26.4 million, compared to \$78.6 million for Quebec. I stress, that on a per capita basis, Saskatchewan receives double what Quebec receives.

Now in answer to a remark I heard from the Opposition benches, a whispered remark which I did overhear, however, somebody said: "What about the Maritime Provinces?" If the Hon. Member will check my remarks in Hansard he will note that I mentioned that Saskatchewan receives more money per capita than any province, except the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Speaker, we therefore desire to serve notice on this Government that we have attempted to keep this on a high plane. I have attempted to avoid narrow political debating points.

but we give notice that we intend to have them either tell us that they will in fact pay this to the school boards, or we shall be demanding a reason why not. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving this Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps not directly to the topic — I'm wondering whether or not it is unusually hot in the Assembly? This Assembly has a reputation for producing more heat, I suppose than light, but this is getting a bit ridiculous. I wonder if you might direct one of the officials to look into it.

That's not the reason why, but I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **Return No. 110**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 110 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Enfield No. 194, 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; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture 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, notice of Motion for Return No. 110 is not unlike a number of motions that are on the Order Paper (there were 11 in total to start with). I believe the Legislature has dealt with six of them. We have five left. All of the amendments that I have been proposing are identical, with an exception of dealing with a different rural municipality. We have had, I think, ample time to debate the amendments that have been brought forward. In fact, I think we had one total night session in regard to that. I, therefore, move an amendment, which is identical to the amendments which I have moved in regard to the six motions that we have already dealt with. In this case, Return No. 110, be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'showing', and substituting the following:

In the Rural Municipality of Enfield No. 194, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed;

(c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

I so move that amendment, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General.

**Mr. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I spoke on a similar motion a day or two ago asking for permission to adjourn debate because I said at that time I have some information I want to bring into the House and I have that information now and I want to lay it before the House.

I want to point out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that what we have been asking for in these resolutions, is plain and simply information. Information that we are entitled to; information that the public is entitled to. The Government of Saskatchewan has launched a very major program to buy up farm lands. Mr. Speaker, \$10 million last year, \$20 million this year and we don't know how much next year, but imagine it will be in the same order. They will soon (they are now in fact) be the major purchaser of land in this province, and they will soon be by far the major owner of farm land (if they are not already). Now, I mean of cultivated farm land. Farm land that is now in the hands, and has been up to this point in the hands of individuals.

Okay, we are asking questions and the Government is refusing to give us the information in regard to how much they are paying for this farm land. Why do we want this information? To begin with, there is a great deal of confusion in the country and there are a great many rumors, not started necessarily by Liberals or NDP or anyone else. I should like to point out that there is not only a great deal of confusion (and I will prove it) among farmers and among people interested in agriculture, in the sale and purchase of land and in the price of land, but there is a great deal of confusion in the Government and in the Land Bank Commission itself. The information I have will prove that fact, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to give you some examples of why we need this information and why I think it is absolutely imperative for the Government to make this information available and make it available now.

I am going to give you one example of a man called Laidlaw, Mr. Murray Laidlaw.

**Hon. Mr. Michayluk:** — Where is he from?

**Mr. Steuart:** — I'll give you this information. I'll tell you where he is from. Just keep calm. His address is Box 281, Churchbridge. Now Mr. Laidlaw sold his farm to a Mr. W. Ament. Mr. Ament, it turns out, is about five years behind in his payments and in fact about a year ago he vacated the farm and Mr. Laidlaw had already started foreclosure proceedings about 19 months ago. Ament offered his land and he did, he sold it to the Land Bank. Mr. Laidlaw objected — he didn't own the land. That's what is wrong with it, Mr. Ament didn't own the land. He didn't deserve the land, he had abandoned the farm and he was five years

behind in his payments. Mr. Laidlaw objected and he phoned Mr. Moxley, who I understand is the Assistant Commissioner or assistant to the top man in the Land Bank here in Regina, and he informed him of the situation. And we will talk about confusion in the Government in just a minute . . .

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Privilege. I am wondering if the matter that the Leader of the Opposition is now bringing to the attention of the Legislative Assembly is in fact in the RM of Enfield, which is the item that we are now discussing in this notice of Motion for Return.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, if I can answer that. It is not in that RM but it is a point that I want to make as to why I want the House to vote against the amendment and in favor of the resolution. The basis for our argument, Mr. Speaker, is that there is confusion, that this is in fact a cloud cast over this whole program; it is casting a cloud over the purchase of farm land by other individuals other than the Land Bank, and I think that the only way to clear this up is for the Government to tell the truth about what they are paying for this land. So I think it is very relevant.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I realize that the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition is not in this RM. I think our debates have strayed away a lot from the RMs, but I also realize that there are other methods by which it can be brought out so I hope if it is used here it won't be used on the next one so we can end the discussion.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I agree, Mr. Speaker. I will bring out these points on this particular debate and on no other debate.

The piece of land happens to be in RM 211 and it's listed in the Western Producer, January 18, 1973, RM 211. I'll give you a description of the land — it's the Northeast 34-24-32, west of the 1st; northwest 34-24-32, west of the 1st; southeast 34-24-32, west of the 1st; southwest 34-24-32, west of the 1st. If you look in the centre section of the Western Producer, the issue of Thursday, January 18, under RM 211, you will find the first piece of land listed under that RM that it is this piece of land.

Now, in spite of the fact that the Land Bank had been informed, this man had no legal claim. It was still listed for rent. I don't know whether Mr. Ament (I hope Mr. Ament was not paid for this land) and I hope some provisions were made to search the title and find out that he was four to five years behind in his payments, and has absolutely no right, legal or moral or any other right, to offer this land or to sell it to the Land Bank.

Now there is an example of confusion, both out in the country and in the Land Bank Commission itself. We talked about the price of land. Mr. Speaker, here is another case. The man who owned the land is Fred Stehr of Churchbridge. He sold a piece of land to the Land Bank, supposedly for the sum of \$49,000. I checked at Yorkton today and this land has been offered for sale. This land has not been listed in the Land

March 9, 1973

Titles Office. So, again, we have absolutely no way of checking whether this amount is right or not. It was sold for a reputed sum of \$49,000. This land is located in RM 211 — the following is the descriptions; and the description of this land is again listed in the Western Producer issue January 18, under RM 211 and it is as follows: Northeast 6-23-31, west of the 1st; Northwest 6-23-31, west of the 1st; Southeast 6-23-31, west of the 1st; Northeast 23-23-32, west of the 1st; Northwest 24-23-32, west of the 1st; Southwest 24-23-32, west of the 1st; Southeast 25-23-32, west of the 1st.

Now that's listed and has been bought. We can't check what the price is. The Land Bank is supposed to have paid \$49,000. I don't know if it paid that much or not, but the assessment of that land is as follows: \$1,450; \$600; \$950; \$1,150; \$1,100; \$1,350; and \$800 for the total of \$7,400. The date of the sale was December 1972, the date of the sale to the Land Bank. Now if the Land Bank in fact paid \$49,000 for this piece of land, Mr. Speaker, then it paid almost seven times the assessed value. Almost seven times. I am further informed that this is, in fact, poor land and that the owner has been trying to sell it for four years without success and that anyone renting this land is going to have a great deal of difficulty eking out a living over the next number of years.

Mr. Speaker, we have a piece of land, again in the Saltcoats area, of Nick Koroll. It was listed and sold by his widow, Mrs. Nick Koroll of Saltcoats. She sold a half section of land, east half of 20-22-3 west of the 2nd. Now oddly enough this price, there was a price put on this land. This piece of land has been listed in the Land Titles Office, Yorkton, and it was supposed to have been sold for \$20,000, the price listed on it was \$21,400. It is assessed at \$4,600, so they received something better than four times the assessed value.

Mr. Speaker, here we have three examples of confusion. We have a piece of land listed for sale, obviously a deal made by the Land Bank for a piece of land that the owner, or the reputed owner had no right to list or to sell; he deserted the land and he was behind five years in his payments. We have another piece of land supposed to be sold for \$49,000, or about seven times the assessed value, which, if this is true, is far too much money. We have another piece of land sold in the same area for a little over four times the assessed value. Now, if these facts are right, then let the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) come in this House and tell the people. Tell us in this House, tell the people of the province exactly what the facts are and lay these rumors to rest. While he is checking upon the confusion I mentioned in the Land Bank (and there are all kinds of confusion in the Land Bank), let me point out another little dandy for the Members of the House giggling and laughing on the other side.

I have here the March, 1972 copy of Farm Light and Power. Now this particular little paper is put out, I think, by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, if I'm not mistaken. Bradley publication. Anyway, it arrived in the hands of the readers in Saskatchewan on the 2nd or 3rd or 4th of March. As a matter of fact, I checked on March 6th and they hadn't received their copy as yet in the Library here and they get a copy of all these little publications. So here is the March issue of Light and Power which gets in the hands of our farmers about the 3rd, 4th or 5th of March. There is an ad placed in there, quite a large ad, "Province of Saskatchewan Provincial Lands available for

lease.” There are about 40 or 50 parcels of land available for lease. That’s fine, an ad paid for by the taxpayers, not part of the confusion, not part of the story according to Mr. Messer and all the Members opposite, everybody knows exactly what they are doing. They are getting all the information to the public that’s necessary, they don’t have to tell the public, Mr. Speaker, what’s going on, they don’t have to tell the price . . .

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Point of Order . . . the . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — What is your Point of Order?

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — The article he is referring to in Light and Power has absolutely nothing to do with the Land Bank, it is lands that are allocated under the Lands Branch, Department of Agriculture. There is no relation whatsoever. He knows it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . by the law, Mr. Speaker, I don’t blame the Minister Mr. Speaker, for being just a little sensitive, because we see here in this paper that they paid good Saskatchewan taxpayers’ money to put this ad in that came into the hands . . .

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — On a Point of Order. This doesn’t apply the Land Bank Commission, the subject matter we are debating now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — This is one of the problems Mr. Speaker, if the Member would close his mouth and open his eyes . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don’t know as Speaker what it is related to. But I did agree that there has been a lot of discussion back and forth on the five or six resolutions dealing with the same topic. I did say that anything even if it doesn’t pertain to this particular municipality I was prepared to allow, but we couldn’t repeat it on the following Orders for Returns. It will have to be in relation to the Land Bank, and not to the Lands Branch of the Department of Agriculture. I have no knowledge, I have to take the Hon. Member’s word when he is speaking that it does pertain to the Land Bank, unless I am shown differently. I have no knowledge.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the application for lease will be accepted until 5:00 o’clock p.m., February 15, about three weeks earlier than they got this periodical. Does this come from the Land Bank? No. It is advertising the provincial lands available for lease by the Department of Agriculture, the same department. I point this out, Mr. Speaker, to show that there is so much confusion, so much misinformation, so much waste of money that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — You’re confused!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I’m not confused, you are the one who put this out. You take a look at it, here. Take this over to the Minister of Agriculture. Take it back to your Department of Agriculture and find out what they are doing. Then get up in your place when it comes your turn to talk, park you gum on the side of

your bench, stand up, move your mouth up and down, and tell the people of this province what you are paying for land if you haven't got anything to hide. Tell the people of this province exactly what you are doing. Tell the people in your own department to smarten up a little with the taxpayers' money. These, Mr. Speaker, are the examples and I could give you dozens more to show that this Government is hiding information from the public. There is confusion in the rural parts of this province and what is even worse there is far more confusion in the Department of Agriculture, headed by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Messer. I say that we should defeat his amendment and we should pass the original motion and force this Government to give the people the information that they are entitled to.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Thorson** (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, the only confusion, if there is any is on the left of your Honour. The Leader of the Opposition supposedly presented three examples of land dealings involving the Land Bank which he says create confusion. Let's take them in the reverse order that he presented them.

The third one which he spoke of, according to the figures he used, the sale value was \$21,400 and the assessed value was \$4,600. He says that the sale value was then four times the assessed value. I don't know if those are the facts or not, but those are the figures the Leader of the Opposition used. If those are the facts, then it seems to me it clearly supports the supposition that the Land Bank is paying fair market value for land in Saskatchewan. Because anyone who knows anything about farm land values and what it sells for and anyone who knows anything about assessed value, by which taxes are levied, knows that it is not a bit unusual for market value of land to be exactly four times the assessed value of land. Using this example, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that on that example which the Leaders of the Opposition advanced, the people of Saskatchewan ought to be assured that the Land Bank is dealing properly in its purchases of land.

The second example he used is one in which he says the reputed sale value is \$49,000. He admits that he doesn't know.

**Mr. Guy:** — Do you know?

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know! I do not know if the Leaders of the Opposition states his facts correctly or if he knows what he is talking about or if that is the sale value of this particular parcel of land. He says if it is, then they paid seven times the assessed value, but he doesn't know what the sale value was. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, none of us can draw any conclusions whatever from that example which the Leaders of the Opposition advances because it is really based on pure supposition on his part. I can go out and pick up all kinds of rumors and talk about values of land. I had a number of clients and a number of people interested in particular parcels of land. I know that all kinds of stories go around about what the value of land will be before the sale, and especially after the sale. To go out and pick up information and get up in the Legislature as the Leader of the Opposition has just done, and repeat rumors and suggest that there is confusion on the part of the Land Bank is just nonsense.

Then, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the first case that he speaks of or the first cases in which he claims that someone sold land to which they had no legal claim. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition lacks some skills in the political field and he has no skill whatever in the legal field. If indeed there is anything whatever to that allegation the remedy of the person aggrieved is in the courts. I daresay that our law, our law pertaining to land, is strong enough to protect someone who has that kind of claim and he will be able to assert it very capably in the courts and get redress. I frankly don't believe that the vendor or the mortgagee, whichever it may have been, in those cases he was using has actually been cheated out of anything that he had coming out of land that he either agreed to sell or agreed to take a mortgage on. I think the Leader of the Opposition surely cannot convince this House and he will not convince the people of Saskatchewan on the basis of what he has just said, that there is anything wrong at all in the way the Land Bank is dealing with its purchases of land.

I urge the House to support the amendment then pass the motion as amended.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, if we have ever had a reason and an example as to why we should defeat this amendment, it is the Minister of Industry. He says, everything is supposition. That's exactly the problem. In all of Saskatchewan all we know about the Land Bank is supposition and nothing more. We gave three examples, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that every Member on this side of the House has three, four or five or more examples. The reason we are not bringing them in is because we don't want to bring up any more names than necessary. The Minister of Agriculture said last day . . .

**Hon. Mr. Cowley:** — Table them!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — If the Minister of Finance would sew up the cut that is beneath his nose we would get along better.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Nipawin got up a few weeks ago and he said, if you want to find that information . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Member from Nipawin never spoke on this motion . . .

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I will certainly abide by your decision. The point is that most of the transactions for the Land Bank are not as yet transferred or recorded in the Land Titles Office, therefore there is no way for the Members of the Opposition to find out the information the Minister of Agriculture has suggested on more than one occasion. All we are saying is that here the Minister of Agriculture has said time and time again there is a formula. Formula only means one thing to me, and one thing I think to the people of Saskatchewan, that everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan will be treated equally, that everybody will be treated the same. Yet, very rarely have we ever heard

of any two examples where land has been purchased with the same formula in relationship to the assessed value. One suggested seven times, one four, we could give you another one with six. We could give you examples, and I'll give the Minister one, of two offers on the same piece of land within ten days at two different prices. Now how is that a formula. I'll ask the Minister of Agriculture and I'll give him this one, privately of two offers from the Land Bank on the same piece of land within two weeks, two different offers. You tell me how that is a formula. But is that related to the assessed value, how is that related to the purchase price of other farmers in that area? All we are trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this debate has been on the Order Paper now since the first day of this House. They stood up and said we could find it in the Land Titles Office, we can't. They said that they would give us the information two years from now, that's when we will get it in 1974 when this Land Bank has been in operation for two years. All we are saying is for goodness sake stop these suppositions that the Minister of Industry is talking about. Stop the rumors, stop the speculation, give us some facts, then you will find that the Land Bank will be much better off for it and so will the taxpayers of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I just might say that the other day in this debate the Minister of Agriculture spoke for about five minutes about some transactions that I had mentioned in the Throne Speech Debate, certainly a different debate and there wasn't any attempt to bring him to order. I only hope that the Speaker will be as quick to bring him to order as he was for the Member for Milestone.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture was referring obviously to stories as reported in newspapers on debates from the Speech from the Throne which is perfectly legitimate in any debate, but it is perfectly illegitimate for any Member to quote another Member on another subject of debate. That Mr. Speaker has ruled and I think it is unfair of the Hon. Member to suggest that Mr. Speaker, is making two different rulings. He is in fact very consistent, that's my Point of Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My ruling for the benefit of the Member who was speaking, was that the Leader of the Opposition said he had certain information he wanted to bring in. I agreed that while it wasn't dealing with this motion I would permit it, but wouldn't permit it to go back into other debates, otherwise he must stay with the motion. I would permit to bring in any documentary evidence he may have but at the same time, the House agreed that it would not be permitted on the balance of the motions dealing with the same topic.

**Mr. Gardner:** — I might just say that in my opinion we shouldn't have to provide information in this House to the Department of Agriculture. I might say also that I am not even in agreement with Members on our side bringing in this information. There is much speculation around the province, surely they are aware of this, and there is talk about prices. No subject is more on the

minds of the farmers today than the prices paid by the Land Bank. The assessors are new, inexperienced, we don't know whether they are consistent or not. We know that prices vary from four to seven times assessed value. I have a file right in front of me of many transactions, not just one or two as the other Members mentioned. I am not going to table them, the reason I am not is that I am against the principle of the Opposition having to provide information in this House about specific transactions, that's the job of the Government. It is not up to us to provide these. All of this information could very readily be provided by the Minister of Agriculture. We shouldn't have to go around the country, we shouldn't have to have people writing to us and giving us this information we are not sure if it is correct or not. We are the elected representatives of the rural people in this province, there are millions of dollars of public money being spent, over 10 already and another \$20 million budgeted. We are entitled to this information now as the representatives of these farmers, not a year and half or two years later. We are not sure what they are trying to hide. Obviously they have something to be ashamed of or they would table all of this information and say here it is, take a look at it, there is nothing wrong with it. They are not prepared to do this, they are not prepared to let the people know what they are doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Would the Hon. Member permit a question. Are you saying that if you were the Government you would make the information available, and that you have in the past as the Government?

**Mr. Gardner:** — That's a theoretical questions if I ever heard one. No Liberal Government would ever put in a scheme like the Land Bank and we would never get in this position.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask one or two questions with respect to the amendment and this debate.

Really the nature of my remarks relate to the question of the statements made just a few minutes ago by the Leader of the Opposition on this matter of provision of facts. What is the situation that has developed here with respect to this debate? The situation is that the Liberal Party comes into this House and in one form or other, either directly if not directly certainly very indirectly that is as equally strong, makes a submission of wrong-doing or an implication of wrong-doing or an allegation of excessive expenditure. The thing that I want to draw to the attention of this House is what I consider to be the long standing rule of this House that when a Member makes a statement of fact he should back up that statement of fact and be prepared to back up that statement of fact. I don't know of any rule in any parliament or any legislature that allows the Members either on this side or on the opposite side to make speeches based on rumors, to make speeches based on innuendo, to make speeches based on hearsay. Surely the rules of debate require of all of us facts. When an MLA gets up in the House and makes an allegation as I read in the newspaper the other day, the Member from Wilkie did about an NDP member in the Wilkie

constituency getting an excessive price for a Land Bank purchase, that's a statement of fact. It should be based on fact, not on rumor. The rules and the decorum of this House require the Member to be able to support those statements by the necessary evidence. For the Member from Moosomin to come into this House and to say I don't have to be concerned about the facts. I can get up and wander all over the ball park. I can concoct any figment of imagination, I can pick up any hearsay comment about any situation relating to Land Bank from any person anywhere. This simply is contrary to what this Legislature stands for. If any Member opposite has an allegation of wrong-doing, then I challenge him. He must produce the facts, to back up that allegation. If there is excessive charge, he must make the allegation and give the Minister a chance to rebut, or failing to rebut that, the Minister is to be censured. But I want to note concurrently, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister is to be censured, so is the accusing Member, if he comes to the House with something that he can't back up.

People of Saskatchewan expect this House to debate on a high principle, to debate on facts. I know as politicians we all descend sometimes to breaking the rules. I am as bad an offender if perhaps not worse than any in this House. But the fact of the matter is that when you are dealing with things like this, when you are accusing someone in effect of wrong-doing, Mr. Speaker, and he doesn't state the facts, no reasonable man would consider the accusation. The Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan demand that the Member comes forward with facts. And if we don't stick to those rules, the debate is going to degenerate entirely. Anybody could come in on rumors or innuendoes or any type of hearsay that Members opposite or Members on this side would choose to offer.

I submit to the House, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that that is wrong. It is wrong for the people of Saskatchewan and it is contrary to the rules of this House. I say to the Liberals opposite, put up or shut up! If you have the facts in this matter, place the facts on the table. Make the allegations. Be able to support your remarks. If you can't support the remarks then obviously you don't have a case and you know you haven't got a case. The whole House and tenor of debate in this House goes down when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I say this with respect, comes in and makes some comments about hearing a rumor down here and the countryside is full of rumors, and I don't know what the facts are, and I am not saying that the Minister of Mineral Resources is wrong, and I am not saying that the Minister of Agriculture is wrong. Oh, no, but just in case, I want to drop this little rumor and drop this little red herring there. That approach is totally contrary to the interest of democracy and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this can only be proof positive of the total bankruptcy of the ideas and the men of the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Because when they descend to that debate, based on rumors, then they haven't got a case. Because to have a case you have to have facts. And if you don't have facts and you only have rumors, you have nothing. You have a political party which, I have said, is bankrupt, is devoid of principles, is devoid of ideas and I think that is totally improper.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. You called me to order and you called everybody to order. I don't know what the principles or the lack of principles of the Liberal Party have to do with this particular debate.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on the same Point of Order, if you don't call him to order on that then I say that this debate is wide open and we can go anywhere we want.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the Point of Order raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

It puts the Chair into a very difficult position because half of the statements are strictly out of order, but I agreed to let it wander wider than this one resolution.

Now the Attorney General said that he was attempting to answer the statements and so on, brought on by the Opposition. I would ask Members to stay close to all the rules of the House then we wouldn't get ourselves in this position. I can see justification that the Leader of the Opposition in raising his point. I can see on the other side other reasons why tempers rise and he puts the Chair in a bad position.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, this is twice that you said you allowed me latitude when I was out of order when I was off the point.

Would you please tell me what we are debating? Would you please tell me what resolution we are debating because I think we are debating a resolution about the sale of land to the Land Bank, the location and the price and an amendment by the Attorney General denying us the information about the price. That is what I think we are debating and if we are, then everything that I talked about was about the sale of land under the Land Bank, the location of land and the price of land. The fact that it didn't happen to fall within this particular municipality, I don't think has any bearing, because I was attempting to show why we should defeat his amendment and vote for our resolution to force the Government to give us the facts.

The Attorney General talks about facts. You have the fact, we haven't. You are hiding them!

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the Point of Order. You asked where you were out of order.

It was raised in the first place that this Motion dealt with the Rural Municipality No. 194. The three cases which you cited were not in this municipality. I rule that that would be out of order but if we could have them all on this one resolution and drop it on any further one, and which the House agreed to. Because it was not on this municipality right here.

**Mr. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Speaker is aware of the dangerous precedent that would be created if that were to be put into effect as a rule of the House, as it will become if the precedent is accepted — that if a bad automobile accident occurs

March 9, 1973

in a particular place and a similar kind of automobile accident occurs in a different place, it is surely not a defence to it, surely it is not out of order to show these examples, if we are talking about a dangerous situation occurring somewhere else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in any debate surely pertinent examples of events that occurred elsewhere, that could occur here, are not out of order, but are in fact in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have ruled that they are not. I would say your statement is not pertaining to the Points of Order which have been raised.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that I was interrupted by a Point of Order by the Leader of the Opposition. I took my seat on a Point of Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Attorney General took his seat when the Leader of the Opposition rose.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate how difficult the job is and I will wrap up my remarks by simply saying that the issue here is, shall the House order the Return as worded, as proposed to be worded by the Opposition, or as amended as recommended by the Minister of Agriculture? That is the issue before us. A vote yes or no will decide the issue.

I know it is tough as when you are talking about it you obviously have to involve all sorts of other issues about the Land Bank and that type of situation. My concluding remarks are simply this — that I say, with all due respect to the House, that this matter of making allegations without substantiating it in fact, is not to be commended and is not to be led credence to, as far as I am concerned, in this House and the people of Saskatchewan.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition and the Member of Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who will be following, if there is something that is totally improper about it that has come to your attention, lay it on the table.

**Mr. Steuart:** — We have done that.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Fine, you have done it today. You have assessed the arguments that are being advanced. But with all due respect that is the issue that should be before us, not the issue of something that a Member believes might be the case, or a rumor that he has picked up somewhere or other about the Land Bank. That is improper and I would ask all Members if they could remain to the issue that is before this House, namely shall that Order be made as requested or amended as proposed by the Minister of Agriculture.

For reasons advanced by others I would support the amendment that has been advanced by the Minister of Agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General certainly hit an all time low, which is pretty low for him, this afternoon.

Apparently the Attorney General needs a good political science text and I am going to get one and send it to him tomorrow. I want to answer three things due to his ignorance.

The first point he brings up is that it is wrong for the Members to say that there is something wrong with the Land Bank and this is innuendo. The number one rule, Mr. Speaker, and it has been here for a long time, that any Member can take responsibility for what he says. Our Members are doing that. The great game the Attorney General plays over there, along with two or three others is, "give us a name." As soon as they get the name they run out and misconstrue most of the information which we gave them. There is no particular reason that we have to provide names of anybody. We take responsibility for what information we give them, we take responsibility for what we say, Mr. Speaker.

There is no particular reason that we need to provide names of every single case we ever cite. He knows that very well and he is trying to draw a smokescreen around this Assembly because he knows that that is not the case.

The second point that he brings up is the implications of wrong-doing. How does the Attorney General expect me to prove the exact price that the Government has paid to a man? Tell me how you expect me to prove that? It is not filed in the Land Titles office. All I can go by is by what somebody tells me and if the man doesn't tell me the truth how am I going to prove that he didn't tell me the truth? So I provide you with the information and you run in here and say, 'Oh it is all wrong because the information the man gave you is wrong.'

I can tell the Attorney General and this Assembly what somebody else tells me but I can't prove that that man told me the truth. I have no way of knowing, so the only way that we are going to clear this up is when you provide information. And that is what we are asking you to do.

I can cite you cases where I think there is wrong-doing. I am not going to give you the names because I can't guarantee that the man who gave me that information is telling me the truth, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General knows that. The only way that this will ever be cleared up is when they provide the facts, the prices, the information to us. There is simply no way, Mr. Speaker, under the present circumstances that we can guarantee the information we bring here is 100 per cent true, because what we are giving them is what other people are telling us, and they are not signing an affidavit before they tell us.

I think that we have a substantial number of cases that have been brought to our attention, that we believe are reasonably accurate, that we are telling in good faith to the Members opposite. We are not going to cite every single one of the cases because I can't guarantee that the guy may not be \$15 out.

Mr. Speaker, this is the case and the Attorney General knows it. It is time that we quit wandering around trying to tell everybody that everytime he says that he talked to somebody's mother-in-law, that he wants to know her name.

March 9, 1973

That is all that I have to say on this subject, Mr. Speaker. The Government could do themselves a good service, and everybody in Saskatchewan a good service, by telling us what they paid for land.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some surprise (although admiration) to the way that the Attorney General has so neatly overlooked all the facts. I agree with everything that he has said except the facts in his conclusion.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Leaders of the Opposition in his remarks indicated how the Department can and has made some rather unusual errors. The examples of bad dealings that we have brought forward today were, of course, just examples and we hear cries from the Government saying file it, or give us names, or table it, tell us names, tell us how much. Now it takes a great deal of courage and a good deal of gall to make that kind of remark when they themselves have steadfastly refused to give any information at all. Yet they call upon us to give information and give names and give the facts.

If they would give us the staff we would certainly be glad to do so. Mr. Speaker, they have the staff and they have the information and they ought properly to provide it.

It is no answer to us or to the people of Saskatchewan to say that there are rumors which should be avoided. The easiest way in the world to avoid rumors is to provide the real facts. This Government has done absolutely nothing to lay one rumor to rest. They have not given one fact.

Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a debate about these facts. The Government should stand totally silent, they should never make a complaint about the Opposition in this debate because they have absolutely refused to give us any of the information which we have requested.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) in his remarks discussed an example of a fair price related to the ratio of price to assessed value of land. If, in fact, four to one is the fair value, as he indicated, perhaps they could go far enough and tell us what ratio they have been paying in the rural municipality of Enfield.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting that information, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson):

That the following be added to the amendment:

(f) with respect to each quarter section purchased, the ratio of the price per acre to assessed value.

Subamendment negatived on division.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agree to.

### Return No. 113

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 113 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Wheatlands No. 163, 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. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 113 be amended:

That all the words after the word ‘showing’ be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In the Rural Municipality of Wheatlands No. 163 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section.

**Hon. Mr. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to this particular amendment. It is the last one that is on the Order Paper other than one that is adjourned and I will not have an opportunity to debate it when it is again called.

The debate on all of these eleven amendments has been broad in field, and no doubt, as you have already pointed out on a number of occasions, there has been some other material that could perhaps be considered irrelevant brought into the debate in order to back up some of the positions and some of the attitudes of the Members who have taken part in the debate. It is true that this particular Notice of Motion for Return has been on the Order Paper since I believe January 26. When these particular Notices of Motions for Return came up for the first time in the House on Private Members day, I unfortunately was absent and I am told that at that time by the news reports that the Members on the Opposition felt that the information they were asking for was in fact most urgent. It has been plain when one follows the reports of the activities in the Legislature from that point in time until now that there have been many rumors brought forward and I think they have been better clarified in more recent days to be rumors which I think emanated from the Members to your left based on supposition and

innuendo and hearsay.

We have stated, Mr. Speaker, that we will be providing, in fact have already provided, the gross amount that the Land Bank Commission will be expending in each fiscal year of operations.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Big deal!

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — The Leader of the Opposition says, 'Big deal!' It is a big deal to spend that kind of money in order to change the transfer system of land in Saskatchewan today. We stated that the Land Bank Commission will at the end of every fiscal year not only give the total amount expended, but we will list the lands that are purchased and we will also provide the price in relation to each one of those parcels of land, but only after the transactions have been completed.

There are very, very obvious reasons for doing that, Mr. Speaker. In order to protect the seller, in order that he have some confidence in the negotiations with the Land Bank Commission while those proceedings are going on and that he is not going to be interfered with or hounded by other people that may be interested in what the transactions may be, so that it will be confidential until he has the opportunity to either accept or to turn down the offer of the Land Bank Commission.

We have also said that there is good reason to keep the amount of money that is paid for land confidential until the lease has been assigned, so that the lessee or the potential lessee will be able to negotiate freely in regard to what the conditions of lease of that land may be. I think all of these are very legitimate reasons and certainly farmers in Saskatchewan, not only those who are dealing with the Land Bank Commission at this time but others, agree that it should be confidential until the transaction is in fact signed and sealed and completed.

Now it has only been the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, who have been voicing concern and they say that they are voicing concern on behalf of the farmer of Saskatchewan. I say that their concern is only to sabotage, undermine and destroy the Land Bank Commission and its activities. I say that, because I get very few complaints as Minister-in-Charge of the Land Bank Commission. I talk to my officials in the Land Bank Commission and they tell me that there are very, very few complaints in regard to the transactions. The kind of complaints that they get are not the kind that the Opposition is trying to register in this Legislature in the past days and weeks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they say they want the facts. They say that they want the prices of land transactions. When you listen to them debate and when you follow the proceedings of this Legislature in the papers, one would think that when they were the government, when they were in power between 1964 and 1971 that they made available the prices that they paid for land, that they were purchasing at that time. They were purchasing a good many lands at the time, community pastures, land for the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation project. Now one would think that they disclosed the transactions that were taking place during that seven-year period of time. But I took a look to see whether they were making the information available when they were purchasing land, never mind at the end of

the fiscal year but made the information available, period, at any time during that seven years. When you go to the annual report of the Department of Agriculture one finds, starting with 1964 for the 1964-65 fiscal year, and in regard to the land that was being purchased for community pastures, they were expending large amounts of money because they were certainly buying large acreages of land. In 1964 they purchased 70,898 acres of land and in not one single case did they disclose what the paid price of that land was. Not one single acre, Mr. Speaker. In 1965 they purchased 44,000 acres and they disclosed the price in relation to not one single acre. In 1966, 31,000 acres were purchased and again no disclosure. In 1967, 26,000 acres purchased and no disclosure. In 1968, 8,200 acres purchased and no disclosure. In 1969, 7,800 acres purchased and no disclosure. In 1970, 10,000 acres purchased and no disclosure. Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars spent, hundreds of thousands of acres purchased and then the Liberal Government and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who was the Minister of Finance at that time disclosed nothing, nothing to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, when one goes then to the Public Accounts and wants to take a look at perhaps what the situation was prior to the Liberal Government coming into power in 1964, we found that the former CCF Government was also involved in purchasing land for community pastures at that time and I have the Public Accounts here for 1962-63, the last year that the CCF Government was in power. They have on page 91, “Acquisition of lands and improvements for community pastures”, and I can name to you, Mr. Speaker, names of farmers who sold land to the then CCF Government, “Dana, Becker, Hindlay, Sanders, Smith, Taylor”, listing in every instance the amount of money that the then CCF Government of the day paid for lands that were purchased by the Government. It was consistent for the Government of the day prior to 1964 to disclose to the people at the end of the fiscal year what they were paying for properties that they were purchasing for community pastures or for other Government needs.

But when the Liberal Government came into power, we took a look at the Public Accounts, we find that under the Liberal Government there was a change, a most significant change, Mr. Speaker. The lands, they were certainly purchasing land for community pastures as I have already noted in the Department of Agriculture’s annual report, but when we look at the Public Accounts we find that they have in the case of community pastures lumped all of the expenditures together and that they have called it ‘Operating costs’ for community pastures. Operating costs, all in one lump sum from that point in time until now, they listed no land purchases, Mr. Speaker. No land purchases at all. So for nearly seven years, because it took them a year before they realized that they didn’t want to disclose what their transactions were, they gave no indication to the people of Saskatchewan how they were expending taxpayers’ money when it came to the purchasing of lands from farmers. None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, no disclosure at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they were also in the process of selling lands to farmers in Saskatchewan. It is the reverse, granted, but it was an asset of the Crown and they were selling lands to

farmers and during that seven years of power when they were selling lands to farmers they never once disclosed to the farmers or the people of Saskatchewan what farmers were paying for those lands and what moneys were being contributed to the Treasury through those lands. Now, Mr. Speaker, our policy is somewhat different, we still sell Crown lands but by virtue of a Cabinet decision made on August 29th, we said that we would disclose the moneys involved in those transactions so that people in Saskatchewan would know what this Government was doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the Press, there has been a great deal said by the Members of the Opposition in debating these eleven Notices of Motions for Return that there is a formula but they don't know what the formula is. I have tried to impress on them on a number of occasions what that formula is.

**An Hon. Member:** — The Press has . . .

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Certainly the Press has got it, on two or three occasions in those debates I referred to it. I referred to it when I brought in the Land Bank Commission. There is a pamphlet around the province which says in an abbreviated form, what the formula is. That formula, Mr. Speaker, was passed by an Order-in-Council, No. 1222 on August 14th, 1972. It is available to all of the Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, in fact it is available to anyone I would say if he wanted to take the time to go and get it.

But these people have been trying to continue to follow that planned campaign of sabotage to undermine the Land Bank Commission, by trying to mislead farmers in Saskatchewan that we are not following a consistent formula and that in fact we don't even have a formula. That is the impression they are trying to leave in the debates that have taken place. Now in order to clarify that, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to take a few moments, I am going to relate to the Members opposite what that formula is. Then if they care to, they can take their pencils out and take notes, but if they want to have it word for word they can get the Order-in-Council, August 14th, 1972. They can read Hansard, certainly, and they would be able to find it there. But I am going to give them that formula word for word and I hope they listen. As the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak), he is not in his seat right now, has suggested that they take their earplugs out. I am not going to suggest that they put them where he suggested they put them, but I hope they take them out so that they have the opportunity to clarify once and for all in their minds that there is a formula in regard to the establishing of a purchase price of land.

Section 10 of the Regulations and I quote:

The purchase price of chattels, lands and capital improvements for the land purchased by the Commission shall be the market value of such chattels, lands and improvements.

Section 11, subsection 1 says:

The market value of cultivated land shall be determined by the Commission on the basis of the productive value of the cultivated portion of the subject property correlated with the productive value and the sale price

of the cultivated portion on one or more comparable properties, that (a) are located in the same area as the subject property, (b) are similar in type and quality to the subject property and (c) have a sale price recently determined by an arms length transaction.

Subsection 2 says:

The productive value shall be determined by professional appraisers in accordance with accepted appraisal practices and procedures that are approved by the Commission. In making his appraisal the Appraiser shall consider the latest edition of the applicable Saskatchewan Soil Survey Report for the area in which the land is located issued by the Department of Soils, University of Saskatchewan and the latest edition of the Saskatchewan Rural Land Assessment Systems published by the Authority of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Subsection 3 says:

The Formula on the basis of which the Commission shall make the correlation to which subsection 1 refers to is as follows: Market value of cultivated land . . .

And it gives the formula there which I won't go into because the Members can take it out of the Order-in-Council if they choose to look at it. It goes through for over a half a page relating to the formula as it has been related to in general terms in Section 11, subsections 1, 2 and 3. Then it goes on to state:

Where there are no comparable properties the Commission shall determine the market value of cultivated land by using the regression equation for the crop region in which the subject property is located. The applicable regression equations shall be as set out in the latest edition of farm land prices in Saskatchewan published by the Authority of the Minister of Agriculture as updated by the Economic and Statistics Branch of the Department of Agriculture.

Now Section 12 of those Regulations relates to market value of grazing land. It says:

Market value of grazing land shall be determined by the Commission;

(1) where the subject property consists only of grazing land and there are comparable properties as described in subsection 1 of Section 11, by correlating the productive value of the subject property with the productive value and the sale price of one or more comparable properties which productive value shall be determined in accordance with subsection 2 of Section 11, based on a similar formula used for cultivated lands.

It goes on to relate to market value and improvements and it says this in Section 13, subsection 1:

If in the opinion of the Commission an improvement of the land has substantial potential use the Commission shall determine the market value of the improvement as follows:

(a) houses, barns and larger outbuildings;

(a) (i) a professional appraiser shall determine in accordance with the accepted appraisal practices and procedures, the 1947 replacement costs, effective age, and current replacement cost and conformity with the latest edition of the Saskatchewan Urban Assessment manual published under the authority of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

(11) The market value shall be determined by depreciating the current replacement cost to the effective age on the basis of the following rates:

(1) frame at 2 per cent per year.

(2) masonry at 1 per cent per year.

(b) The market value of grain storage facilities shall be determined by calculating the current Saskatchewan provincial average replacement cost, which shall be depreciated by the effective age as determined by a professional appraiser based on observed maintenance and obsolescence as is set out in the following formula. The formula related to a column of effective age at and a depreciated rate. Where depreciation has taken place; Very good, 15 per cent; good, 25 per cent; fair, 50 per cent; poor, 80 per cent; very poor, 100 per cent depreciation (in fact, a write off).

(c) The market value of fencing shall be determined on the basis of current Saskatchewan provincial average replacement cost depreciated in effective age on the recommendation of a professional appraiser based on observed maintenance and obsolescence.

(d) The market value of dugouts shall be determined on the basis of current Saskatchewan provincial average replacement cost less Federal and Provincial grants received by the owner at the time of construction. A depreciation on the recommendation of a professional appraiser based on observed deterioration.

(e) The market value of wells shall be determined on the basis of current Saskatchewan provincial average replacement cost depreciated on the recommendation of a professional appraiser based on observed maintenance, obsolescence and water condition.

(f) The market value of a hydro transformer with pole shall be \$500 where the vendor has paid current maintenance fees to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation

(111) Where the Commission is of an opinion that an improvement has limited or no potential use the market value shall be the salvage or removal value.

Section 14 where an offer for purchase made by the Commission is accepted by the owner and agreement shall be entered into in the form prescribed in schedule C or in such form as may be subscribed by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, that is the formula that we have referred to and every Member sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, knew of that formula but chose not to disclose it to the people of Saskatchewan. Instead at every opportunity they had they insinuated there was no such formula. They tried to convince

farmers in Saskatchewan, those who were not well informed in regard to the activities of the Land Bank Commission, that in fact we were paying whatever one might choose to pay for land. That is not the case and I have read into the records of this Legislative Assembly those schedules of regulations which the Land Bank Commission adheres to in arriving at purchase prices for land they are purchasing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these regulations, this policy that the Land Bank Commission is now following is the first set of regulations that have ever been instituted in the Province of Saskatchewan to be followed consistently in the purchasing of farm land.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, while the now Opposition was the Government for seven years, they had no regulations, they had no policy in regard to the purchasing of lands. They went out and purchased it at the cheapest possible price. Generally speaking at a cost to the farmer, a detrimental cost to the farmer, they had no consistency whatsoever.

**An Hon. Member:** — Depended upon membership card.

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — It has been suggested except depending upon what kind of membership card one was to produce from his wallet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they not only purchased land as I have mentioned for the use of community pastures but they also purchased large quantities of land in the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project. Here they chose not to record the acreage but simply recorded the gross amount that was expended. Never related to the acreage of the farmers that were involved. When we look at the Department of Agriculture's annual reports we find that in '64 and '65 they expended \$141,000 in purchases of land, but never disclosed the deals that were made between individual farmers. No disclosure whatsoever. In 1965-66 they expended nearly \$800,000. Again no disclosure. In 1966-67 over \$500,000, no disclosure. In 1967-68 \$568,000, no disclosure. In 1968-69 \$350,000, no disclosure. In 1969-70 \$82,000, no disclosure. In 1970-71 \$26,000, no disclosure, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are also other agencies. Agencies of the Federal Liberal Government were purchasing land and did not disclose it. One could reel off a number of examples. VLA would be a good example of an organization under the auspices of the Federal Government purchasing land. It holds title to that land. It leases that land. It sells that land to farmers without any disclosure whatsoever as to what those transactions are so that the general public does not know whether they are consistent with what they would like to see going on in the way of land transactions. The Farm Credit Corporation discloses nothing. Nothing to the general public in regard to loans that are being made to farmers for the purchase of land. Nothing is disclosed, Mr. Speaker. We understand that the Small Farms Development Program of the Federal Government has no intention of disclosing information pertaining to lands, Mr. Speaker. No intention of disclosing the price of lands that are purchased, if they have any intentions of making any kind of final report

at all.

**An Hon. Member:** — With public money.

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — With public money, the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear to the people of Saskatchewan that we have changed the practice of former governments by disclosing to them the information as soon as we think it is reasonable, as soon as transactions are finished so that there will not be an opportunity for misinterpretation to take place. We will not only disclose the price of the land and list the location of the lands but we also established a formula as I have read to you in the schedule of regulations which the Land Bank Commission will consistently follow in the purchases of all land. And I ask Members of the Opposition to stop this campaign. To stop this campaign of sabotage in regard to the Land Bank Commission and be honest with themselves so they can answer to themselves when this program ultimately proves itself to be one of the most successful programs introduced for Saskatchewan agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, let's just deal with a few of the little mis-statements and innuendoes that the Minister of Agriculture just made. I have here the Journals for the third session of the Sixteenth Legislative Assembly Session, 1970. The Minister of Agriculture stood up and said the Liberals bought land, and we did, it wasn't this kind of land, it wasn't this rate. It was land for community pastures. We weren't in the land buying business anywhere to compare not one-tenth, not one-hundredth with what they are buying. They are buying land and they intend to keep on buying land, I am sure, as long as they are the Government.

I would ask Mr. Messer to point to the examples when he asked for this information. He asked for it once and we gave it to him. Now he stood up and deliberately misinformed this House. Mr. Speaker, he stood up and he deliberately misinformed this House. Friday, February 13th 1970, Returns, Reports and Papers Tabled. Return No. 9 was tabled. What was it? An Order of the Legislative Assembly dated March 6, 1969 on the motion of Mr. Messer showing:

- (1) The total acreage of Crown Land sold under the Saskatchewan Government Land Selling Program since 1967.
- (2) The Government's objective, if any, of acres of land for the year 1969.
- (3)
  - (a) The name of each purchaser of land up to December 31, 1968.
  - (b) The number of acres purchased and the location of each purchase and
  - (c) The total selling price of each purchase.

The fourth part is not relevant here. And that was tabled and we gave them the information. He went back to the annual report and he said it is not in there and of course it is not in there.

It has no reason to be in there. He probably didn't ask. Now if he can get up and cite more examples of where he asked for Orders for Returns for this information and we refused it, then I will take it back. But he did not ask for it. I have stated an example, I have looked through the Journals here, we can't find one more example in that particular year. If you can find some examples, fine. Let me also point out there is a vast difference between buying a relatively small amount of land for pasture and buying \$30 million of land from farmers.

Now, let's talk about some of the other things he said. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, we have never asked the price until the deal was closed or locked up and sealed and delivered as he said. We haven't asked the price. Finish your deal, buy your land, put it out for lease, then give us the price. But you don't have to wait until the end of the year before you do that.

The Minister says that he hasn't had any complaints. Well I suggest if he has got the intestinal fortitude to come out of his office and go out into the country and go to some of the meetings that are taking place, he will find out the complaints and he will find them out in a short time. And again, I ask him to cite Orders for Return of the questions. If he has, fine. I have cited one, I can't find any other examples. I think the truth is he didn't ask for the information or when they did ask for it, we gave it to them.

He talks about a formula. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that a formula means nothing. Unless we know how it is being applied. You can have all the wonderful formulas in the world but if you don't apply them fairly and equitably they don't mean a thing. Neither we, nor the people of this province will know whether you are applying that formula equitably until you give us the facts and give us the price. Why shouldn't you give it to us in the middle of the year? Because farmer A should have some idea what farmer B sold his land for? Why shouldn't he have this information? Why shouldn't he know what the market is? Of course he should know.

Now let's take a look at that formula. It sounds like a bureaucratic nightmare. But I tell you that formula could be applied almost any way the commissioners want to apply it. And I want to point out to this House that the Land Bank Commission is a politically chosen, politically oriented political body. And believe me until we have some facts given to us, we will believe the things that are being told to us by the farmers of this province. We will believe them ahead of the false protestations of this Government who refuse to give us the facts and clear up the rumors. If it isn't true that some people for example were offered one price, turned it down and got \$2,000 more offered two days later. If that isn't true then give us the facts. Up until we get the facts, Mr. Speaker, we say it is true. Take a look at your Land Bank Commission. Take a look at your regulations. Take a look at your formula. At least three or four times, two or three times in that formula it says, if in the opinion of the Commission, this, or that event happens or doesn't happen. Or this piece of property will have this value or this improvement will have that value, in the opinion of the commissioners.

Now, in other words the total price paid for any piece of land will in the final analysis depend on the opinion of the

March 9, 1973

commissioners. As I pointed out the commissioners are, in fact, chosen politically and we know their political affiliation and until we have the facts to prove otherwise, we still have the suspicion, just as the suspicion is rampant throughout this province that too many of the deals are made on a political basis and not on any fair and equitable application of any formula.

I see they are having a little meeting with the Premier and maybe he will be able to stand up and point out that we didn't give some prices for land. I pointed out that the Minister said we never gave them any price. I just pointed out that we did give them the price on February 13, 1970. There may be examples where we didn't give them the price. Again, I point out that there is a vast difference between buying maybe \$300,000 or \$400,000 worth of land for the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Scheme. As a matter of fact we had a deadline, we had an agreement to fulfil in the South Saskatchewan River Project. It was signed by the then CCF Government and the Conservative Government. We had to buy so much land and we did pay the market price. Whatever we had to pay, and I will clearly admit that there were different prices paid for different pieces of land because we had 100,000 acres to get into place.

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — How did you establish the price?

**Mr. Steuart:** — We established the price with whatever we could buy the land for. That is exactly how we established the price.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — And that is the market value.

**An Hon. Member:** — No formula?

**Mr. Steuart:** — You tell me any other formula since the beginning of time. An article is worth what you can get for it. Let me tell you people for your own little information, that when you buy land or when you buy 45 per cent of packing houses, the value of that is the market value not what you decide to pay and then cover up the information from the public. We paid the market price. We had to buy the land as you people had signed the agreement with the Government of Canada. Within a certain length of time we were to have so much land in place ready to irrigate and farmers were aware of it, it was common knowledge. Of course, from time to time we had to pay higher than the going price because we had to acquire that land, put in the equipment and put in the facilities in order to allow it to be irrigated so we could fulfil the contract that was signed in good faith by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Now, let me just say this, Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference again, I will say between the land that we bought and the land that we sold when we were the Government, and a calculated plan to buy \$20 and \$30 million worth of farm land, the most active purchasing of land that has ever taken place in this province's history and I suppose in any province's history. And to try and compare that to buying some land for community pastures or some land for the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project whereby we had a deadline, I believe it was

1968. We had a deadline of one or two years, there is a vast difference.

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Because you had a deadline you could steal it!

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, we didn't steal it, we paid a good price for it. The farmer didn't have to sell it to us. We didn't believe in compulsion. They didn't have to sell it to us. We offered them a price, if they didn't take the price, they could keep the land. Nothing unfair about that. Not stealing the land at all. We offered them a price, if they didn't want it they could keep the land. That is a vast difference. You are not doing the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, if they are not doing the same thing, then they admit that they are applying the formula in a different way in a different area and to different people at different times. And that is exactly what we claim. You want to talk about sabotaging the plan. They are the Government. They are the ones that have the information. They are the ones that are spending the taxpayers' money. They are the ones that are sabotaging the plan. All they have to do is give us the information, make it public. If they have nothing to hide, I am sure the public will applaud them. If there is something to hide then it should be exposed and let the public judge them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add just a few comments. First I would like to deplore the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) with respect to the members of the Land Bank Commission. There are four members on the Land Bank Commission, Mr. Miner, who I think will be identified as a supporter of our party. But to call Mr. Wesson, or Mr. Moxley, or Mr. Jake Brown political appointments, I think does a disservice to the Leader of the Opposition and to this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — These people are first class citizens, recognized as such in their communities and I would be surprised if anyone knew the political leanings of Mr. Wesson, Mr. Moxley or Mr. Brown. Certainly Mr. Brown found favor with the previous Government and that government appointed him to various posts. I think they exercised good judgment and we followed their lead. I think he is a good man and I think that he will make proper decisions as will the others. May I make one other comment before I sit down. I don't want to engage in this long debate except to say this; that if we wanted to adopt the tactics of the former Government we could simply pass these motions. We could simply say, "sure we will provide the information." Then we could sit on these motions for 10 or 11 months and then we could provide the information. This motion that the Leader of the Opposition paraded before us as an example of the free and open handed disclosure of that Government was passed on March 6, 1969 and was revealed to the Legislature on February 13, 1970.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

March 9, 1973

**Mr. Steuart:** — The end of one session and the beginning of the next.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — March 6th, the end of a session! Just a little more than 11 months. Now if the Opposition are perfectly happy, if Members opposite are happy to have these motions passed and have the material disclosed . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about the nine left over from last year?

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Don't change the subject.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I have the Journals before me and I have the questions for Wednesday April 15, 1970. That indicates that the 1970 session seemed to go on a bit. My point is, Mr. Speaker, that if the Opposition want us to take eleven months to answer the Orders we will be perfectly happy to let them pass, but we think that where the information can be reasonably gathered it should be tabled when it can be tabled. We intend to do that. Because we don't intend to disclose this information until the particular series of transactions now under way are through, we have sought the amendments that have been put on the Order Paper.

If we wanted to adopt the tactics used by Members opposite we would simply have passed these Orders and sat on them, as they did in this case for eleven months, more than eleven months. But we think the better way is to do what we think ought to be done in a case like this; get the information which we think can be given now, including the information provided for in the amendments. This we will try to do as promptly as possible and name particular names and particular prices, these will be disclosed at a later date and probably before eleven months from this date.

Probably before eleven months from this date and that's the best the Opposition did. So I think, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to disclosure, Members opposite have nothing much to parade and I think that Members opposite, if they are fair, would realize that an amendment which offers to disclose now the information which can reasonably be disclosed now and offers to disclose later the information which can properly be disclosed later, is a better course of action than a course of action designed simply to pass the Orders and sit on them for eleven months like the Members opposite did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment about the Premier's last remark. His argument does not hold water at all. There is a vast difference between passing a resolution to provide the information that the Opposition wants and amending it to not provide the information we want. We are not going to get the information that we requested because you have amended our motion and you are not presenting the information that we asked for. And there is a vast difference and the Premier can get up here and try and draw a cloak and a cloud over it the way he usually does, but the principle is altogether different.

They asked in 1969, March 6th, nearing the end of the session . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — March 6, the end of the Session!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, all right, it doesn't matter anyway. In the middle of the session — they asked for specific information. We agreed to give that information as it was asked for and that information was provided . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Eleven months later.

**Mr. Guy:** — All right — eleven months later, but it was provided. Now the situation we find ourselves in today, we are asking for information and we are being told that you can't have it today; you can't have it tomorrow; you can't have it a year from now. They are telling us, "We are not going to provide the information you want at all", and that's an entirely different situation than what the Premier tries to leave on the records of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, if I may make a suggestion to the Government. I think an excellent approach for them to take would be to publish the price after the deal is finally made with an individual when they are buying land. Once the deal is made, once this land title goes to the Government as becoming the owner of that piece of property, and if the Government published through their own news media or through one of the papers, they don't need to put the person's name in, the land description, the price paid, and I don't think that there would be much objection. I don't think this idea of tabling all of the results once every year is very satisfactory, even if it does take place and, Mr. Speaker, if a week or two weeks after the Government buys a quarter section of land they should publish the price paid.

Now as far as the formula is concerned, as the Leader of the Opposition says, Mr. Speaker, the formula — how can anybody know if the formula is working until you know what answer you get. It's impossible. Let's take for example one part of the formula in there that I would be particularly interested, and I think a lot of farmers are interested in — that portion pertaining to farm buildings. That portion, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to farm buildings. Every one who is a farmer knows very well that very frequently land sells on the basis of zero for farm buildings, because in many cases the buildings are not wanted, the person buying the half section doesn't want the buildings, he has his own buildings that he is using, he has his own fences, etc., the corrals, etc, he doesn't need the buildings that exist on that particular farm he is buying. Therefore, very, very frequently there is no compensation for buildings whatsoever. Exceptions usually are if a farmer is going to use those buildings and he is going to live in that house, or, the other exception is that the house is movable. Then, maybe it will bring a certain value, but there certainly are reports all over Saskatchewan and the formula indicates that the Government is very frequently paying a substantial

amount of money for farm buildings that in all likelihood are going to a person, under the lease, who doesn't want farm buildings at all.

Now the question is, Mr. Speaker, does the Government charge 5 per cent interest on farm buildings that nobody wants? Apparently this is going to be part of the cost if the person ever goes to buy. Now without the formula to see how it is going to be applied and the kind of results we are getting how can we possibly know whether the thing is working right or not? Because I can tell you right now that there are many people in Saskatchewan who are getting leases, or the Government is buying land, that they are saying that the Government is paying substantial amounts of money for farm buildings that nobody will ever be using and that nobody ever wants. Yet, make no mistake, the person who rents that land is going to pay 5 per cent on the price of whatever was paid for those buildings, and if he ever goes to buy that land in five years, if he does, he will also be paying the price of those buildings, because it says right in the ad in the Western Producer that the Government will not be selling land for less than they paid. So if I, as an individual, Mr. Speaker, happen to get a quarter section leased to me, and the house is on there, and the Government has paid \$2,000 for a house, I am going to be stuck for paying 5 per cent interest for that house and I will be stuck for paying the \$2,000 should I ever own it, regardless of the fact I may never ever want those buildings in my time, Mr. Speaker. Now this is the kind of thing that can only be proven to be right or to be wrong if the formula is provided to us, which it has. We are not making any secret about the formula, I have the formula, it's no secret. It was in the Saskatchewan Gazette, the Minister is absolutely right, but until we are able to sit down and take a look and see if the figure is applied right, I couldn't tell you whether that formula means anything or not, Mr. Speaker. And until we get the answer of what some of the prices are, there is simply no way that anyone in Saskatchewan will know whether that formula is a bonafide formula in getting a desired price, or a reasonable price for the land that the Government is buying.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault** (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, you know after sitting here all this time and listening to this game go on, one question after another, now we are down to number four, and anytime I see the Opposition fight a program the way they are fighting it now, it is because it is a good program . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thibault:** — . . . and they are scared of it. And just like many other programs, they try to abort it before it is born. It should be called an abortion question. Try to destroy it before it comes because you know you have had it if this thing works okay.

Now, another remark that we heard is that the land is being sold preferentially to NDP supporters. I am going to tell you something. We in the New Democratic Party don't want to destroy any species. We are going to keep some Liberals because we believe in a little variety. So we are going to

make sure that we do put a few Liberals here and there so that their species can survive. So don't worry about that one. We'll be pretty fair — one to four maybe, I don't know what ratio, but I'm sure that the Land Commission is not taking any blood tests. I don't take them in my constituency and I'm sure that Mr. Messer has chosen in the Land Commission not to be taking any blood tests. These are the remarks that we have heard and I am going to tell you, are we going to spend all this time trying to ruin the Land Bank? That's all it's designed for. We have more important things to do and I'm sure when the time comes that you will get your answers and you'll get honest answers. So I say, "Let's get on with the work of the House". I've sat here for days listening to this and there are more important things to do.

We are going to be rushing through the Estimates at the rate of a million dollars a minute when we should be spending more time on them. Here this crazy nonsense has been going on for days. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 120**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 120 showing:

The total number of employees in the public service that were categorized other than permanent employees on: (a) July 1, 1971; (b) January 1, 1972; (c) July 1, 1972; (d) January 1, 1973.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Taylor:

That all the words after the word 'employees' in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

temporary and supernumerary, in the Public Service on (a) July 1, 1971 (b) January 1, 1972 (c) July 1, 1972; (d) January 1, 1973.

**Hon. Mr. Smishek** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a subamendment to this motion, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow:

That the amendment to the Motion for Return No. 120 be amended by inserting the words 'labor service' after the word 'temporary'.

I think it will provide the information the Member is asking, plus some additional information.

**Mr. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to discuss this with the Hon. Minister this morning.

Subamendment agreed to.

Amendment as amended agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**Return No. 12**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 12 showing:

(1) The amount that has been expended in the fiscal years 1970-71; 1971-72; and 1972-73 to January 25, 1973, by the Human Resources Development Agency on: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (2) The advertising agencies used and amounts paid to each for: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (3) The names of the printing companies used and the amounts paid to each printing company.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Romanow:

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

(1) the amount of advertising that has been placed in the fiscal years 1970-71; 1971-72; and 1972-73 to January 25, 1973, by the Human Resources Development Agency on: (a) radio advertising, (b) television advertising, and (c) printed media.

(2) The advertising agencies used to place such advertising.

(3) The persons, companies or firms with which the said advertising was placed and the amount paid to each.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, there is a subamendment. This is one of the very early ones that was proposed. The subamendment, I'm proposing that we defeat the subamendment. I don't think that that should create any problems with the Opposition. I have discussed this with my friend from Athabasca. Otherwise, if we do that then the amendment will go through as we have done for the whole series of other ones.

**Mr. Guy**: — Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with the Attorney General and I think the easiest way, rather than to try and amend it and subamend it and so on is to defeat the subamendment and then we will have the same as we passed or later in highway debates and so on.

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:18 o'clock p.m.