

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
38th Day

Monday, March 19, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. F. Meakes: — (Touchwood) Mr. Speaker, on your behalf I want to introduce a group of students from your constituency, the high school at Wishart. Some of these children, I believe, come from my constituency which borders a few miles south of Wishart. They are with their teacher, Mr. Millham. They are in the Speaker's Gallery. I am sure that you would want me to say, Sir, and I am sure the other Members of the House would want me to warmly welcome them to the Legislature. May they have a pleasant and informative visit and may they have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I. W. Carlson: — (Yorkton) Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly, 40 Grade Twelve students from St. Joseph's College and Sacred Heart Academy in the city of Yorkton. These students are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Eugene Hnatiuk and Sister Mechtildt. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly will join with me in wishing that these students have an educational, informative day here in Regina and that they have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. R. Kowalchuk: — (Melville) Mr. Speaker, I too, should like to add a word of welcome through you, Sir, to the students from the Sacred Heart Academy and St. Joseph's College. I am sure that most of you know that the students who go to those two schools come from Saskatchewan and clear across Canada. In fact, many of them came from the United States. A number of those students come from my home town of Goodeve School. And through you, Sir, I want to bid them welcome and I wish them well and a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, I too, should like to welcome the students from St. Joseph's and Sacred Heart. I do this because I had the pleasure of attending St. Joseph's a few years ago — well maybe a few more than that. But I just wanted to say that I had many experiences of pleasure there, and I can well understand that we caused a few headaches to the Brothers. Now I really appreciate the reason why upon leaving, all Brothers waved very lustily. I hope you have a very good afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow: — (Saskatoon Riversdale) Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to the Legislative Assembly, 51 students from Pleasant Hill School in the city of Saskatoon. These are 51 Grade Six students who have made the journey from Saskatoon to visit the Legislature and to watch the Legislative Assembly in action. They are accompanied by two teachers. They are Mr. Bender and Mr. Matson. Pleasant Hill is an old and honorable school from Saskatoon. We all welcome to the Legislative Assembly these students.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Saskatchewan Housing Corporation

Hon. E. I. Mr. Wood: — (Minister of Municipal Affairs) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make a short announcement regarding the setting up of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation.

This Housing Corporation has been established by a Provincial Order-in-Council pursuant to the Crown Corporation's Act. The corporation will be managed by a Board of Directors whose appointments are also included in the said Order-in-Council.

I will be acting as chairman of the Board. The members will also include, Mr. William Davies, Mr. Harry C. Gemmel, Mr. D. M. Wallace, who is with the Budget Bureau of the city of Regina; Mr. H. E. Wellman community planner of the city of Saskatoon and Mr. W. T. Wardill of the town of Eatonia, which will give some recognition of the smaller places in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I expect to introduce legislation later on in this Session pertaining to the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and related programs. These programs will be directed to providing suitable accommodation for people of low and moderate incomes, improving substandard housing and related amenities, and providing an adequate supply of serviced land for housing and related purposes and conducting research into Saskatchewan's housing needs.

I should like to point out that the reason for setting up the corporation prior to related legislation being introduced into the House, is to allow the Board to hire staff and expedite the necessary administrative work to allow the Housing Corporation to become fully operative at the earliest possible date.

I should like to indicate that the province will continue

to stress close federal-provincial co-operation in the development and delivery of housing programs, but we will not be hesitant to act alone to fill gaps when we find it necessary.

I would emphasize that many Saskatchewan housing problems are unique to the province and that it is the intention of this Government to become more active and aggressive in the determination of housing requirements and delivery of housing programs to satisfy these needs.

I would also point out that the establishment of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation fulfils another of the election promises made by the New Democratic Party in their 1971 election platform.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, on a very brief comment on the Hon. Minister's announcement.

I regret very much that the Government did not see fit to bring in legislation and debate this issue in the normal manner. To me it is just another illustration, something similar to the Hog Marketing Commission.

This Government is doing what it thinks it knows best. I see no reason, and the Minister gave a very weak argument really, as to why he couldn't wait for legislation.

We have been in Session now for six weeks and he could have had the Bill in front of us. It was announced in the Throne Debate and surely that would have been the place to discuss the move of the Government to step into a housing commission.

On the other hand I welcome the fact that the Government is moving to further the housing possibilities in the province and if this is their channel, fine and dandy. I just regret the manner in which they have gone about it.

QUESTIONS

Shares Purchased in Choiceland Iron Mines Limited

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

In light of the Government's incursion into the market place and the concerns of the investing public in Saskatchewan, and the rumors that are abounding in the market place — not started by the Liberals but by the investors themselves — has the Government made any purchase or offered to purchase any shares in Choiceland Iron Mines Limited?

Hon. E. L. Cowley: — (Minister of Finance) I think, Mr. Speaker, that that question would be better placed on the Order Paper as I am not aware of all of the agencies which could be involved. I can say that I am unaware of any in my Department. If the Member wishes a more

complete answer to that question he would be better to place it on the Order Paper.

Mr. Lane: — Are you saying that you do not know of any offers to purchase . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Minister's answer is not debatable. It was not a supplementary question, it was a good try though.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. E. I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 70 — An Act respecting Urban and Rural Planning and Development.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present Bill No. 70, an Act respecting Urban and Rural Planning and Development referred to by its short title, The Planning and Development Act.

Planning Acts are nothing new to this province, indeed, we have had similar legislation since 1917. Major changes took place in 1928, 1945 and 1965. In 1968 it became clear that The Community Planning Act had serious deficiencies and since that time a major review of planning legislation was undertaken initially by Professor Bryden. Due to the rapid advances made in the field of planning, the existing Act, in its present form, is incapable of meeting the demands and needs for public involvement, the need for better land use controls, the long-range planning desires of municipalities or of the government.

The object of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to clarify and to consolidate planning legislation in this province and to introduce certain new measures. It is this Government's intention to provide local municipalities with effective planning legislation to enable them to deal with both long-term and day-to-day planning problems.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age when the citizen is demanding the right to be heard and demanding the right to participate in the democratic process. This Government is conscious of the fact that in some areas of the existing planning legislation, no such right exists. Greater provision has therefore been made for the public to challenge the planning decisions and actions of the municipal and provincial governments.

The citizens will have the right to appeal more decisions to the Provincial Government to exercise its planning functions and to provide the powers necessary to guide or control development within those areas over which it has jurisdiction. It enables the Government to deal effectively with planning problems which are outside the control of any one municipality such as a sub-division of land. It enables the Government to provide assistance in those areas where municipalities do not have the technical or financial resources to provide a proper planning service to its citizens.

The Bill provides the authority by which municipalities may voluntarily prepare a comprehensive set of proposals for the long-term development of the community. This will be in the form of municipal development plans or zoning by-laws depending upon the size of the community and the complexity of the problem. However, where the circumstances indicate need for control of development, provision is made for the mandatory adoption of development plans.

Mr. Speaker, it has become very obvious over the last year or so that some municipalities have found themselves in great difficulty when dealing with the problems associated with speculative development, due to the fact that the municipality concerned has not taken advantage of provisions made in the present Act, for the preparations and adoption of community planning schemes on a voluntary basis.

Although it is my hope that municipalities will adopt development plans on a voluntary basis, the power should be available within the Act to make the adoption of such plans mandatory in those cases where the public interest would be best served by such an arrangement.

Proposals of this nature will be subject to examination and comment by the public. The public will have the right to express their views, both to the local council and the government and such submissions will be of the greatest importance when considering the approval or otherwise of the plan.

The Development Plan will consist of survey material, a written statement, a public capital works' program, zoning and land use controls. The Plan will be subject to a statutory review at least every five years. This section of the Bill replaces the reference to community planning schemes in the present Act.

Mr. Speaker, many sections of this Bill are the same or very similar to those in the present Act and quite a few are housekeeping amendments. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in dealing with individual sections which will be dealt with in Committee. There are, however, certain important additions that I should like to bring to the attention of the House at this time.

Although the law has provided for zone controls for many years, a large number of municipalities still do not have this basic type of control. It is absolutely essential for the protection of the residents of an area, the municipality and the province, that certain municipalities, particularly in the resort areas of the province, should have such controls.

Also in the interest of justice, it will now be mandatory for municipalities that have a zoning by-law, to also have a zoning appeals board. To ensure as far as possible that an Appeals Board is independent, a municipality with a population in excess of 5,000 may not include any municipal council member on the Board.

The Minister, a municipal council or planning commission may appeal a Zoning Appeals Board decision to the Provincial Planning Appeals Board. At the present time there is no method whereby such an appeal could be made in order to rectify any injustice which may have had occurred.

The subdivision of land within the province is causing some concern, both to municipalities and the government. Public reserve requirements have now been adjusted so that dedication may be on a sliding scale up to a maximum of 10 per cent of the land to be subdivided.

Steps will be taken to deal with the very difficult problems of flood protection, development on unstable ground and dealing with unregistered, obsolete subdivision plans. It is proposed to introduce provisions in the Bill to permit planned unit development. The present conventional zoning and sub-division controls prevent bad development, but also stifle creative and innovative design which development, on the basis of a comprehensively planned unit, will permit.

A planned unit development will be designed to a very high standard from the outset and the proposals will include the detailed design of buildings, landscaping and public facilities. In return for a high standard of design and development, the conventional subdivision controls can be relaxed. Special regulations will be prepared to make this possible. Provision is also made for the protection of roads by the application of protective road development control regulations.

By this method it is hoped to prevent uncontrolled and unsightly development alongside roads in areas where no municipal development control exists.

Municipalities will be encouraged to protect existing stands of trees and woodlands within their area by passing tree preservation by-laws. The Minister of Highways will be given powers to replot land to protect highways and adjacent lands and to regularize subdivisions affected by a highway improvement program.

In other words, we will be expecting that the Department of Highways will clean up any subdivision problems which are caused by the construction of such a highway.

Provision has been made for the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to have the power of a municipal council under this Bill, so that he can carry out planning functions within that area and to delegate certain of these functions to local communities. The Bill will also apply to the Crown to ensure that all people and agencies are treated as equals.

Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading of this Bill, I would note that there has been some discussion in the Press about it, indicating that the Provincial Government was hereby arrogating to itself a great deal of powers formerly given to municipalities.

The Sections chosen for special attention were those dealing with the Municipal Development Plans. I should like to point out that this Bill is the result of a study by Professor Bryden for the University of Saskatchewan., Saskatoon Campus, as I have already stated. This was commissioned by the former Liberal Government.

When we first came to office in 1971, I found the Bill in much its present form and ready to be presented to the Government for approval, including the sections which are now being criticized in the Press. There were, however, some

things about this Bill that I questioned and this matter of the power of the Provincial Government to insist upon a development plan, where it was deemed to be advisable, was one of them.

It was pointed out to me that whatever the authority might be, it was clear that the Provincial Government had responsibility for planning. Provincial responsibility in regard to municipal matters is not new. Practically since the beginning of the province, it has been the responsibility of the Department of Municipal Affairs to see that municipal business was carried on satisfactorily and where necessary, to take control.

While this has not been done frequently, it has from time to time been done through the years. And provincial responsibility and authority to initiate planning control has also been in the Community Planning Act for years.

According to the new Act development plans must be worked out with a good deal of discussion with local people and property owners. I am not anticipating any instances where the plans will have to be initiated by the Provincial Government, but if there are, they will have to abide by the same rules. This proposed Act has been widely discussed with the planners and municipal people throughout the province and elsewhere. Although I have not discussed it with elected officials before it was introduced in the House, lengthy discussions have been held with municipal staff, especially those of the larger cities.

While at first, I thought it rather autocratic, I have been convinced, Mr. Speaker, after one and a half years of discussion, that it is right that the province should be prepared to accept its responsibilities and have not to hide behind an inadequate Act as an excuse for not endeavoring to have some good planning principles applied throughout the province. I should also like to make it clear that contrary to what may have been indicated in the Press, when a municipal development plan is approved, it does not mean that the municipality will be obliged to carry out all the terms of the plan, either immediately or at a later date. It simply means that development contrary to the plan, would not be allowed by any individual, by the municipality or by the Provincial Government. Exception has been taken to my use of the word 'significant' in speaking to the interviewing reporter. Possibly I did use the wrong term, but I do maintain, Mr. Speaker, that I was right in mentioning what I thought might be a controversial section instead of endeavoring to sweep it under the rug.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, by its very definition, is of a technical nature. I have highlighted those items which I feel should be brought to the attention of the House. I am aware that the many detailed provisions of the Bill will be discussed in Committee. I would, therefore, move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister covered many of the difficulties and the problems with respect to bringing in any legislation dealing with community planning in his remarks on second reading and I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the frankness with which he dealt with some of these problems or some of the

weaknesses, if you like, in the legislation that he is introducing.

It is a complex Bill, it is a complicated Bill. The provisions are technical, in fact, the whole field and the whole process of planning and planners in today's world is one that always did leave me a little befuddled and it hasn't improved as time has gone on.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, one of the chief dangers of the legislation that is before us is the very thing that is perhaps there and designed to make this whole process of planning a more democratic process. The question of allowing appeals to almost any move along the way, this can certainly be a problem insofar as municipal governments are concerned and I can certainly appreciate their concern in this regard. Hopefully, this will not prove to be the case, but this certainly, I think, is one of the weaknesses of the legislation.

The highway provisions are certainly good. There is no question about that. There are many other provisions that are good and as the Minister has pointed out, this is a Bill that has been under study for a good number of years, as a matter of fact.

It is a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that covers both rural and urban areas. It is a Bill that is designed originally at least, for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan needs, which are somewhat different in many respects from those of other provinces. Because it is as complex as it is, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave at this time to adjourn debate, and may I also take the opportunity to thank the Minister for giving me privately some of the explanations behind some of the moves. But I would ask leave to have a look further at some of these provisions and adjourn that debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972 — be now read a second time.

Mr. G. Lane: — (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, when I asked to adjourn debate the other day we finished up on some of the remarks from the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) who stated that any farmer with his head screwed on properly would be in favor of this legislation. We now hear some 'hear, hear's' from the members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that in the Western Producer of Thursday, March 15th, farmers (supposedly without their heads screwed on) by the hundreds are urging, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan give a vote to the farmers on the implementation of a Hog Marketing Commission.

But, Mr. Speaker, what the Government opposite has done, is bring in amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act,

which will be another touchstone in the Government's attempts to take over control of the daily lives of rural Saskatchewan.

The Government can close down any business in rural Saskatchewan and now can close down any farm in Saskatchewan, and they are proud of that fact. Subsection c(a) states:

That the Government can require any or all persons who are engaged in the production or marketing of any regulated products to register with the commission;

(c) can require all persons who are engaged in marketing of any of the regulated products to obtain licenses from the commission; and

provide guarantees of financial responsibility.

Supposedly, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to help the small farmer. Instead, they want financial guarantees before he can get a license and has to go through the political apparatus of the Government in order to get the right to produce a commodity. And then, Mr. Speaker, the Government can cancel or suspend any license for a violation or any part of any of these rules or regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is attempting to take control of rural Saskatchewan and this Bill is just another aspect in that attempt. To top it all off, the Government then, after setting the rules and regulations and the stringent political requirements which it will have, will then put the onus back on the farmer to prove that he didn't break the rules.

The Government is proving its arrogance by attempting to ram this policy down the throats of rural Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan farmers are being told to place themselves totally within the hands of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the reverse onus clause is nothing but the most direct evidence that we could possibly get that the Government intends to steam roller its programs down the throats of rural Saskatchewan and down the throats of the farmers of Saskatchewan without regard for their future.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Bill 50 make this Act infamous and it will also make the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) infamous.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is attempting to deceive this House and the people of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Agriculture stated in the Debates and Proceedings, 1971, 'that this Bill was only to be brought in in an emergency'. Those were the words of the Minister of Agriculture. The need for a Commission can be better outlined, 'a need for quick action by the Government to correct or improve a deteriorating market crisis'. "Crisis" is the word that the Minister of Agriculture uses. That was what the Minister of Agriculture told this House when he asked us to vote on that Bill. It's not true. It's not true and he proved that he didn't mean what he said on that date by bringing before us The Hog Marketing Commission, without regard to the producers, without regard to

the people of Saskatchewan and without regard to what he said in this House.

He states that the hog producers support the implementation of a Commission without a vote. I urge the Members opposite and we've been accused of paying for this ad in the Western Producer . . .

An Hon. Member: — Who did!

Mr. Lane: — We didn't have to pay for it because the hog producers themselves did it and they are prepared to pay for it with their own contributions. The Liberal Party didn't have to do anything because the Government opposite forced the hog producers to go to the public and go to the people and present their side of the story because it wasn't given by the Minister of Agriculture.

What does that Ad state?

Attention: Hog producers mail these coupons to request a vote on The Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission.

Big bold headlines —

“Did you know — This is the First Commodity in Saskatchewan to be put under Compulsory Selling System without a Vote?”

By law, any commodity, including beef, can be put under a compulsory selling system without a vote. The Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission is responsible to the Government and not to the hog producers. The Saskatchewan Government has presented a Bill to the Legislative Assembly in Regina to license all producers. Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission favors selling hogs by negotiation of both price and now many hogs each packer gets. The Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission has the power to determine the time and place at which a producer may sell. The Saskatchewan Government now owns 45 per cent of one of Saskatchewan's packing houses.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has said that the hog producer favored the compulsory marketing commission, the implementation without a vote. But what do the hog producers themselves say? They say in this public notice that they want a vote, that they want a right to determine their own future and yet the arrogant Government opposite and the arrogant Minister of Agriculture say 'no'. No vote — no democratic right to decide your own future. That is the approach of the Government opposite. Ram it down the throats of the hog producers without giving them a say as to their own future.

The Minister of Agriculture sees truth staring him in the face and we won't do anything about it. His statement that the Act would only be used in emergencies is not true. The statement that the unvoted Commission is supported by the hog producers of Saskatchewan is not true. His political statements on corporate farms and his statement in the last Session dealing with Second Reading to The Natural Products Marketing Act, he makes the comment:

Individual producers fear the advance of horizontal and vertical integration and corporate farming and see marketing boards as a useful farm organization to curb such developments.

Those are the comments of the Minister of Agriculture. What does he say outside this Legislation? First of all with regard to the matter of corporate farms. A headline in the Star-Phoenix, February 28, 1973:

“Messer Calls for Corporate Farms”.

What he says in the House and what he says in public are two different things and he is overriding the duly elected opposition and he shows utter arrogance for the position of this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture states that the producers are opposed to vertical integration. That's what he said in the House a year ago. What is the first company bought by the Government opposite? A packing plant. Vertical integration. In spite of what he says in the House the producers are against it, the Government opposite turns around and buys Intercontinental Packers — 45 per cent interest and then pays twice as much as the company is worth in their hurry to get a hold of this and completely refute what he said in the House.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the matter of the Intercontinental Packers deal (and it's relevant in this debate) because the Minister of Agriculture has stated that Intercontinental Packers and The Hog Marketing Commission will work very closely together. It's a vital issue in this debate. The Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, fell over backwards in their rush to buy Intercon at any price. All that Mr. Mendel had to say was, “I want \$10 million”, the Government — “we'll give it to you”. “Just give us 45 per cent.” And all we have to do is just find the Press statements and the words of the Premier that that deal only took three weeks to negotiate between the time that the discussions were started between Mr. Mendel and the Government of Saskatchewan. It took three weeks for the Government to spend \$10.2 million to get their clutches on the Intercontinental Packers and in effect, set up government controlled vertical integration of the producers of Saskatchewan. That's precisely what that was made for and it is that very reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite was in such a hurry and such a rush to take over Intercontinental Packers.

Again, we've had deceit, we've had deception. We've had untruths by the Government when it came to what they intended to do about vertical integration, what they intended to do, but I think in reality this Bill makes it very, very clear what direction this Government is going to take. It's going to take over, it's going to take complete control of rural Saskatchewan and the farmers of Saskatchewan and it is the farmers who are now starting to rise up in protest — the farmers with their heads screwed on properly are now starting to rise in protest. The ones who don't have their heads screwed on properly as the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) said, are the ones who are sitting back and not reacting to what the Government is going to do.

The Government has taken control of the land of rural Saskatchewan and what a farmer can buy and what he can't buy.

March 19, 1973

They have now taken control of the agricultural machinery dealers in Saskatchewan. They are taking control now, with this Bill and these amendments, of the fruits of the farmer's labour. That's NDP policy for rural Saskatchewan. The Government intends to control rural Saskatchewan. It tells the people in rural Saskatchewan where they can live, how they will work, when they will work, how they will sell, when they can sell and when they can buy. That is NDP policy for rural Saskatchewan.

You can accuse the Liberals of rumor-mongering and paying for ads in the Western Producer, but you'll never hide your true purpose from the people of Saskatchewan because your statements, your deceptions are becoming evident throughout this province. These amendments will be proudly opposed by the Liberal Opposition and we will probably proudly hold meetings around this province to make sure that every farmer knows exactly what he is getting from the Government opposite. We make no apologies for telling the truth to the farmers of Saskatchewan because you refuse to do it.

This Government, by this Bill, and its statements made in the House last year and its phony, inaccurate justification for The Natural Products Marketing Act, is merely trying to cover up what they are attempting to do in Saskatchewan, but the people, the people in rural Saskatchewan are no longer being fooled.

The only part left that the Government has not yet taken control of in rural Saskatchewan is the chain stores, and the markets and we can await for that day because we expect it in the near future. We expect the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Tchorzewski) to make an announcement at any time that the Government is going to control the end result of farmers' products.

I should just like to close, Mr. Speaker, with a quote from the Star-Phoenix of January 25th, 1973, under the headline—

“Angry Hog Producer voices Dissatisfaction to Messer”

Mr. Messer replied:

Democracies would be in total chaos if every decision were decided by plebiscite.

When we were the Opposition a marketing agency was one of our platforms. Obviously, somebody thought it was a good idea. If you don't like the way we are operating . . .

and I'm quoting the Minister of Agriculture:

. . . if you don't like the way we are operating you will have an opportunity to register that disfavor in the next election.

I can assure the Government opposite that the farmers of Saskatchewan are starting to register their disfavor now and we urge the Government to reconsider this proposal to take over control of the fruits of farmers' labor in Saskatchewan.

Needless to say, we in the Opposition will proudly oppose the amendment proposed by the Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. F. MacDonald: — (Moose Jaw) Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about how disappointed I am with the attitude of the NDP members opposite. The hog producers have taken action that they feel is necessary. They have taken out an advertisement in the Western Producer, they feel that their case is justified so they take out an ad in the Western Producer and what do Members opposite do, they belittle the efforts of the hog producers for trying to put forth their position. They say that the Liberals put them up to it, that the Liberals paid it. Just because the producers have shown some opposition to the party opposite is no reason to belittle their efforts. They have every right to tell this Government how they feel about this Bill without being belittled at every turn. It goes further than that. Near my community in Moose Jaw a group got together last week at Marquis and again they took a vote at that meeting and at that meeting the vote was 84 against the Bill and 3 in favor of the Bill. Again, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) got on the hot line and he belittled the efforts of that meeting. He said that the meeting wasn't representative and he wanted to know how many hog producers were there. Well, it shouldn't matter to the Minister of Agriculture how many hog producers were there, this Bill 50 is not concerned alone with the hog producers. Beef producers and producers of any other commodity have every right to show their opposition to the Bill. When they do so they have no right to be belittled for their efforts. I don't think the Minister of Agriculture should expect people to roll over and play dead just because he is going to put a Bill through. It is a disgraceful action on the part of the Members opposite and the Minister of Agriculture. I think he is going to have to learn that he is going to have to listen to the farmers of this province and he is not going to be able to steamroller them.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 66 — An Act respecting Community Colleges be now read a second time.

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, permit me to look through this . . .

Mr. McPherson: I got a speech here.

Mr. Mostoway: — You have one? If I read on of your speeches, fellas, I am afraid I couldn't get back to the constituency. They wouldn't have me. I might add that if I read one of your speeches, I wouldn't blame my constituents one bit for running me out of the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill in regard to community colleges, I think, is a good Bill. I think it is going to be a good Bill because it will permit community colleges to be set up within the various areas of the province. I think it is good because up until this point, we haven't had anything to kind of set as a go-between universities and our grade schools. It seems to me that there has been a need for this kind of a school

or a college throughout the province. Very often people will find themselves a little too old to want to go to a grade school, or for various reasons, they will not want to go to university because it is extremely formal. I think that this will fill the needs of those people. Another thing that I see in this Bill, because of the makeup of the board where there will be representation from various people within the district, is that this will reflect on the policies and the courses offered at these community colleges. I can see courses in various things that local people want. There could even be courses, quite possibly, on anthropology. Sometimes they might get into the realm of certain politics. It could be anything that the people would want. So I would just want to be very specific in saying that I fully support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Richards: — (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to say a few words in support of the principle of this Bill.

There are three pitfalls which any community college development program must avoid. I hope that we have succeeded in avoiding them. The first, but very obvious pitfall, is that we create community colleges merely as a string of second rate universities as has unfortunately happened with certain community college programs in other jurisdictions. The second pitfall to be avoided is to conceive community colleges as being merely another string of technical training schools. The third pitfall which often has bedevilled adult education programs is irrelevant, unstimulating, deadend curricula, stereotyped recurrent bad jokes about basket weaving.

If we can avoid the three pitfalls of trying to have second rate universities and trying merely to use them as an extension of technical training and of having them loaded down with irrelevant deadend courses, we may be able to provide a truly flexible institution which, to use a somewhat hackneyed phrase, will bring education to the people. I hope that we shall succeed in doing this. I hope that we shall be able to satisfy particular demands by particular people in local areas for the particular kinds of courses they want. I think the Department has to its credit been solicitous of discovering what are the felt educational needs in local areas which community colleges could serve.

The community college first must remain in some sense a humble institution in the hierarchy of educational institutions. It should not aspire to large buildings, large staffs, large budgets, professional organizations and all the kind of paraphernalia which we associate with institutionalized education. The second purpose which they must observe is the humble one of being an effective, alternate route for people to get back into the main stream of education, in particular to get back into universities.

I should like people to realize how few people really do get access to and do get the benefits of publicly supported university education. In Saskatchewan one person in eight in the age group of 18 to 24 is actually in attendance at

university. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the proportion of people in this age bracket attending university is actually declining. Enrolment is declining not only as a result of declining provincial population, but also because the proportion of people attending university is actually declining. For example, in 1970 — 13.26 per cent of 18 to 24 year olds were at university and this had declined, admittedly quite marginally, but it declined to 12.57 per cent by 1971. If we pride ourselves on the availability of post-secondary education and it is seen as a right and not a privilege, the reversal in the trend of rising university enrolment and an actual decline in the proportion of young people going to university are rather grim statistics.

Another concern not new to educators, the fact that there is obvious discrimination of there being far fewer women relative to men actually going to university. In Saskatchewan of the age group 18 to 21 — 22.7 per cent of the men, but only 15.3 per cent of the women actually get to university.

A final form of discrimination in our society with respect to university education is surely the one with respect to age. We take it as factual and we take it as inevitable that the time to go to university is the late teens and early twenties and after that you should settle down to the grind of earning a living. Why should that be? Why should that be that at an age when people are changing jobs, at an age in which we fortunately do have some increase per capita income relative to times gone by, why should it not become normal that people at any age in life who desire to return to university should not be able to do so? Despite all the rhetoric about availability of education we have got the fairly dismal statistic that those students over 30 years of age constitute a mere three per cent of university enrolment.

With that kind of background, Mr. Speaker, of problems of access to university, I hope that the community colleges when established will serve as a valuable in-between institution, a humble institution perhaps in terms of size, space, staff, etc., but nonetheless an institution serving a very valuable function in contribution to the idea of universal access to education.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. E. Guy: — (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make one or two comments. I haven't too much to add to what has already been said by Members on both sides of the House. I think they support the principle of the Bill. I think the last speaker, the Member for Saskatoon University, probably made the best speech from that side of the House. Most of the Members got up and one after the other said, it's a great thing and they are supporting it, just because it is a New Democratic piece of legislation and so it has to be automatically successful. I think the Member for Saskatoon University mentioned three pitfalls which on this side of the House we accept as being probably either the reason why it will succeed or why it will fail.

He mentioned first of all that we don't want community colleges being a second-rate university and I think we all agree with that idea, with that philosophy. He says we don't want to have another string of trade and technical schools evolving.

I think that that is also true and a pitfall that must be avoided in this new approach. He said, finally, that we don't want to be burdened down with any more irrelevant, deadened courses. I think we all agree with that.

Having referred to those pitfalls and pointing them out, he didn't go on to say what he saw in the Bill as being some reason these pitfalls will be avoided. This is what I should like to make one or two comments on this afternoon. He said he hoped that these pitfalls would be avoided and we certainly all hope that. I think that built into the legalization there are some very definite reasons why the pitfalls will not be avoided. First of all is the absolute control which the Minister has taken over the establishment of community colleges. He is the same Minister who has complete control over the university and it is becoming more obvious every day. He is the same Minister who has complete control over all the technical schools and the technical trades in this province. He is the same Minister who has complete control over the ordinary school system. So I say that when you have the same Minister in complete control of all the institutions of learning in this province that the chances of what the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) suggested of a watering down of one system, or overlapping another, is quite likely and quite probably what is going to happen.

This is one of the weaknesses I see in the legislation. The Minister has taken too much control upon himself. Members opposite spoke of the large amount of local autonomy that was being provided in this legislation, well this, of course is nonsense. There is very little local autonomy because the one aspect of local autonomy which has to be there, of course, is fiscal autonomy and there is no local fiscal autonomy in this legislation at all. All of the money is being provided by the Department of Education through the Minister. Therefore, the Government has complete and absolute budgetary control. When Members opposite say that they are going to be able to control the courses on a local basis because the members of the board have to come from within the region, that is not necessarily true and in fact it is probably not true. Whoever holds the money bag will also control the courses. It might be very well for the local board to say we want to have a course in xyz and the Minister says well I am sorry we haven't got that kind of money this year, we can't provide that course. So regardless of what the members on the board will like to have in regard to who teaches in the school, their qualifications, their standards, and what courses they want in the school, it is all going to boil down to the fact, is the money going to be there. Of course, the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has absolute complete control in the fact that it is being funded by the Department of Education and by the province.

This brings up another question that I have some concern about. We've seen the university fees increased quite substantially this year. We've seen the fees in the technical schools increased quite substantially this year. The Minister hasn't said and I hope that he will say categorically when he is closing the debate whether there will be any student charges for attending community colleges. He didn't say one way or the other when he introduced the Bill or if he did, I am sorry I missed it. I think we in this House would like to be assured that there will not be. If the Government is going to have 100 per cent fiscal control, then there shouldn't be any charges

against the students taking any of these courses. I hope that he will make that clear. I hope that he will make it clear also that not only is he going to have free courses, free education through the community college system this year, but it is going to be a practice which will continue. We have all seen how the NDP talk about universal accessibility to universities and the abolition of tuition fees and yet over the years, and certainly since they have become the Government again a couple of years ago, the tuition fees instead of being abolished or reduced are being increased on a very regular basis.

So those are some of the things which we on this side of the House fear may prevent the three pitfalls mentioned by the Member previously, as not being avoided. We hope that this system will be successful. We'll be watching the four pilot projects very carefully. I think it is going to take, and I say this with all deference to the Minister and quite sincerely, I think it is going to take a great deal of hard work in establishing this new system with the pitfalls that have been mentioned. And particularly without falling into a pattern of too much government control in an area where if they are going to work it's got to be if they are community colleges in the full sense of the word. I am not sure that the set-up provided in this Bill will accomplish it. We hope that it will and we certainly support the principle.

Mr. H. H. Rolfes — (Saskatoon Nutana South) Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this Bill.

First, if I may I should like to say a few words about the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and what he had to say about the Bill. It always surprises me, Mr. Speaker, how some one like the Member for Athabasca can stand up in this House and speak about local autonomy. When he was a member of the Treasury Board, considerable local autonomy was taken away.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Those of us who were in the field of education when he was on the Treasury Benches know too well what was meant by government interference. We know all too well what it meant when a government dictated to local boards. How much they allowed increases in salaries for teachers. We know all too well, Mr. Speaker, what it meant when by Order-in-Council they told us and gave principals the authority as to how long teachers were to work and when they were to work. We know all too well, Mr. Speaker, how they issued school operating grants when they were the Government.

We, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House know that there are pitfalls in this particular Bill. But if you were only to present a Bill with no pitfalls you would never present any legislation. We are aware of some of the weaknesses of this Bill. And I think Members on this side of the House have pointed them out. I agree with the Member from University (Mr. Richards). If community colleges are going to be an extension of technical schools or if they are going to be an extension of university then we ought not to get into them.

We don't want to copy what some of the other provinces have done in Canada. We want to make absolutely certain that our community colleges are not going to go the way of community colleges in Alberta and Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, before I go a little bit further I also want to mention that when the Members opposite were the Government they also were planning for community colleges. They also made announcements on community colleges. A few years ago I was able to get hold of their draft legislation. I wish I still had it with me. That particular draft legislation, Mr. Speaker, gave all control, absolutely all control, to the Department of Education, to the Minister of Education. There was absolutely no indication that local people would make any decisions. The Minister of Education was to decide what courses were to be available. The Minister of Education was going to decide who was going to be on the board. The Minister of Education was going to decide what schools were going to be built. And by the way, their emphasis in that draft legislation if I remember it, was on physical plants. They were going to establish physical plants, which of course this legislation does not.

Mr. McIsaac: — On a point of Privilege, I wonder if the Member could tell us what draft legislation he is speaking of. There certainly was no such legislation ever drafted in the Liberal term of office. At least he is not talking about it if that is the case. Now either table it or back it up a little better than he is talking about.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, maybe I shouldn't have used the words 'draft' legislation', it was a proposal. It was a proposal by the Department of Education that had gone out to various people and I believe it was in July or August of 1971 when I happened to get hold of one of the proposals. And as I say, I haven't got it with me but I am sure that I could find a copy of that proposal some time, I will look for it.

Mr. McIsaac: — I'll give you one.

Mr. Rolfes: — You'll give me one? If you have one I would appreciate getting one so I could . . . Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to say was that the new Bill that we have introduced into the House puts emphasis on courses. It de-emphasizes buildings, it de-emphasizes campuses. And I believe that this is the heart of the whole Bill. We are going to leave the authority up to the local people to decide what they want and what is needed. There is absolutely no doubt that the present situation in education leaves much to be desired. The Member for University has already pointed out that only about 18 per cent, if we are generous, only 18 per cent of our people go to university or technical schools. What happens to the other 82 per cent? What opportunities are there for these people? We spend right now about \$50 or \$60 million on universities and technical schools. Surely another \$2 or \$3 million for the other 80 or 82 per cent of the people is not asking too much.

This particular legislation, Mr. Speaker, tries to fill some of the gaps that present education leaves in Saskatchewan.

Those of us who have spent some time in high schools know how fed up many of our young people are with education. And some of us have to take the blame for it. I think this innovation that the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has come up with is a good one. It is an alternative to the present situation and certainly deserves support of all Members in this House.

This particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, also makes available to rural people some of the opportunities that many of their city friends have.

We said in 1971 when we went about this province during the election that we would equalize opportunities in rural Saskatchewan. This is another one of our determinations to carry out those promises. I think that people in the various areas of Saskatchewan will be able to decide for themselves what the needs are.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that just because we pay the bill that we have to determine for the people at the local level what the needs are. I don't think that the present Minister of Education is going to tell the people of a particular community, no, because I don't agree with the needs, you can't have that. This might have been true from 1964-71 but I do not believe that that situation is true today.

Mr. Speaker, as long as we have a Minister of Education who believes in community schools, who believes in fulfilling the needs of the community, as long as we have a Minister of Education like that, I certainly am not too afraid that local needs will not be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there are many gaps in the present educational system. The community colleges as I see them in this particular Bill will fill these gaps. And I hope that through the establishment of these community colleges throughout the whole Province of Saskatchewan, we will be able to maintain a rural way of life. We will be able to give to people who are 30, 35 or 40 years old an opportunity to re-educate themselves, to upgrade themselves and obtain the knowledge that they want. Many of our people are forced into early retirement. Many of our people have many hours of leisure time and they would like to spend this time in more meaningful activities.

I think community colleges will fill this gap. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the legislation that the Minister of Education has brought forth which will establish community colleges in a very unique way in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy: — (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise again in closing off second reading debate to thank all Members in the House for their support of this Bill. A record which is so far unusual it would seem to me. I also thank all Members who have spoken on the Bill for their suggestions of some of the difficulties we might face as we implement the community college program.

The Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) talked about the pitfalls. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) continued on and we're very sensitive to, in fact, those pitfalls as they were raised. Concern expressed by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) about the appointment of boards, consultation between boards and the Department of Continuing Education in appointment of staff. And we share some of those concerns and the legislation is deliberately drafted in the way it is because of our concern about the new concept. Now it is not a new idea but the concept in terms of making that idea a reality is something new not only in this country but on the North American continent. We are embarking on something unique once again here in Saskatchewan as we implement the community college program in the way that we are.

Now, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) talked about the lack of program in the initial stages in the city. We have said that the program won't begin in Regina and Saskatoon and Moose Jaw and Prince Albert. We have said that for two reasons. Because, Mr. Speaker, we want to get a good foothold in the country. And because there are all kinds of adult education programs being offered at the present time in the four cities, through the university, through the technical vocational operations, through the adult education programs that are conducted by school boards. We think that it is necessary to begin in the rural communities, in the smaller cities, before we in fact move into the large cities. And I don't think that there is any question that we will see in the future community colleges under way in Regina, in Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, as we develop, as we get a foothold, as we build in the philosophy in the rural communities.

There was a great deal of talk from the Member for Wilkie about how much work had gone on under their years of office. How they had put forward a proposal. How they were ready to bring in legislation had they been elected.

I think I can say to all Members here, Mr. Speaker, that it was a good thing that they weren't re-elected just in terms of the program that they were going to bring forward. Because not only would it have cost the province a good deal of money as we have seen taking place in Ontario and Manitoba, because their concept was the technical vocational concept. But also we would not have built in the community control which is so vital to the community college program which they have talked about on the other side of the House.

As far as control by the Minister, no question, their program would have contained the same kind of approach as ours is with respect to the Department of Education or Continuing Education and thus the Minister.

Now a very legitimate question was asked, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the financing of the community college program. And it is interesting as I listened to the Members opposite that the Member for Athabasca was saying that the financial control with the Department of Continuing Education will be a very serious drawback to the program. As I recall the Member for Wilkie speaking, said that it is necessary in fact to have that financial control in the Department of Continuing Education.

Now we agree with the Member for Wilkie that it is

important to have financial control. If the Member for Athabasca believes, I think that is what he was saying, that the board should have a right to levy a property levy for community college, then I think he is wrong. I think he is wrong and I think the Member for Wilkie thinks he is wrong. If that means autonomy for a board to levy a mill rate for this program then I think he is wrong. There has to be, it seems to me, some financial control of the program centrally, particularly with respect to the present legislation. How it will be financed, now and in the future, will be through a grant from the Department of Continuing Education. But there will be a tuition fee charged to students who embark on the programs. We don't see any reason why there shouldn't be that kind of local input into the program at the community level. The board will levy a tuition fee for the varying programs that they conduct. And certainly as is the case of the technical student as is in the case of the university student, if assistance is needed for the tuition, for board and room by students participating in the program, our loan bursary program will be available to them.

Let me, in winding up, say that the legislation as presently drafted is legislation that is drafted for the four pilots. We are just going down the road in this new program. The philosophy it seems to us dictates some special kinds of clauses in the legislation, some special kinds of restrictions with respect to boards and how they are appointed. As we develop the program, as we look into the future, there is no question but we can see boards being partially elected or totally elected. No reason why those boards can't have complete autonomy with respect to their staff. But if we are going to make this work it seems to us that it is important that we at this point at least have some kind of control. For certainly every one that has spoken in this House has said we don't want junior universities, we don't want the technical vocational approach. We do want the community program. We think this legislation, established for the pilots, will bring that forward in this province. And as I said before, we will bring leadership to community education, into adult education in this country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 60 — An Act to provide Financial Assistance to Encourage and Promote the Development and Expansion of the Agricultural Industry in Saskatchewan be now read a second time.

Mr. W. A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with respect to Bill 60, The FarmStart Bill. As an urban Member I very strongly support this Government's concentration and emphasis on re-vitalization of the rural economy of Saskatchewan. I think it is absolutely essential not only for Saskatchewan as a whole but also in terms of the cities, Saskatoon, Regina and even the smaller cities. We cannot possibly expand and grow without a re-vitalized rural economy. I think we should look at the statistical data related to the

situation in agriculture in Saskatchewan. This will enable us to clearly place ourselves in a position where we would give strong support to this type of legislation.

Statistically Saskatchewan had some 85,000 farms in 1966. This was reduced to 76,690 by 1971. That trend has been here for a long time. In fact it has been here for some 15 or 20 years. The Liberal Government from 1964 to 1971 claimed that they were going to try to bring sufficient industrialization to the province to stem the population decline and they were not successful, Mr. Speaker. Their emphasis, of course, was on bringing industry to the province. This Government's emphasis is on agriculture and the processing industries related to the basic industry — agriculture.

We should take a look at these 77,000 some odd farms in 1971 in relation to their economic situation. Of those farms, only 22,000 or a little better than 22,000 actually had sales of agricultural products in that year of \$10,000. This means if you assume roughly 60 per cent of the costs of production are in expenses which have to be recovered in terms of the agricultural industry, that even the top 30-35 per cent of our farms only had a net return of about \$4,000 per annum. Mr. Speaker, \$4,000 per annum is a pretty minimal annual income in today's world, some \$333 a month. The 1971 census also indicates there were some 24,000 farms in the category which had sales between \$5,000 and \$10,000 on an annual basis. There were some 16,000 farms with sales between \$2,500 and \$5,000. There were almost 14,000 farms in the province which had gross sales of less than \$2,500. Obviously farmers in this category are living well below the poverty line.

One of the major problems in the province and all of us should realize this, is related to the declining population particularly in rural areas. Rural inhabitants' capability of maintaining the social structures required in those areas decline as well. Grid roads on which we have an investment of some \$175 million, perhaps \$100 million at the provincial level and \$75 million on the municipal level; schools which probably have a total plant investment in the range of up to \$300 million; hospitals that range from \$350 million to \$500 million; business establishments and associated services all added together perhaps total some \$2 to \$3 billion in capital in terms of rural investment which could go down the drain unless we take imaginative steps to alter the trend. That will only occur if we are willing to be a bit aggressive in terms of what we decide to do. The Liberal Party when they were the government watched that steadily decreasing trend in population and did not devise any comprehensive or imaginative programs to stem the decline. It is like watching a fellow bleeding to death and saying, I'll come back 10 years later and see how you are making out. It just doesn't work that way. That route leads to disaster.

For us really to do something about this situation, action is required. I am of the opinion that Bill No. 60 creates a situation that will give us at least a tool which may well assist in halting decline in rural population. Mr. Speaker, it may result in an increase, even if that increase occurs on a rather modest basis. I noticed the other day when the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) was speaking in this debate he said that in reality all this Bill was doing was bringing together a number of prior programs which provide incentives for farm operations. Well, if that be the case, so be it, but at least

we must make a serious attempt to stem the population decline.

Looking again specifically at the principle of the Bill, it bears a relation to the fact that statistically our farms are in trouble and, Mr. Speaker, they have been in trouble for a considerable period of time. We may say that with increased grain prices and markets we can make some progress in improving the economic returns to the agricultural industry. While true, that can be a pretty dicey situation, because there is not much stability in that approach. In actual fact, all the grain production in this province could come from about 12,000 people. That would mean that we would have two large provincial centers, some minor smaller cities and the rural areas would be largely denuded of population and obviously would be denuded of services. I think it highly important that we do our utmost to turn this trend around and I believe the FarmStart Bill is one which gives us reason to believe that we can effect this very much desired change.

The Bill itself will permit loans up to \$60,000 and grants up to \$8,000. Under the Bill people will be eligible if they have less than \$100,000 of productive assets. The Bill is oriented in a manner in which people who have incomes of less than \$10,000 per annum will be eligible to participate in the FarmStart program. This will be another means of creating employment because livestock production is labor intensive, much more labor intensive than grain farming. It will assist us to probably increase the population in the rural areas and in itself will provide considerable stimulus to the general economy because of the need for constructing new facilities related to intensified livestock production.

Mr. Speaker, as an urban Member of this House I wholeheartedly support the emphasis that the Government currently places on measures which may revitalize the rural economy and the rural communities of Saskatchewan. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to live in a province where we find large concentrated urban areas with the rural areas largely denuded population and of services. Frankly, if that rural population declines sufficiently it will not be possible to maintain even a minimum of good community services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Richards: — (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I too should like to rise in support of the principles of this Bill. I think the Bill basically has two purposes. Very simply put, the Bill is seeking to encourage one further program towards farm diversification and secondly the Bill displays a very healthy concern with the whole question of equity in farm programs.

Diversification, Mr. Speaker, is one of those motherhood words in the realm of farm management, like efficiency, good management, etc. Everybody talks about it, everybody is in favor of it, rather like the weather, nobody does very much

about it. What has really happened in the Saskatchewan rural economy when we take seriously the statistics over the last decade of experience with programs designed to encourage farm diversification? I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot avoid a pessimistic conclusion. In 1961 grains accounted for 67 per cent, fully two-thirds of the farm cash receipts; livestock in that year accounted for 22 per cent and the remainder came from various miscellaneous payments. In 1972, Mr. Speaker, the last year, of course, for which data is available, grains accounted for 68 per cent and livestock 25 per cent. After 11 years experience receipts from grain rose one per cent as a percentage of total cash receipts; livestock receipts a three per cent increase. Surely this is not a very dramatic diversification record! There is admittedly some shift between different grains. In 1961 wheat contributed 60 per cent of total receipts and that had declined to 52 per cent by 1972. Apart from that internal shift within grain production one cannot deny the remarkable stability in relative terms of grains versus livestock in total cash receipt statistics of the Saskatchewan farms.

To be a little more specific and break these figures down a bit, wheat bottomed out in 1969 at 44 per cent of total cash receipts and since then the percentage from wheat has actually been increasing. Wheat was 52 per cent in 1972 and with good prospects of sales, (if we get a crop this year) who can be really optimistic that, in the short run there will be any further diversification out of wheat. On the other hand, as for other grains, after all the attempts that have been made to diversify grain production, other grains as a cash percentage peaked in 1969 at 24 per cent of total receipts. They declined by 1972 to 16 per cent. As for livestock, it too peaked in 1970 at 27 per cent of farm receipts and it has marginally declined down to 25 per cent in 1972.

I don't mean to be a Cassandra by making public these statements or by analyzing these statistics, but I think we must be very acutely conscious of the problem of whether any of our programs will seriously put a stop to the charms which wheat has had as the siren attracting the Saskatchewan farmer. One of the most persistent characteristics of our provincial economy has been wheat. In 1972, after all the attempts at agricultural diversification and beyond that attempts to diversify our economy out of agriculture and into mining and manufacturing, 38 per cent of net commodity production in Saskatchewan in 1972 still comes from wheat. Add to that other grains and fully 56 per cent of commodity production in Saskatchewan still comes from grain.

We all know the dangers of a one-crop economy. We are all anxious of what can happen to our provincial economy given instabilities of climate and markets for wheat. With that fear in mind I wish this program every success. I hope that it can have the desired impact of seriously convincing farmers to diversify.

Referring now to the second principle, that of equity. Equity is another of those vague general words which we are all very keen about, but it does hopefully have some substance when it comes to determining programs. Far too often agricultural experts are solely concerned with maximizing the aggregate of value of commodity production and are unconcerned about one of the distributive effects of the income thereby generated in the farm economy. Many farm programs have been discredited,

not because the basic intent was wrong but because of their failure to come to grips with who gets the benefits from the programs. Programs which provide public money to large farmers discredit themselves in the eyes of the public. Therefore, I am pleased that this program is oriented towards smaller farmers and it has in it the ceiling for eligibility of \$100,000 available assets, and other constraints so that grants and subsidized loans will not be going to the large farmers who do not need them.

I am also pleased to see the idea of agricultural development counsellors providing farm management skills in the context of family farming and not making the assumption that we necessarily need further and further farm consolidation in order to get efficient farm management. There is an element of pessimism among agricultural economists who assume the only way to have efficient farming is to do away with small operators and to adapt the industrial model of large corporations to farming.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Otto Lang deserves a certain credit, from Members on this side of the House, not only for having helped get us elected but for the popular uprising against his Agricultural Task Force, but rather more seriously for the fact that he, as a politician, was willing to have published the Agricultural Task Force report which for all its failures in terms of radical concepts or new directions in farming, did at least have the virtue of painting clearly what were the trends in farming in terms of increasing size, in terms of declining population etc. It is the reality of these trends which are the overwhelming fact in agricultural policy in the 1970s. I hope that FarmStart can, via various pricing mechanisms in its grant formulas, have some substantial impact upon diversification. However, I think that the farming community at some date in this decade will have to choose explicitly, and hopefully there will be a political forum in which it can choose explicitly as to whether it wants to maintain independent small family operations, whether it wants to try to revitalize co-op farming as a model or whether it wants to accept corporate farming as the inevitable conclusion of Saskatchewan rural development.

There are, crudely speaking, those three choices before Saskatchewan farmers. It is not for me, as an urban Member, to make that choice for them. All the programs that we have to date, good and however well-intentioned, FarmStart may be as one of them, will ultimately prove insufficient unless farmers conduct that explicit debate and unless they are prepared to take the legislative measures to make that choice real. With that warning and with that air of guarded optimism, I am glad to give my support to the principle of FarmStart legislation.

I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUEST

Canada's Easter Seal Timmy

Hon. A. E. Blakeney: — (Premier) I should like to introduce to you a special guest. Seated in the Speaker's Gallery is Master Danny Musgrove, the 1973 Timmy for all of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Many of you I think will have heard of Timmy and seen him on television, seen him at two successive Kinockey Games, and know something of the Danny Musgrove story. It is really a remarkable story. Danny is 11 years old, he is a grade six student at Richmond Heights School in Saskatoon where he maintains a better than average academic standing. He plays defence for his schools 'C' Division hockey team; he has a Fifth Star in swimming at the YMCA; participates in wrestling, floor hockey, lacrosse; he plays the trombone in the school band. This is a pretty active life for any young fellow. It is a particularly active life for a young fellow who has the disabilities that Danny has. I think we all know them, he has a number of physical disabilities, more particularly he has two artificial legs. Any of us who have difficulty skating with two good legs as we demonstrated, I think perhaps unnecessarily clearly at the Kinockey Night the other night, we all know just what an accomplishment that is. I think Danny is a credit to himself particularly, but also to his parents, his school and his city, and he is an inspiration for people young and old who suffer from a physical handicap. He is a living example that persons who suffer from a physical handicap can, and do, live a full and complete life.

I know that all in this House would want to welcome Danny formally and I will ask him to stand.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, just a very few words to associate myself and the Members on this side with the remarks of the Premier.

I am sure that there is one thing we would all agree politically, privately at least, and perhaps this is a good time to do it publicly, when we look and listen to the achievements of a young chap like Danny, we stop, as politicians — at least I did in listening to the Premier — and realize that there is one thing that political parties are not very good at and that is the kind of inspiration and the kind of example that this young man has given us.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly on this side and all Members, congratulate him on the job he is doing himself in showing everybody how one can live with disabilities and live tremendously. I say, again, we are glad to see you here. Keep up the good work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 5:31 o'clock p.m.