

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
69th Day

Tuesday, May 1, 1973.

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

QUESTIONS

Old Age Pensions

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — It has been recently brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that when the Federal Government recently increased the old age pension to the extent that two persons over 65 years of age now receiving full supplement would have a minimum of \$295 per month. When the increase was announced the Department of Social Welfare reduced the amount paid to the extent of the increase. The situation I recently encountered, Mr. Speaker, was a family of three with one person 73 years of age, one person 60 years of age and a dependent child of 15 receiving a total payment of \$208 per month. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask that Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) if he is willing to review this policy which resulted in the Government taking away all of the increase and it would appear in some cases more than the Federal Government's pension increase?

Hon. A. Taylor: (Minister of Social Services) — Mr. Speaker, the policy the Member refers to has been in effect for a good long time. It's an agreement with the Canada Assistance Plan and the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan which places the provisions of assistance on the basis of need. Certainly, I think, and the Special Intersessional Committee is looking at the question of what the needs allowance ought to be and we will certainly be taking this into consideration in reviewing whether the needs ought to be raised. But income has to be counted as income and has been for many years. If we want to provide greater assistance it can only be done by increasing the amount of need, which would not only be for senior citizens but for all citizens.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, certainly it is an injustice where two people over 65 years of age can receive an income of \$295 per month and in a family when there is one person of 73 years of age with a daughter of 15, receives a total of \$208 per month for all three. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government has apparently adopted a policy of them receiving less?

Mr. Taylor: — I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, I can't quite follow the Member's comments. He says something about \$295 a month and yet they are only getting \$208.

Mr. Weatherald: — At 65 they would get \$295 a month.

Mr. Taylor: — Okay, so the needs under our plan may be slightly lower than they are at \$295, and as I have stated, we are

reviewing the needs, we are looking towards an upward revision. This is one of the things the Intersessional Committee is looking at and we will be happy to take action in the near future in this regard.

Motions for Returns

Return No. 256

Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 256 showing:

(1) (a) The date and subject matter of each press, publicity or communications media release issued by each branch, agency and department of government in the fiscal year 1972-73. (b) To whom each of these releases was sent.

(2) (a) The date and subject matter of each voice clip distributed by each branch, agency and department of government in the fiscal year 1972-73. (b) To whom each of these clips was sent.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, we have looked at this Order for Return and would like to supply information to the Hon. Member. It happens that the information which he requests is not available if we interpret the request appropriately. He asked first the date and subject matter of each press, publicity or communications media release issued by each branch, agency and department. If by this he means each publicity or press release which is sent out in writing by any branch, agency or department of the Government then that can be answered. It would be a great deal of work but it can be answered.

Communications media releases is obviously an ambiguous term and if it seems a verbal comment to a radio station if they call in or a television station if they call in, that is, in a sense, a communications media release, but these are not recorded.

To whom were each of these releases sent — no doubt this could be supplied but I am going to move an amendment which deletes that on the grounds that it's a prodigious amount of work. There will be ten or a dozen radio stations or perhaps a little more than that, maybe 20 or 25 radio stations and maybe 100 or so weekly and daily newspapers and we're looking at communications media releases of a written kind which will exceed 1,000. If we have to identify for each of 1,000 releases the 80 or 100 newspapers to which it may have been sent and the list will vary, then we are looking at a release which, unless we could find ways of grouping them, would indicate some 100,000 items. I am going to ask the House to delete item (b).

Voice clip distribution, and this is not clear what is intended here. If it means tapes, whether a tape is sent out, then we can accommodate that. My people tell me that a voice clip distribution ordinarily means that we prepare a voice clip, we put it on a machine, someone calls in and takes it off the machine electronically and we don't keep records of the people who call in and themselves make a voice clip from our recording. This happens both formally and informally. I know informally it certainly happens with me. In any case, as an example only,

May 1, 1973

a reporter will come to my office and indicate that he wants to ask me a series of questions. I will ask the Cabinet Press Secretary, Mr. Powell, to come along and make a recording of what I say and the reporter will voice something over a radio station and as soon as he does a number of other radio stations call in and at this point Mr. Powell plays back to them the recording of what I said to this other reporter, they all then have the same. That, in a sense, is a voice clip distribution, but we don't keep records of those. So we don't really have any records of voice clip distribution other than actual mail-outs of tapes. And we are, therefore, left with some information to provide the Hon. Member.

I am going to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General):

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

The date and subject matter of each written news release issued by each department of government in the fiscal year 1972-73.

Mr. Speaker, that in itself will be a very large amount of work involving I would think some thousands of items probably since the Department of Highways churns them out on which highway has got a ban on it and which highway doesn't have a ban on it and DNR churns them out on which hunting season is open and which isn't for block or other blocks, and all of these news releases go out in their hundreds and we have to acknowledge that. I don't know any way to separate those from the ones which the Member will want which are of more political content so I think the best thing for us to do is to give him all of the dates and all of the subject matters of all of the news releases and I think that's about the best we can do. They will take some time. I am going to ask the House to defeat the suggestion as to whom the news releases were sent because, again, the list principally is of the weeklies and we have to go through that for each of these some thousands of releases and I think that would be an enormous amount of work.

With respect to the voice clips we just don't have the information which we can give him and therefore I am asking the House to acknowledge this as a reasonable effort to supply the information which the Member asks and accordingly I move the amendment which I earlier indicated.

Mr. D.G. Steuart: (Leader of the Opposition) — I think I will ask leave to adjourn the debate with the idea that we will sit down with Mr. Romanow or someone. We recognize the problems the Premier has posed here and we don't disagree with the amendment and we are prepared to sit down and go over it with someone on that side to see if we can reduce it. We're not interested in the hundreds or maybe thousands of press releases about conditions of the highways and so on. What we are looking for frankly are the ones of a political nature and it may be that we can by discussion eliminate the ones that are not necessary and bring in another amendment or a subamendment to these. And so I will ask leave to adjourn the debate and we will discuss this to see if we can reword it.

Debate adjourned.

Adjourned Debates

Resolutions

Resolution No. 20: To urge the Federal Government to construct a new runway at Regina Airport.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):

That this Assembly urge the Federal Government to construct a new main Northwest-Southeast runway at Regina Airport at least one mile south and west of the present main runway and that the present East-West runway be extended to the west for the use of all jet and large aircraft.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald: (Moose Jaw North) — Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Members from Regina Albert Park and from Regina Lakeview particularly for showing their concern and indeed their responsibility to their constituencies. I think the residents of these two constituencies which they represent bear almost totally the tremendous annoyance from the noise of the large jets at the Regina Airport. They also bear the risk of a possible disaster from a possible crash. Citizens of south Regina have a legitimate concern with the airport and I recognize this concern. And I have said I recognize the part played by the two Members on this side of the House in bringing this matter before this House. However, I would like to urge Members of this House to either withdraw the resolution or to delay passage. I would even go so far as to urge the defeat of the resolution even though I recognize the concern of the citizens in south Regina. My reasons for saying this is not that I am against the proposed resolution, but I do not think that the resolution takes into account all of the factors involved. Nor does it provide an adequate solution to the problem created by the airport near a city. I urge the withdrawal of this resolution so that all factors may be taken into account and a proposal brought forward which embodies a longer range and more adequate solutions.

May I first of all say, as the Member from Moose Jaw North, that the city of Moose Jaw has hopes and aspirations that in the future an airport would be more accessible to our city than it is at present. We feel that there is a trend in larger cities to have the air terminals and runways located away from the city. Therefore, an airport conforming to this concept and located ten or fifteen miles west of Regina would serve this concept as well as making airport accessibility available to Moose Jaw.

A location towards the town of Pense would satisfy the desires of Moose Jaw and district. Potential industry in Moose Jaw would be facilitated by closer and easier access to air travel and to air freight. This point is brought forward by potential industry justifiably or not. It should also be pointed out at this time that there has been some discussion of an industrial corridor between Regina and Moose Jaw. We already have two examples of this type of thing between the potash plant at Belle Plain and the salt plant at Belle Plain. It is suggested that other industries might be located similarly thus removing the hazard of urban pollution and industrialization. An airport located near the centre of this proposed industrial corridor could help as a stimulus to the project. This proposed corridor would then have an excellent access to rail, road and air. This project may seem a long way in the future but I don't think we should commit ourselves to short range solutions

May 1, 1973

without considering the longer term benefits that could be attained.

We should also consider the results of the proposed resolution. First of all, the relocation of one mile or about one mile does not eliminate either the noise factor or the danger factor from the city of Regina. The proposed relocation would simply lessen these two factors. This may satisfy the residents of south Regina for the time being because anything is better than what they are putting up with. However, we might find that in about ten years the same residents would be again urging for another relocation. Secondly, the proposed relocation would not permit utilization for development of the present site of the airport. This site could well be prime land for development if the airport were moved ten or fifteen miles. Relocation by about one mile would also render the land in south Regina and in particular south of No. 1 Highway absolutely useless to further development. We would, therefore, be denying any further development of Regina to the south or to the southwest. It has already been pointed out that in conjunction with any relocation there should be a policy of land sterilization in order to avoid the situation similar to Albert Park, which was largely built after, and in spite of the fact that large jets were landing at our airport.

We must also be aware that at some time in the future we may find it possible to have an international airport in south Saskatchewan instead of the domestic type of airport that we now have. This could mean flights north and south instead of just east and west. If this happens, the city of Regina would be confronted with much more air traffic than they have at the present time.

There have been suggestions that moving the airport towards Pense, would result in air corridor conflict, with the Canadian Forces Base at Moose Jaw. On the best and the most reliable information that I have been able to get I have been assured that this is not the case as long as the airport were not relocated to a site south of No. 1 Highway. And even if this was the case, I understand that the air corridor pattern at Moose Jaw could be rotated to a north-south access, in any event it should prove not too much of a problem.

It should also be noted that a significant number of loadings originate outside of Regina and that there are several ticket agencies outside of the city of Regina. There are two agencies in Moose Jaw, there are agencies at Swift Current, Assiniboia and at Gravelbourg. There are no surveys to indicate the origin of loadings but the number from outside of Regina is certainly significant.

I recognize that relocation of the runway, utilizing the same terminal as is proposed by the Member for Albert Park, would only cost about \$7 million or \$8 million. A total relocation would cost at least \$50 million. However, in moving this resolution, I think that we should be concerned with more than the monetary implications. We should indicate to the Federal Government what our wants and desires and aspirations are and this should be based on a long-term goal.

It is for these reasons that I propose that we should be cautious and careful before indicating any recommendations to the Federal Government. The needs, the desires, and the

aspirations of Moose Jaw and other centres in south Saskatchewan must be considered. Therefore, while recognizing and congratulating the two Regina Members for their legitimate concern, I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I see that the mover is about ready to rise so I just might say a word or two before I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

I am not a Regina resident. I happen to have a home here because of other matters but I do notice that this subject of an airport has been a matter of some concern by city council in Regina. I believe that the city council of Regina has not come to any final decision on this issue, none that is certainly visible to myself.

It appears that there are many aspects that have to be considered and I think it would be perhaps unwise for us to proceed headlong, as the Member for Moose Jaw suggests, to pass an opinion on something, which to a very large extent, is a purely local matter, a Regina matter. I realize the Member for Moose Jaw sought to expand it, to involve Moose Jaw residents and other similar aspects. But I think basically this is a Regina matter and we ought to let the local authorities make some decision on this. After all, I am one who believes in a high degree of local authority and freedom for local decision-making processes as I am sure some of the Members opposite do as well. Therefore, I think that we ought to be very careful before we move precipitously with respect to this resolution.

I happen to live on Hill Avenue which is five or six blocks away from the airport and the jet aircraft certainly do create some problems. I am very pleased to see my MLA from Regina Lakeview speak for this area. But I wonder if we get a bit carried away. He talked about the bigness of city life in Regina and Saskatoon. When we talk about moving airports 15 miles from Regina and the like, I am wondering if that is perhaps not stretching and exaggerating, with all due respect to the importance of the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. I know that when we travel we like to think of ourselves in the category of Vancouver or perhaps of Edmonton or perhaps Toronto, but I think that it must be kept in mind that we are not of that size.

As I say, I am not a resident of Regina and I speak strictly as an interloper, who I hope will have a long life in Regina, although one can never be sure. I am not quite sure speaking as a Saskatoonian why one would like to have a long life in Regina, very frankly. But in any event, I am concerned about this implication for local autonomy and local government decision-making. Therefore I should like to show some caution before we pass this resolution.

I see that my colleague from Regina North East is here and he will undoubtedly have more to say on this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I am going to

May 1, 1973

be very brief. I am sure that the Hon. Member from Albert Park as well as the Hon. Members from Whitmore and Lakeview have no doubt had representations from people in those areas of our city, expressing concern about the flights that go over the residential areas in that part of our city. I must say that the resolution itself is one that merits consideration and I am not opposing the resolution per se. The difficulty that I have in my limited examination of the problem is in talking to members of city council, making some checks. It is my understanding that the community or the planning group in the city are looking at that particular problem and have come up with some recommendations, some thoughts.

I am advised that the Regina City Council has not made a decision, has not considered this particular proposal. I have, in fact, become more concerned about the proposal in the resolution in the last few days. As the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) is aware, last week there was a meeting between the mayor and the federal officials to talk about the airport. I am advised that there were five alternatives that were considered. Two of the alternatives were to leave the airport where it is. Two of the alternatives were to move it into an area perhaps along the lines as is suggested in this resolution and one was entirely different.

I am aware that His Worship Mayor Walker just late last week, made the announcement after the discussions with the rural people. He felt that the airport should be left where it is for the time being. I am also aware that the federal people, the transport people, will be spending something in the order of \$750,000 on renovations of the building. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether really this is an issue that the MLAs from both sides of the House, might get together on with the city council to come up with an idea, because I would be concerned that we take a position here which our city council has not had an opportunity to consider fully its implications and come up with thoughts themselves.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I am not opposing the proposal, but I do think that we do have to recognize the local needs and the views of our city council to make sure that we are on the same wave length and perhaps collectively come up with, between our city council and between the MLAs, a position and exert as much influence as possible on the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Adjourned Debates

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw) that **Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act, 1972**, be now read a second time.

Mr. A.R. Guy: (Athabasca) — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned the other day during debate on it, I adjourned it in order to give the Member who introduced the Bill an opportunity to close the debate. I think he will be

here very shortly. I have nothing further to comment.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this particular Bill, the proposed amendment to The Trade Union Act, it has attracted from the Hon. Minister of Labour, rather a lengthy and unfortunate speech in this House, a speech which I believe has done serious harm to the Minister of Labour himself and to the trade union movement.

It struck a low when it came to statesmanship in this House. It is a matter which I would like to examine at some length, and I have been preparing remarks for the House addressed to this Motion. Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with this on Friday, the next Members' day, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I know I ought not to be saying this but there are two Bills that are before us. One is The Trade Union Act and the other one is The Labour Standards Act under Government Orders. I am just wondering as I was under the impression that informal arrangements, so-called, was for a wrap-up by the Hon. Member but maybe I am wrong.

Mr. MacLeod: — Just on that point, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if the Hon. Minister misunderstood. It is quite true that the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) adjourned it and his remarks were with the intention that if wrap up should be given, that the Hon. Member who moved the Motion should be given the opportunity to wrap it up and close the debate.

Regrettably I was absent from the House at that particular moment. I did not hear the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Labour but I heard of them and I have read about them. Consequently I have determined that it is appropriate to answer those remarks. I should like to speak to them. I have been preparing material. I should like to deal with it later and, therefore, do beg leave to adjourn the debate. I regret and apologize to the Hon. Attorney General if some misunderstanding did occur.

Debate adjourned.

Final Report of the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora) that, the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands be now received.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, as the mover of the motion that this Final Report of the Special Committee regarding the foreign and corporation ownership of land in Saskatchewan be received by this Assembly, I take great pleasure in speaking to this motion.

It gives me pleasure, indeed, to speak to a report which I anticipate will lead to legislation that will be a major factor in the preservation of the viable family farms of Saskatchewan.

May 1, 1973

I have had the satisfaction of having served on two Agricultural Committees, both very closely related and directly concerned with agriculture. In both cases I have had the honor of being chairman of these committees.

Now there have been criticisms voiced against the committee system and many reasons were used to draw such conclusions. I don't intend to enumerate them here, Mr. Speaker, I will, however, state in a most positive manner possible that committees structured by using members from Government and Opposition side of the House can produce and have produced, answers to questions that could not be obtained in any other form.

Now this type of collective association tends to diminish the political antagonisms and polarizes the thinking of the Members to work with certain objectives in mind. It is the most democratic process in my opinion and an arena in making it possible for all people to participate and have an input.

My opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that committee reports, if studied and used by Governments and not necessarily used in totality, can be the most effective way to produce legislation that people want and that there is a need of.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that my comments in the remarks in the report expressed quite clearly somewhat my thinking on the committee, its incorporation and its members. I should like to read the statement for you, Sir:

In a democracy the responsibility of the elected Members is to represent his constituents and to help enact legislation consistent with their goals. Democracy implies that Members and the electorate should meet to share their views with one another. The purpose of a special committee of the Legislature is to provide an organized way of acquainting members with opinions all across the province and to provide the public with an opportunity to speak to members, from both sides of the Legislature, on current issues.

The fruits of our labor, as a committee, will be, I trust, a better informed public and a more understanding and sensitive group of Members of the Legislature. The opportunity to share in the work of the committee with members of both parties, has been an opportunity to put the long-term well-being of our communities ahead of our short-term partisan concerns.

My colleagues on the committee are from rural and urban areas and from both parties. I take this opportunity to record my gratitude for their wholehearted co-operation during the hearings and during our own committee meetings. Our assignment was probably one of the most sensitive and important, the control of our land resources and the future of community life in Saskatchewan, that a committee could be given. Each of us has brought his own experience and insights to bear and our report does not fit precisely the pattern that any one person or group would draw if he were the sole draftsman. We trust that our efforts will be guidance to the Legislature and serve as resource material to all who may consider the issues relating to land ownership and use. We have noted in various places in our report our appreciation for

assistance given us as a committee in the past year. The privilege of having been the chairman of the special committee has been a stimulating experience for which I am grateful.

These are my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

It's a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that a special committee on agriculture was established by this Legislature to deal with the question of land tenure in Saskatchewan and specifically the wording of the amendment to the motion was:

That such committee be directed to investigate the purchase and ownership of agricultural lands by non-resident, foreign and corporate persons.

A controversial question indeed, Mr. Speaker, a question that begs for answers in view of the interest generated by the introduction of Bill 115 as a point of discussion. This is a question that was anxiously discussed in all parts of Canada in regard to not only agricultural lands, but recreational lands as well, whole big blocks of land being taken over by non-Canadians, lock, stock and barrel; a question that was anxiously asked by the farmers of Saskatchewan who saw that the lands that were pioneered and broken by their forefathers slowly, but surely, being taken over by non-Canadian people, corporations run by non-farmers and they saw rural communities in danger of being destroyed by corporate organizations and large plant owners.

Mr. Speaker, indeed a very controversial question, but to a great many people of Saskatchewan a very crucial one when regarded in the light that throughout Saskatchewan a looming question has to be answered: "Who in the very near future will end up owning Saskatchewan farm lands?" The farmer and the family farm unit, or the big land owner and the commercial corporation, either foreign or domestic?

There are many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, for the study which I will not enumerate. I am sure Members will bring forth many of these reasons, making this study necessary and other reasons that emerged as the hearings progressed.

As I indicated before, Mr. Speaker, a special committee was struck, consisting of eleven members, eight from the Government side and three from the Opposition, one member was promoted to Cabinet position and did not serve. Mr. Speaker, in spite of a number of minor skirmishes, arising out of a misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the terms of reference where some members had the notion that Bill 115 was the subject of the hearings, and when that was settled to what I consider mutual satisfaction, it was agreed then that matters relating to land tenure in Saskatchewan was relevant in the area of discussion and that Bill 115 was dead and done with. The committee worked diligently, co-operatively and exceedingly well together.

May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to say that all members of the committee had in mind the welfare of the Saskatchewan farmer and the welfare of the Saskatchewan people and the community and were searching for answers to the many different and difficult problems the farming community was being continuously faced with, regardless of what other differences of opinion they may have had personally. They all recognized that farm

May 1, 1973

lands are a resource far different than the other resources of the province; that it was a commodity that we have only so much of; that agriculture being the basic industry of Saskatchewan, the land base was a very crucial resource in the overall economy of our province and its people and, therefore, there was an overall agreement that if we were to be masters of our economic destiny, we the people of the land would have to be in control of our land.

Other factors relating to the farm economic stability are probably even of greater importance to the well-being of our farming people. This I intend to discuss later on in the debate.

I want personally to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, all the members of this committee on their overall performance during these long, hard and often weary hearings. But I am sure that all members will say that they were compensated frequently with the very challenging and stimulating discussions with the people, with the many people across the province who came to present their briefs and to speak to the committee members. I want to thank the committee members for their co-operation and sincere effort. On behalf of the committee I also want to express thanks to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Gordon Barnhart, who once again performed, organized and participated in the most efficient manner; who guided the committee through its work by helping set out the agenda and the travel itinerary including the trip to the United States. Also to the many other people involved; Roy Korpess, the research assistant; Professor Paul Jensen, assistant in writing the report; Mrs. Marion Kelly, recording secretary; Mrs. Joyce Rublee, recording secretary, Merry Harbottle, secretary and a good number of others who helped in the total job of compiling and completing the study of the report on foreign and corporate ownership.

I want to say how I am personally appreciative for having the honor and the task (the hard task) of being chairman of this committee. I don't mind the difficulties and the inconveniences. I am a farmer, I was born on the farm. I guess my feelings for the land and the farm people will always be deep. I have a great respect for the people who till the soil — who have a feeling for it, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I am willing to sacrifice a great deal to see that these people remain on the farms and anything I can ever do to promote the co-operation and good will and provide room for mutual discussion for and against on farming issues, I will do so, Mr. Speaker. But I do want you to know Sir, that I am appreciative of being given the opportunity to have chaired this committee and to have steered and guided it in this very important agricultural issue.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read another part of the report and that is that agriculture is the basic industry and I think it is important that this be recorded in the minutes of this Legislature:

Agriculture is the basic industry of Saskatchewan. In no other province of Canada does agriculture contribute as large a portion of the provincial product as it does in Saskatchewan. The land base of our agricultural industry is thus a very crucial resource in our overall economy and a study of the ownership of agricultural lands is by its very nature a far-reaching study. A consideration of appropriate policies for agriculture thus amounts to consideration of policies that are appropriate for

the economic well-being of the entire province.

The committee found that the public was interested in very broad issues relating to agriculture. For example concern was expressed for the difficulties faced by agriculture and businessmen generally in the province that arise out of the national transportation policies of Canada. The rise in cost of inputs of farmer's purchases have been one side of the cost-price squeeze in which agriculture is caught.

With 1960 as a base of a hundred the farm machine price index had climbed to 137.2 by 1971 (and by today it is worse than that). The index for petroleum products reached 117.3 and for repairs, tires and batteries — 136.1 in 1971. The cost-price squeeze robs many farms of fair incomes and is the major deterrent to the entry of young people into the career of farming. While the price indexes noted demonstrate the impact on farmers or the inflationary trend which they neither cause, nor can control, we note that the management of the Canadian economy is a Federal responsibility.

Important though the price income situation of farmers is, it is not within the powers of the province or the terms of reference of our committee. A major concern of persons presenting briefs or who spoke at the hearings was for the transfer of farm lands from one generation to the next. (A very important one, Mr. Speaker). This concern for land transfer is recognized and shared by the members of the committee and is a vital part of the entire land ownership situation. The importance of credit programs, especially for small or beginning farmers hoping to raise more livestock, is evident.

The study of foreign ownership, prepared by Professor Brown, provided factual information on the extent of foreign ownership in the nine townships lying along the entire southern border of Saskatchewan. We agree that a record of land ownership and use by various categories of owners should be obtained and maintained on an up-to-date basis.

The committee believes that recreational lands are also a valuable public resource. The safeguarding of the use and the ownership of recreational land was urged by many persons who presented briefs and spoke at our hearings. Accordingly, we are offering recommendations respecting recreational lands as well.

We trust that our report has expressed the concerns of our Saskatchewan people and that it offers good guidance to our colleagues in the Legislature.

I think a very basic and important paragraph right here, Mr. Speaker, is the last one and I quote:

Our faith in the role of the farm family in the future of our communities and of our province is the basic theme of our entire report. We will recommend ways of safeguarding the family farm and rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, the committee set out 12

May 1, 1973

recommendations — some very much to the point and very specific, some being more specific as well, but properly clarified and strengthened by the following recommendations:

Recommendation number 1:

That the Legislature enact special legislation — The Family Farm and Community Group Agricultural Incorporation Act.

This recommendation is to legally identify the people who legitimately are farming people; clearing any doubt as to who qualifies within those definitions as a farmer and those who will be restricted, Mr. Speaker.

Recommendation 2:

That the acquisition by any means of agricultural land for agricultural purposes by any corporation except a farm family or a community agriculture co-operative, be prohibited.

Mr. Speaker, there is no misunderstanding this recommendation. It is clear and to the point that no corporation except family farms, a community group or a co-op will be allowed to farm when, and if, such legislation is written.

Recommendation 3:

That any corporation except the farm family or community group, or co-operative association now owning agricultural lands be required to dispose of the land by a specified day 20 years from now.

That, Mr. Speaker, is also clear that they have a 20 year period to dispose of the land.

Recommendation 4:

That known corporations should be registered for the carrying out of any agricultural purposes except as a farm family or community group or agricultural co-operative association.

Almost a corollary of recommendation 2 except that it states “no acquisition by non-farming corporations”, as 2 does, and 4 states “no registration by non-farming corporations”. It’s a sort of clean-up recommendation.

Recommendation 5:

That no corporation, except a farm family or community group or agricultural co-operative association should be permitted to operate any agricultural enterprise after five years from the date specified in the legislation.

Once again it specifies that after the date of legislation these corporations that are in the farming business will have five years to get out of the farming business.

Recommendation 6:

That no one except a Canadian citizen or a landed

immigrant may acquire by purchase, gift, inheritance or other means, except from the spouse, any agricultural lands in Saskatchewan.

This again is very clear. Upon the date specified in legislation no one except a Canadian citizen or a landed immigrant will be able to buy Saskatchewan land or acquire it in any way by gift, inheritance, except that of a wife or husband. And it cuts out all non-Canadians purchasing Saskatchewan farm lands.

Recommendation 7:

That alien individuals now owning land should be permitted to continue as owners and to transfer the land to a spouse.

Now this is regarding individual people not corporations. This is an offshoot of Recommendation 6. As I said, it is different from the corporations, they have 20 years to get rid of their land. These people, individual aliens, can continue to own land, can transfer to a spouse or to a husband, but must eventually sell, bequeath, give or lease to a Canadian citizen.

Recommendation 8:

That the ownership and control of lands suitable for recreation be studied.

I think that's clear in itself. It wasn't within the terms of reference but the committee members felt very strongly that this problem should be studied.

Recommendation 9:

That the effect of large farm land holdings of all kinds in Saskatchewan communities and Saskatchewan agriculture be studied.

We say that an immediate study of the effect on communities of large land holdings of all kinds be done. Thirty-eight per cent of the people answering the questionnaire expressed their view and the fear of large land owners. We heard it expressly said from the lips of people who appeared to speak to us.

Recommendation 10:

That a central registry be maintained showing the ownership and operator of agricultural land and recreational land.

I think this is very clear that to keep a good record of what is happening, that this be done.

Recommendation 11:

A promotion of the co-operative movement.

I am not going to say very much about that. I shall speak a little more on Recommendation 12 before I close, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard the recommendations — 12 of them. I think that it was a really good effort on behalf of the committee to come up with something like this in that short

space of time. I should like to read into the record a number of other comments regarding the report itself, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt in my mind certain people and certain groups of people will say that the recommendations of this committee haven't gone far enough. (You heard them just a moment ago and I've gone through them all.) I didn't go through all of the recommendations but I thought it was important that a rather summary review be made of them and this I did. As I say, some will say we haven't gone far enough and it is possible that many members of this committee would agree with that statement, Mr. Speaker. However, wide discussion was permitted encompassing many agricultural issues. Definite recommendations were made where the terms of reference were clearly explicit. In a number of other cases, the majority of the committee said that the report would be incomplete, regardless of the rules of reference, if some related recommendations were not made when a great many people presented evidence that these were factors related to land tenure in Saskatchewan.

One of these was Recommendation 8, the ownership and control of land suitable for recreation be studied, Mr. Speaker. People said recreational land was a very valuable natural resource and should be safeguarded for public use. The fact that agricultural land today becomes recreational land tomorrow is good enough reason for such a study to be implemented immediately. The same can be said for land used for road construction and highway construction and especially the ever-increasing hungry expansion of urban settlement. I personally feel that this problem of recreational land around our lakes, rivers and natural wilderness be studied and that this type of land be made a Crown resource, that all sales of recreational land be stopped not just to foreign and non-resident people but to Canadian people as well. There should be a thorough study of all our recreational land and this study should be done as quickly as possible.

Another Recommendation, No. 9, the effects of large farmland holdings of all kinds in Saskatchewan communities and Saskatchewan agriculture be studied, is in my opinion one of the very important recommendations that might be dealt with in the very near future. In this case the Liberal Opposition says we are going too far. I will have more to say about this recommendation later, Mr. Speaker.

Recommendation 10 is not controversial. It says that a central registry be maintained showing ownership and operation of agricultural lands and recreational lands. As explained in detailed notes following the recommendation this is what it says:

A system of data collected should be established and updated regularly and provide information on land ownership and use.

The Opposition states that only a record be kept and an up-to-date index on the amount of corporate and foreign-owned land be kept. This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is too narrow and incomplete. Knowing and having a record on the amount of land on these people is not enough. You should know who owns the land as well. A complete registry should be kept showing ownership and the name of the operator updated regularly, including foreign and corporate owned land and would be far superior than the recommendations suggested by the Opposition Members in

their reservations. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if you are going to do half a job then why not do the whole job. It is very important that in today's fast changing world, socially and economically, that we have data and statistics at our finger tips to know quickly what is occurring in our agricultural sector of the economy and what is happening to our land. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that Recommendation No. 10 is superior in every aspect to the Opposition's reservation on the same topic.

Let me deal, Mr. Speaker, with some of the other comments made by the Members in their reservations. The first sentence of their reservations states that:

The report of the majority of the members of the committee is, and was intended to be a rubber stamp of policies of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, we know that some of these statements from the Opposition are part of their political game of saying something rather than having something to say. I will deal with this thoroughly at a later date, Mr. Speaker, but let me say this — would two prominent Government Members have made some fairly strong reservations if indeed the report was to be rubber stamp for the Government? I say not, Mr. Speaker, I say it is pure and simple political hogwash what they are saying. The people of Saskatchewan will take most of the Opposition's reservations to mean exactly what they are, political gamesmanship and nothing else.

Before proceeding into comments on reservation No. 3, let me read to you a statement from this reservation, Mr. Speaker:

A major concern of persons who presented briefs or spoke at the hearings was the transfer of farm lands from one generation to the next.

That was page 11 and no doubt about that.

The need to make the transfer of ownership is important to both the outgoing and incoming generations.

That's correct.

However, because this is in conflict with the Government's operation of the Land Bank, the committee skirted the problem and made no recommendation relating to the transfer of farm land from one generation to the next.

I am somewhat taken back at that last sentence. They make these bold criticisms yet they, themselves, made not one recommendation relating to the transfer of land from one active farmer to the next one — not one, Mr. Speaker. The Land Bank is indeed, to keep the land in the hands of the farmers who otherwise, in the majority of cases, would never be able to stay on the farm. It would be lost to the large land owner or to the non-farming enterprises, Mr. Speaker. The fact that we have a Land Bank acts as a counterbalance to the business and the corporate interest who like hungry wolves, seek the underbelly of a good number of farmers, wanting to get out of farming but cannot find farm buyers. The Land Bank is the buffer between those who buy the land for business exploitation and the legitimate farmer who, if he wishes and is able to, will buy the land from the

May 1, 1973

Land Bank in five years, but who, otherwise, would have been left out in the cold completely. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the land in the meantime going to those who don't need it at all or to those who are out to exploit it for their personal business benefit. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Land Bank is a very important factor in maintaining the family farm in the hands of farming people.

Though the majority recommendations were criticized for not recommending other ways of transferring farm lands — and I personally don't accept that argument — many of our recommendations and observations, made many references to methods of expediting transfer of lands. We say better guaranteed income for farm products, stabilization of many of these farm commodities. I know that the Members of the Opposition agree with that wholeheartedly. These all have a great deal to do with the availability of being able to transfer land. But where do we see the recommendations by the Opposition in this respect? Except as I stated before the last recommendation and it is a good one, in spite of it being sort of a motherhood type, but it is a good recommendation. The truth of the matter is that the Opposition Members were so busy criticizing in the 3½ pages of reservations that very few positive recommendations were made.

I should like to remind the three members that, indeed, they could have furthered their own cause by bringing in some fairly good ideas, brought forth in many briefs. One for instance, the brief presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). One part of it that we seriously contemplated including in the report but rejected it because we felt that other recommendations we had made had over-riding factors when compared to Mr. Steuart's. But Mr. Steuart did have a very reasonable recommendation, and that was the establishment of a land-price review board to review land sales — and there were others as good as that. Some of these good ideas, Mr. Speaker, were entirely ignored by the Opposition completely. Instead, they chose to be political, and I am disappointed.

Reservations 4 and 6. I won't read them but the gist of these two reservations is that the anti-corporation laws in North Dakota, brought forth in 1932, did not prevent alien purchases of farm lands — and that land sizes increased. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will deal with this end of the debate extensively. But let me say that indeed that legislation, if it did nothing else, did keep out vultures like the Ceres Land Company and the giant Gates Rubber Company, which in my opinion and in the opinion of many farming people in the Province of Saskatchewan, say that such corporations have no business in the farming area, Mr. Speaker. In fact they are destroyers of rural communities, not builders.

We agree, Mr. Speaker, that these laws in North Dakota, in fact could not control farm size and all the more reason, Mr. Speaker, that the question of farm size will have to be faced squarely in Saskatchewan in the very near future if we are to stop this trend of giant monopoly of land-holders, completely destroying the rural communities. The failure in North Dakota was because they failed to implement other laws that would have been effective to restrict the growth of these huge conglomerate farms.

We recommend that only landed immigrants be permitted to

buy land, but North Dakota had no such regulation, Mr. Speaker. We recommend that farm families be allowed to incorporate, but North Dakota did not permit this. It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the three members did not read the report even though our recommendation that families could incorporate dates back to December 30th.

I should like to comment on reservation No. 7, regarding co-ops, Mr. Speaker. I know that many Liberals have the tendency to speak out of both sides of their mouths when talking co-ops. Not that there aren't many strong good supporters amongst them in the co-op movement. But when the verbiage and the garbage is pushed aside, the fact of the matter remains, that opposition to the co-ops surfaces very clearly. Not for one moment did we express total enchantment with the record of the Saskatchewan Co-op Farms and other areas of the Co-op movement, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Governments, past and present, should look at their record to see how much encouragement and assistance has been really given to the co-ops, Mr. Speaker.

The committee did not prescribe co-ops as the only acceptable form or even the best. Co-ops ranked as acceptable along with family corporations and community groups. The situation farmers are finding themselves in today, Mr. Speaker, the high cost of machinery, the high cost of building hog barns, feed lots, I wouldn't be at all surprised, Mr. Speaker, that given a boost by our Government, the co-op movement in many respects will flourish in Saskatchewan. This decision will have to be made by the farmers, Mr. Speaker, it will not be forced on them by the committee, nor this Government, I am sure. We are criticized by the Opposition Members by saying, "Some co-ops have succeeded, some co-ops have failed," indicating that we are contradicting ourselves in that respect. This statement, Mr. Speaker, is as true and as correct as the results of the Liberal candidates in the 1971 election. "Some succeeded and some failed," Mr. Speaker.

In dealing with reservation No. 8, Mr. Speaker, the minority members expressed the fact that, "Commercial corporations, are no threat to the agricultural community," using the argument that the Hudson's Bay and the CNR had virtually sold all of their land. (That's part of their statement.) First let me say, Mr. Speaker, that they very conveniently forgot to mention two giant corporations which have not sold their land, at least one of them is a giant. By these I mean the Boles Land Company owning some 10,000 acres of land in the southeast part of the province and still adding to that 10,000; and the Marathon Realty Company, a subsidiary of the CPR, owning 260,000 acres or 1625 quarter sections of land. They forget to tell that in their report, Mr. Speaker. May I be permitted to say, Sir, that in the opinion of many people, "it's the calm before the storm." Many indicators all across Canada are pointing strongly to the fact that Americans are storming over into many provinces to buy up land, all kinds of land, any kind of land. Many of these corporations we even have no knowledge of as to who they are or whom they represent. Land prices in the States have skyrocketed, Mr. Speaker. The people of the States expressed the danger when we visited with them, that land prices would be doubled in some cases and even quadrupled in price over that of Canadian land values. There is every indication that whether it is corporations or individuals, now is the time to stop this cheap sale of Saskatchewan land. It's cheap to the Americans but we would have to pay a ghastly price

May 1, 1973

in total ruination of our rural communities.

I am amazed, Sir, that the three members expressed so much concern for the corporations as those being, “Hardly a threat.” I shouldn’t be surprised, Mr. Speaker, because it is typical Liberal philosophy to do as little as possible or nothing. The storm clouds are gathering but somehow they get the idea that the situation will rectify itself, reminiscent of the old Roman story that — while Nero fiddled, Rome burned — I say, Mr. Speaker, industrial corporations are tied in with all the giant financial institutions. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the industrial corporations have what is called, “retained earnings” of profits not paid to shareholders, and they’ll use these anywhere, anytime they can make a big fast buck. I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no time like now to stop them. Let’s not play games, for industrial corporations have no heart — they are ruthless and cunning businessmen. If it serves their purpose to wield a big stick and exploit Saskatchewan agricultural land, they will do so without a qualm. They don’t worry if thousands of farm families have to leave the farms and the rural communities. You’ve seen the closing of the Robin Hood Mills, nobody worried a thing about them and the other oil companies who moved out lock, stock and barrel. They really don’t worry about the Saskatchewan people. Their goal is profit at any cost. Not only are the three Opposition Members showing their affection and sympathy for the commercial corporations, they completely overlook the possibility of commercial corporations renting land and farming it without tenants owning it. I say, Mr. Speaker, in either case, whether it’s a corporation owning or renting land, great globs of land in a Saskatchewan rural community, the undesirable social effects would still be the same.

Our hearings indicate that the people express great anxiety of commercial corporations owning farm lands; corporation like I’ve mentioned including food chains, etc. which are already deeply involved in the farming business. The people said, “stop this,” and they also said, stop vertical integration, Mr. Speaker.

I find the objections to the recommendations, “Restricting Commercial corporations,” hard to understand. By objections, I mean the objections of the Opposition Members. Is it that once again the real fact emerges that food chains and other commercial corporations are the friends of the Liberals, and therefore, they be permitted to buy our agricultural lands from under our farmers’ noses, Mr. Speaker. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest and I hope that these Members stand up in this House and say so for all of Saskatchewan to hear.

We had a questionnaire that we circulated to the public. A very limited number of these questionnaires were returned to us. We certainly agree that the questionnaires were so limited in number that one cannot draw conclusions strictly from them, I agree on that. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this questionnaire can be useful in drawing support for our other observations. The other observations being the hearings and the briefs and the discussions held with the many people, therefore, the questionnaire did serve some useful purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in their reservations we further find that opposition is expressed because the Committee adhered to the principle that farming be restricted to farmers in the main.

The three Opposition Members say, they deplore the restrictive trend in that recommendation. Restrictive because we indicate we want farming people on the farm lands, Mr. Speaker, so say the Opposition. This principle, Mr. Speaker, of farmers farming their own land and being masters of their own destiny was repeatedly expressed by the people of Saskatchewan. Once again, I am amazed at the Opposition for saying to the people of Saskatchewan, "We really don't care about this matter; we really don't care and we see no reason why doctors and lawyers and others shouldn't be allowed to interfere in the business of the work of a legitimate farmer". That's what they really are saying.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, makes no apology for this recommendation. We know that some definition of farming will be needed to determine whether a farmer is a legitimate farmer or whether he qualified for any Government program. This definition and other definitions should be set out clearly. The Minister of Agriculture, was expressing approval of this idea. I find that hard to understand. Surely, the minority members do not favor handing out money to non-farmers and to commercial corporations posing as legitimate farmers, writing off tax expenses in the deal.

The Assembly recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Welcome to Students

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly a group of 37 Grade Seven students from Grosvenor Park School in the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre in Saskatoon. They are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Welsh, Mr. Bonner, and Miss Busch. They came to Regina by bus and will be taking a tour, I am given to understand, of the city after the opening of the sitting this afternoon. I sincerely hope they will find their stay in the Legislature to be a pleasant one, that it will be educational and informative for them and that they will gain a better knowledge of the parliamentary procedures under the British Parliamentary System. I will be meeting them about 3:00 o'clock or shortly before and I would hope the students will want to ask a goodly number of questions with respect to the proceedings in the House. I am sure that every Member here would bid them welcome today, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend a welcome to 50 students, I think it's 50 students, from Princess Alexandra School in Saskatoon who are accompanied here by their principal Mr. Enns. They are in the Speaker's Gallery. Princess Alex is certainly one of the oldest schools in the city of Saskatoon, located on Avenue H just off 20th Street. It has a proud tradition and history as one of the finest schools as well in the city of Saskatoon. I am very pleased that the students were able to make it in time for the Session in its last few days, hopefully last few days, in order to see their Government, their

May 1, 1973

Opposition in action here in Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly continued the interrupted debate on the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands.

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my words of welcome to the students and the teachers that are here. I hope that this afternoon will be of some benefit to them in their study of social studies and what goes on in Saskatchewan and in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, when you called it 12:30 this morning, briefly, I said that agriculture is the basic industry of Saskatchewan and that the land base of our agricultural industry is a very crucial resource in our overall economy and I think this is very important to remember when discussing our problems of the rural constituencies and the rural communities. I say that the report was written with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to repeat that, that our faith in the role of the farm family in the future of our communities and of our province is the basic theme of our entire report. We will recommend ways of safeguarding the family farm and the rural community. And briefly again, when I began this morning this is what I did, I took the opportunity first, Sir, to thank the people who devoted themselves so well to the work on the report and I briefly enumerated the recommendations as set out by the committee. And I will enumerate very briefly again, just the important ones, those that I think are important. They are all important but some are of extreme importance.

1. That the purchase or acquisition of farmlands in any manner by corporations be prohibited except farm oriented corporations.
2. That corporations dispose of their agricultural land in 20 years.
3. That aliens continue to hold their land and only passing it to a husband or wife, otherwise, pass it to Canadians only, or meet the status requirements or residence.
4. Recreational land ownership and control must be studied and the effect of large land holdings be studied in Saskatchewan as well.

There is one that I didn't mention and which I think is of real importance and that is a meeting of the four western provinces be convened to pool the knowledge on land ownership problems and to attack the problem in a joint effort, hopefully, this leading to a Canadian-wide joint action. And I said also, Mr. Speaker, this morning that the Liberals had a golden opportunity to offer some bold and constructive criticism based on some of their own comments and their Leader's statements and rather than that they chose to be political. And when I say that I say that the Hon. Eugene Whelan, Federal Minister of Agriculture, agrees with us in many respects and many people of Saskatchewan agree with us, but the Saskatchewan Liberals do not. I suppose that's par for the course for the Saskatchewan Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say, Sir, as I said before, some part time farming is acceptable. A person who is not licensed could still raise a pig in spite of what the Opposition Members say but he would not be eligible for grants which are intended for a legitimate hog producer.

Mr. Steuart: — How big a pig?

Mr. Kowalchuk: — About the size of the one you let into the Chamber the other day, Mr. Opposition Leader. An interesting and important fact emerged from our hearings pointing out to us that the people of Saskatchewan want the farming done by legitimate farmers, Mr. Speaker. Many pointed out, and rightly so, that they, the farmers, are excluded from practising as teachers or mechanics or veterinarians or lawyers and they see no reason why people of other professions should be practising farming and doing everything else.

Mr. Speaker, the committee made a number of recommendations some of which I have dealt with directly or indirectly as a result of the written reservations by the Opposition Members. I have commented on many of these reservations. The reservations voiced by the Government Members, too, I appreciate their concern. However, a 20 year period for the non-Canadian to dispose of his land is a long, long time in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker. For the same reasons five years for a corporation to go out of active farming and still have 20 years to dispose of the land is also in my opinion more than just and fair and equitable. Mr. Speaker, I respect the reservations and the concerns expressed by the two Members of the Government side, but I also respect the reservations and concerns expressed by the three Members of the Opposition who voiced their concerns, however, more politically than in the manner of constructive criticism. However, Mr. Speaker, this is democracy in action. The right to express and the right to dissent and the right to disagree is paramount to our free democratic society. Only by a true atmosphere of free discussion can we finally arrive at a consensus of opinion. This committee, in my opinion, was not politically inspired nor politically oriented, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe more firmly than ever, despite some of the failings, and who would dare to suggest that failings are not prevalent in all of man's deliberations, that this committee has done an outstanding solid work contributing to an outstanding final report in the short space of time allotted to it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — That it hasn't produced all the answers that were needed, should not be too surprising but the recommendations contained in this report will, I believe, result in legislation necessary for the answers to the question asked by this Assembly when they gave us the orders to go out amongst the people and seek answers to the crucial and all-important agricultural problem of land tenure in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing there is one more thing I should like to say, that this problem of who will end up owning all kinds of our lands whether they are agricultural, recreational, timberlands or the rocks of the Canadian Shield, these are the questions that were asked regarding these problems and indicates that people all across Canada are concerned. As I read to you,

May 1, 1973

our last recommendation, number 12, which said that we are asking for Saskatchewan to convene a meeting of all western provinces and hopefully that this meeting will result in setting up basic answers to these problems. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it will result in leading to a ten province-wide meeting on the same problems, Mr. Speaker, the problems of land tenure in Canada. In closing, I want to once again thank all the committee members and all the people who contributed in the work toward this final report. I have the greatest pleasure in presenting this report to this Assembly and for taking part in this debate.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comments on the report which our committee has tabled to this Assembly. I should first like to make two or three comments on the remarks made by the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk), particularly the comment when he says that the Members of the Opposition had the opportunity to put forward some good ideas and didn't take that opportunity. I find that statement rather strange to understand how he would mean this would be put into operation when one considers that the Members opposite had the majority of the committee. I could particularly outline to him one specific case where we moved that succession duties be considered, which are recorded in the minutes, where we moved a resolution that succession duties be considered by the committee and the majority members of the committee voted against it. So one of our presumably good suggestions which we considered was a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker, as far as succession duties on farm land was concerned was rejected by the majority of the committee. I, therefore, would also suggest that frequently we did attempt to put forward several ideas which were rejected by the majority members of the committee and I suppose that we could have added them to the back of the report in which case the report would have been as long from the point that we started as it was from the point at the beginning of the report.

I want to make a few comments also, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that this debate is coming into the Legislature at such a very late date. The Government apparently during the election, the New Democratic Party put great emphasis on the importance of this matter. The committee did work diligently. I think all the members did for the year to compile the report and yet here we are having the report some two weeks or more before us in the Assembly and we are down to what could be the last private Members' day in this Session, Mr. Speaker. Now it doesn't seem to me that such a report which the Members opposite apparently place so much importance on should be tacked on to the dying days of the Session of the Legislature which I think this presentation is. Certainly, for other Members of the Assembly both on our side and on their side, to have an adequate opportunity to speak is extremely limited when we say, Mr. Speaker, that it's very obvious that many of the Members who were not on the committee would want the advantage of listening to the chairman's remarks and the remarks of other Members and if they don't speak today it could well turn out that they lack any opportunity in this Session to do so since Friday is the next private Members' day. So I think it's disappointing that the Government did not see fit to bring this debate to the Session somewhat sooner to give it a somewhat more thorough study.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to turn to the main part of my

remarks. As you know, the committee when it was struck was composed of eight NDP members and three Liberals. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, the eight NDP members were reduced to seven when Mr. Tchorzewski was appointed to the Cabinet. At the outset our committee set several ground rules as to how we as members would conduct our various public meetings, and to what extent we as individuals would participate in these hearings. Members were, I believe, to be commended in the manner in which these basic rules were adhered to. Personally, I felt that the chairman did a very fine job in conducting his duties.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, despite these favorable aspects of the committee I would be wrong if I did not suggest at least two or three differences of opinion which I voiced during committee meetings and which I again wish to voice now. Public meetings were somewhat more extensive than I believe were required. Thirteen public meetings were held at individual locations in our province. I believe eight would have been sufficient, resulting in less cost to the taxpayer and yet ample opportunity for the public to participate. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I felt that sometimes our committee meetings held by our members were of extremely short duration despite the fact that we often did receive a full day's salary. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to complain about the legal counsel who was hired and which we objected to. It would appear to me that the legal counsel was hired largely for political reasons by the Government Members opposite who were on the committee. Mr. Speaker, however, generally speaking, other than these three points that I wish to raise regarding grievances toward the committee proceedings, the committee did do a very fine job in my estimation. I believe that I expressed the views on these three points when they were being decided at our committee meetings.

I should also like to express my appreciation for the work done by many of the individuals who helped the committee. And I would not wish to go into great length in congratulating each individual with the possible exception of Mr. Korpess who carried the bulk of the work for the committee and had the heaviest work load. In fact, Mr. Speaker, our committee received excellent co-operation from all persons whom we contacted or worked with. These are too numerous to mention and to single out as individuals.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn in more depth into the findings of this report, a report which I consider to be extremely important to the province. The beginnings of the study go back, I believe, to the election pamphlet entitled the "New Deal for People, 1971". Under the heading of the "New Deal for People" published prior to the election was the heading "Agriculture — Provincial", and it reads and I quote:

As first steps an NDP Government will restrict corporate ownership to family farms and groups of families farming co-operatively.

The significance, Mr. Speaker, of this statement in an election manifesto I believe to be considerable. These enunciations of NDP policy meant to a large extent our committee was only carrying out a public relations jobs to drum up public support and information to support a decision that the NDP and the Government

May 1, 1973

had already made. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that much of the preamble to the report is not based on facts found by the committee but is actually based on what Government Members wish to later recommend. The result is, I suggest, that we Members of the Opposition on the committee have dissociated ourselves with much of the preamble. Our comment under reservation number one says, and I quote:

The report of the majority members of the committee is and was intended to be a rubber stamp of policies of the Government.

This, I believe, to a large extent is an accurate assessment of the work the committee had done. The following discussion deals with two distinct features of the report itself. I wish to deal with each of these in a separate manner.

1. There was the aspect of non-resident alien ownership of land.
2. The aspect of the report dealing with restrictions on individual and corporate agricultural activities.

I want to deal now, Mr. Speaker, with the first aspect, non-resident alien ownership of land. Several studies have been recently completed to determine the extent of non-resident alien ownership of land in our province. Our committee obtained all the information we could on this particular subject. First was the Brown Report.

As of December 31, 1970, Americans owned, according to the Brown Report approximately 2.34 per cent of the land in the area studied by Professor Brown of the University of Saskatchewan. The area studied was along the Saskatchewan border running 54 miles north and south, and 390 miles east and west. Some of the municipalities had very little such ownership, while others had in excess of nine per cent. The following table, Mr. Speaker, gives you an indication of the extent to which American ownership was involved, as taken from the Brown Report:

<u>Percent Owned by Americans</u>	<u>No. of Municipal Units</u>
0%	10
0.1 to 0.9	13
1.0 to 2.9	12
3.0 to 4.9	7
5.0 to 6.9	5
7.0 to 8.9	1
9.0 or more	7

50/

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in this regard the committee also sent out a questionnaire and an explanatory letter to each of the 292 rural municipalities and to each of the nine local improvement districts in the province.

The area of land covered by the 263 municipalities out of 301, was that 87.37 per cent, Mr. Speaker, I will go back over that. The area of land covered by the 263 returns out of 301 sent out was that it covered 87.37 per cent of agricultural land in the province.

This survey showed that 2.18 per cent of the area studied was owned by Americans versus 2.34 per cent shown by the Brown Report. So in actual fact we have two reports, the Brown Report and the one which we ourselves conducted, and came up with an extremely close similarity as far as the amount of land owned by Americans is concerned.

However, there is one aspect to this that should be taken close note of, Mr. Speaker. And that is that both of these studies while indicating ownership by an alien, do not indicate where he is resident. And some could actually be living in Saskatchewan but have actually retained American citizenship. However, I believe that this number is not likely to be high. That is a particular reference, Mr. Speaker, to a person who may still retain his American citizenship but actually lives in Saskatchewan. He would be part of this percentage.

The statistics produced by the two studies do indicate that at least in some municipalities there is a substantial ownership of agricultural land by non-resident aliens. I think this is indicative of the municipalities particularly that are over nine per cent.

Mr. Speaker, all members of the committee, Government and Opposition members expressed a concern and a desire to limit this type of ownership. I would like to give some reasons why we believe that limiting this type of ownership is desirable.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that if you wish to own land in Saskatchewan you must live at least somewhere in Canada. Or if you are living outside Canada you must at least be a Canadian citizen. In other words, Mr. Speaker, an alien can own land here but must live somewhere in Canada. We have not provided for any restriction against a Canadian owning land and living for some reason in the United States. As long as he retained his Canadian citizenship he would not be disturbed.

Secondly, restrictions here are necessary in my view because of the very real possibility of large scale buying of agricultural land by non-resident aliens, particularly Americans in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell a bit at length why this is a real possibility.

A. Mr. Speaker, the United States has many wealthy corporations and individuals which would be interested in Canadian land.

B. Land in Canada is cheap compared to the United States and the supply is obviously limited.

C. The third reason why I think American owners would be interested in Saskatchewan or Canadian land, is that their tax laws permit the writing off of agricultural losses against other income, thus reducing the risk of the investment.

D. I think it is quite obvious from our investigations that Canadian farmers cannot compete with other individuals who would obviously have so much capital at their disposal.

E. I believe that there is a possibility of capital gains in investment of land in Canada by United States investment.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to see how such wholesale

May 1, 1973

buying by people living outside our country would be of benefit to Saskatchewan communities and farmers, with the exception of some gain to the persons who would actually be selling. However, while I believe these restrictions should be imposed, I also believe that the New Democratic Party majority recommendation involving retroactivity is ill-advised.

In my view, land which is presently foreign owned should be identified but regarding this land there should be no retroactive legislation requiring the owners to divest themselves of it. The NDP majority in the committee under Recommendation No. 6, would only permit the wife of a non-resident alien to acquire this land without changing status to a Canadian resident. All other non-resident aliens have been effectively ruled out. This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, would place considerable hardship on residents of our province who currently lease from non-resident aliens, often on extremely favorable terms which they wish to continue.

The NDP recommendation would almost certainly result in these leases being changed or terminated in the near future. The non-resident alien would naturally be concerned about continuing such ownership knowing that if death took place he is forced into a selling situation almost immediately unless his wife was able to continue. In any event the recommendation effectively limits him to owning it and he must sell it within the 20-year period.

The result of this retroactive recommendation by the NDP member, Mr. Speaker, would have these results. The current American owner of land would find that he would divest himself of the land at the earliest appropriate moment with the result of severe implications for Saskatchewan farmers who now lease from him. These farmers who currently lease from him would face two prospects. Buying, which they may be unable currently to do, or losing the land from their farming operation. Neither of the above may be very attractive to the lessees.

I think that these are two serious aspects which should be considered, Mr. Speaker, as far as retroactivity concerning current American ownership and that is why that we recommended that currently held land outside our country be not altered in the future. Our recommendation would solely be applied to new acquisitions of land in Saskatchewan by people who live outside our country.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to deal at some length with restrictions on individual and corporate agricultural activities. This is the second aspect of the report, in my view.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, did considerable work to determine the extent and impact the corporate ownership was having on agriculture in both the United States and Saskatchewan. The impact in Saskatchewan it appears is extremely limited. Information provided to the committee disclosed that firstly, Marathon Realty Limited, a subsidiary of Canadian Pacific Railroad, owns 260,000 acres of agricultural land in Saskatchewan. Out of the total agricultural acreage that we have Canadian Pacific actually only owns 3,300 acres. So we have a combined total of Marathon the chief holding company for the CPR owning 260,000 acres of agricultural land while the parent company, CPR, owns 3,300. Marathon Realty Company leases its agricultural lands in Saskatchewan to some 860 farmers or ranchers on either a cash

lease or crop share lease arrangement or a combination of both. This information was provided to us by the Company at our request. Annual cash rentals are negotiated and are based upon a productive market value per area of the land included in each lease. The company also provided us with a copy of the lease agreement.

Annual crop share rentals call for payment of the prevailing cash equivalent value of a one-third share of crops grown on the land. Crop share rentals are paid as and when the crops are sold. I am referring once more to the land held by Marathon and CPR. Examination of the lease forms which we were provided with show and indicate that Marathon Realty Company offers terms at least as favorable as does the Provincial Government through its own Land Bank system. However, Mr. Speaker, I do acknowledge that at the Kerrobert meeting some complaints were registered about the company's activities.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to make note that nowhere in our report — the book presented to this Session — are the statistics on the amount of land that is held by Marathon Realty and this may not be due to any — may not be anyone's fault except that we did not receive the information until fairly late on in our hearings. Although I do believe that it should have actually been in the report itself. But it has been missed out for some reason which I am not able to explain at this time.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, other than Marathon and CPR the Morris-Bole Land Company in Saskatchewan owns approximately 10,137 acres. Again this information was provided by the company to our committee.

Thirdly, the Canadian National Railways has approximately 1,000 acres.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, Hudson's Bay Company has sold all of its farm lands in the province according to the company that reported to our committee.

Fifth, Credit Foncier of Regina owns approximately 65 sections concentrated in the Rural Municipalities from 1 to 190. According to the information presented to our committee the above mentioned land is currently all that is held by corporate ownership in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There were no other indications at any of the public hearings that there were other large corporate holdings so we presume that there were no others. Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that due to possibly our own oversight that we did not include these statistics in our report that was presented to the Assembly but the statistics were presented to us and are in the information that the committee has at their disposal.

Neither, Mr. Speaker, was there any evidence provided that Canadian corporations were becoming involved in agriculture in Saskatchewan, particularly concerning feedlots, cattle, poultry or hogs or other activities along these lines. The committee did study three corporate agricultural operations in Colorado, Ceres Land Company, Gates Rubber Company and Monfort Farms. One of these in my opinion was unsuccessful, the Gates Rubber Company which is in the process of disbanding and selling off its assets.

May 1, 1973

The Ceres Land Company in my opinion which we studied was a large ranging operation, cow-calf operation, and apparently it owned two feedlots, although I don't believe our committee had the privilege of seeing those two feedlots. But the Ceres Land Company was in what I would consider a development stage. It was at a stage in which it was difficult to determine how successful or how unsuccessful they may well be as far as the future was concerned.

Monfort Farms that we visited had a very large feedlot, I understand the largest in the world and was obviously an economic success. So, in essence, we studied three agricultural corporations; Ceres Land, that I would say was in a development stage and would be not able to determine whether it was successful or unsuccessful for at least a few more years. The Gates Rubber Company was obviously not successful. The Monfort Farms was a success.

However, despite the lack of any sign of corporate involvement in Saskatchewan which our committee was able to obtain, NDP members have recommended severely restrictive measures that in effect, curtail both individuals and corporations. Respecting corporate ownership in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, as far as land is concerned, I think it could be fairly readily determined that at this stage our province probably has less corporate ownership of agricultural land than they did some years ago.

The recommendations of the NDP members, if enacted, would largely eliminate all persons from agricultural enterprises who do not make the majority of their income as farmers. Individuals, Mr. Speaker, who are not farmers are effectively eliminated from forming private companies. Groups of individuals are therefore prevented from supplying financing for the development of feedlots, hog barns, poultry barns, etc. These individuals therefore are extremely unlikely to participate since they are forced to participate only as a private individual. They are effectively deprived of all the limited liability provisions of a private company, any tax advantages, etc. In other words, the recommendation as I understand it, and I think this is correct, Mr. Speaker, provides that individuals who do not make the greater part of income from farming would not be able to form themselves into corporations. While they could still carry on the same activity as individuals the fact that they cannot form a corporation would severely limit their activities under limited liability and certainly limit their banding together with other groups of individuals.

At least five of the NDP members would not allow any such existing operations, I am talking about corporations where the individual does not make the majority of his income from agriculture. This could well be a person who is a corporation and operates a garage for example. There are some individual's cases around in Saskatchewan, individual persons who are corporations and operate feedlots etc. But the majority of their income does not come from that. The recommendation of five of the NDP members would allow these individual existing operations only five years to divest themselves of such ventures. Frequently these ventures have assisted communities by providing employment and income that would not otherwise have existed. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe is far too severe a restriction upon individuals in our society and Province of Saskatchewan. More importantly it deprives agriculture of an important source of financing and deprives the province of much needed economic

development. In essence, Mr. Speaker, if this recommendation was put into operation, it would deprive citizens who currently live in Saskatchewan of forming into a private corporation or any other corporate activity to develop agricultural activities.

Such a law, Mr. Speaker, will not prevent the same individuals building a hog, or a poultry barn or feedlot in another province. They would deprive Saskatchewan however of this economic activity. This point, Mr. Speaker, I think is one of the most important in that we can make all the laws in Saskatchewan that we wish against individual enterprise or individual activity but in many instances these individuals will simply locate in Alberta or in Manitoba if they have no such restriction and the net result would simply not be reduction of competition for farmers but would simply mean that that enterprise of feeding cattle or hogs, etc., just moves outside the borders of our province and we are deprived of the income to the citizens who live in Saskatchewan.

Farmers, Mr. Speaker, have always enjoyed the freedom to invest in non-agricultural business and are willing to compete on a fair and even basis within the confines of their own business. I think that on this point it is extremely interesting to note that Mr. Monfort, who was a large owner in their company if not the sole owner, told us in his interview with the committee when we were in Colorado that the most efficient production unit was still the individual farmer. And he said this despite the fact that he owned a large corporate operation himself.

I think that Saskatchewan farmers are able and quite willing to compete in any of these operations. They have a number of economic advantages that corporations or individuals incorporated to not have. I think that farmers basically are quite willing to compete on this basis and do not really request this type of restriction. This as I illustrated before, in my view, only hurts the Province of Saskatchewan and really does not lessen the competition for farmers because these operations will simply be located in some other province or part of the country. I do say, Mr. Speaker, that if a serious corporate threat does appear to be developing in the country that there would still be time to put some limits on it.

I would suggest that this corporate threat did not become evident to us in our hearings in the Province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, I would strongly suggest that no change be made regarding present economic activities in agriculture. It would seem to me that there is currently no great desire of Canadian corporations to become active in Saskatchewan agriculture. I think this is illustrated by the fact that, in fact, corporations have reduced their land holdings in the past number of years. And we have effectively recommended, our committee in a majority agreement we have effectively recommended against allowing foreign corporations to do so. There could well be a threat from foreign corporations in Saskatchewan agriculture because of our restrictions on land ownership as far as people who are non-resident aliens which would also apply to corporate ownership. We have effectively ruled out participation by foreign corporations in Saskatchewan. I think therefore that restrictions against our own private citizens who are not farmers would be at this time ill-advised.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to just say a few words before I conclude my remarks on the recommendations that we

May 1, 1973

tacked on to the end of the report regarding social development. This did receive some consideration among the members of the committee and we thought it worthy of adding to our own recommendations. During our investigations and as a private Member of the Legislature, I believe that one of the major reasons for lack of new young people in agriculture has frequently and seriously been overlooked. I am referring to the social opportunities for young persons. And I must admit that we spend a great deal of time in this Assembly and people involved in agriculture spend a great deal of time dwelling on the economic aspects which certainly are important as far as young people are concerned in farming, but we spend very little time in discussion or concentrate very little on the social opportunities available to young people. We have always tended it seems to me, in both farm organizations and people in the Legislature, to concentrate on the economic reasons for young people leaving agriculture.

We did encounter in our hearings a number of young people who had turned down farming for other reasons, more of the social nature. It seems obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, and I have encountered it in my own travels and I did encounter it during committee hearings on one or two occasions, where young people who had the opportunity to make a very good economic start in agriculture had rejected this offer. After some further investigation it had appeared that they had rejected it because of other reasons than the economic ones. They had rejected it in more specific terms because young people appear to be attracted to other areas where there are other young people and often there is a lack of companionship in the rural communities. There is a lack of facilities as far as they were concerned. There is a lack of social activities for them which are better found in the larger centres.

I think, in my view, in order to bring about a satisfactory move of more young people into agriculture, government will have to spend a good deal more time trying to improve the social activities in many rural communities. Some of these, of course, Mr. Speaker, are fairly obvious. Many of our rural communities still lack artificial ice for curling in the winter time. Many of them lack recreational facilities and community halls. There is an extreme range of these activities that still are not available in the smaller towns. It is also obvious that young people are very frequently leaving agriculture because they lack both friends and companions of their own age group. As I said, ways and means must be found to equalize social opportunity in the province otherwise the mass migration of young people from the rural areas will continue regardless of the economic opportunities that exist therein.

That, Mr. Speaker, concludes my remarks on the report. I felt that the committee members enjoyed each others' companionship. We each argued our own case but I think that the conduct of the members at least from my point of view was appreciated and I found the other members of the committee to be cordial companions in our work.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes: (Touchwood) — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who just sat down for once I agree with his very last remarks, I think the committee worked very well together and I will have more to say about that a

little later on.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction and of pleasure to support the filing of this report in this Legislature. I should like to quote, Sir, from my first speech in this Legislature in 1957 on February 26 when I discussed what I saw as a threat to agriculture, the family farm and the rural way of life. I don't claim to be a visionary but even that far back, if anyone kept his eyes open, it was easy to see that unless something was done the rural life as we knew it then would vanish. I said, in part, talking about the position that farmers were finding themselves in and I'd like to now quote from that day:

They all find themselves in more or less the same dire straits, losing money and going broke. We have seen many farmers leaving the land for the cities for the winter, looking for work.

And later on in the same speech I said and I quote again:

Unless something is done to stop this exodus off the farm, farming as we know it will vanish in ten to fifteen years and in its place will be large farms run by absentee owners. This is what the fathers and the grandfathers of many of our farmers left in Europe when they came to Canada.

I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, it has got to that extent but in the years since then we have seen great changes. Farms have grown larger and larger and with modern machinery and technology farmers have and are producing more than they ever did before. While these changes have been coming economic conditions for the farmer have not improved. Farmers have increased their farm size hoping by efficiency to improve their finances but really it has become a vicious circle. All one has to do is think of the alternate end of this growth to know that if it is allowed to go on to its natural conclusion that rural life will gradually vanish.

Not only the farm community has felt the brunt of these changes but the villages and the towns that serve the farmer have felt the pressures as well. More and more businesses were forced to close their doors, more and more homes in these communities were boarded up.

Mr. Speaker, it was not only in Saskatchewan that this was happening. All over the great plains of North America this same process of elimination was underway. In actual fact in the United States these forces were at work earlier than in Canada. Nearly two decades ago, especially in the grain growing areas, farms were getting larger and larger. During this change corporations moved into some areas and dominated the agricultural scene. A few large fruit companies control the fruit, the vegetable and the flower industry of California. Large companies have major control of cattle feeding and finishing in Colorado and Arizona and in Texas. I think I have said in this House before, I remember driving 275 miles through southern Arizona through only four ranches, all large cattle companies.

For several years, Mr. Speaker, I have taken an active interest in this phenomenon. I have read everything written on

May 1, 1973

the subject that I could lay my hands on. What I had found out had scared me and I would hate to see our rural way of life go by the wayside and in its place a corporate structure dominating society. Mr. Speaker, it was in this kind of a background that it was a right move that this Government made to set up an Intersessional Committee on the Ownership of Farmland in Saskatchewan, to study and to make recommendations in this regard. I was happy to be chosen a member of that committee and I must say that I found the assignment challenging, interesting and fulfilling. The report tabled, in my opinion, is a good report. Naturally, it is a compromise, it is a meeting place of the different viewpoints of the different members. To me the report did not go as far as it might in some fields but nevertheless I am basically in agreement with all of its recommendations and I'll elaborate a little further on this a little later.

The decision of the committee to go to North Dakota to talk to people there about their anti-corporation laws, to see some of the very large privately owned farms, to visit Colorado and to see first hand some of the large corporate structures in the meat industry was a wise one. I believe the cost was a good investment for the people of Saskatchewan. One of the most outstanding features of the trip was that all people we talked to, whether they were farmers or small businessmen, bankers, farm union people, state civil servants, all said the same thing. Senators and Congressmen, said we in Saskatchewan should act now to stop the corporations moving in, in other words, to lock the door before the horse was stolen. We also discussed with these people their reactions to any possible limitation of ownership of farm land by aliens in Canada. I would like to quote a few of the answers that we got. Let me quote Governor Guy of North Dakota, in part:

I can't see how foreign ownership can help you, and I can't see where Canadian ownership of land in North Dakota would help us. I think here we have absentee ownership of land in this state. This starts hurting the community and the state and I would think whether the owner was living in Arizona or in Canada it is not the best.

Or the banker from Sterling, Colorado, Mr. Speers said, and I quote:

But as far as the bank is concerned and as far as our community and ultimately for our businesses, they are better off with a lot of Lavern Stoltz . . .

And this was a small feedlot owner that we had visited.

. . . than they are with Ceres Cattle Company. And I would say this without any qualifications whatsoever.

This was a banker. Or Senator Parker of Colorado who said:

It's not being anti-American to protect your own.

Or Mr. McGraw, a Congressman:

You'd be damn fools if you wouldn't.

Or Ken Monfort, the owner of the two feedlots that my hon.

friend was referring to of over 100,000 cattle each. And when we asked him the question, and I'll quote his answer:

Oh, I don't know, we don't consider the Japanese all anti-American and they have pretty strict rules on that. If we wanted to go into business in Japan we'd be able to do so with only a Japanese partner.

And I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that he volunteered to come up and set up a feed plant in Saskatchewan. One of the members of the committee said that we were capable of feeding our own cattle.

We held 13 meetings in Saskatchewan. I disagree with my hon. friend who said that he thought that was too many. I do not say looking backwards, and it's always easier to look hindmost than foremost, the first weeks of August were not the best time. Farmers were busy haying or even harvesting. Nevertheless, I believe the hearings were well worthwhile. There was interest shown and certain things became apparent. There were only certain areas where there is some corporation activity, places like Fillmore, south of Weyburn, Kerrobert, Elrose. Wherever we went there were those who were concerned over the rapid increase of farm size and as to what was going to happen in the next few years when the older farmers wanted to sell and as to who was going to take over the land. Many good briefs were presented, some of them expressing this view and saying that the Government should be acting to stop the continuing fact of farm land falling into fewer and fewer hands.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to pay tribute to our chairman, the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk). I believe he made an extremely good chairman and conducted all the hearings and the workings of the committee fairly and expeditiously. I also enjoyed immensely working with the other members of the committee and with the staff. I want to say a hearty vote of thanks to the staff.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, before I go on into the recommendations I should like to deal for a few moments with the minority report by the three members from across the way. I really think that minority report, Mr. Speaker, really shows where they stand. A couple of things become very apparent. One is their very anti-co-op philosophy. I'd like to deal with this number four and number seven of their reservations. I want to deal with number seven.

The majority members of the committee found it puzzling to find so few co-operative farms inside the province. It apparently never occurred to the majority members of the committee that co-operative farms have not been generally accepted in other similar areas. For example, they have not been generally accepted in North Dakota despite an effort extending over 40 years.

I think the visit that we made to the Matador Farm and the Beechy Farm certainly convinced me that there is a great possibility in co-operative farming. And I say also that I believe that one of the reasons over the 25 years there haven't been more was that there wasn't enough leadership given by the Government in 1944 to 1964. I think not nearly enough research was done, not nearly enough support was given, not nearly enough educational work went on to encourage people to work in

May 1, 1973

a co-operative fashion. I'm the first to admit that no co-operative farm will work unless there are people who are willing to co-operate together. Secondly, I think there was never the need, I'll change it, Mr. Speaker, there is even greater need today for co-ops in this growth of large farm size which all Members will agree is going on across the province. It was never more needed than now than the possibilities of the co-operative movement in assisting this land to remain in the hands of families and still remain a fairly large farm when they band together.

I would now, Mr. Speaker, like to say a few more words on what the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said. He contradicted the Member from Melville about a statement he had said that Members of the Opposition had not put anything constructive in. He inferred that the chairman of the committee was referring to the fact that they hadn't added anything constructive in their minority report. I think the Hon. Member for Melville was referring to the fact that they really offered nothing constructive in their minority report. I would certainly agree with that.

I should like to now turn to the report and its recommendations. Mr. Speaker, No. 1 – I am not going to read them out as they have already been read out.

1. It became apparent during the hearings that there should be an easily acceptable way for ordinary farm families and groups of farmers to organize themselves in ways that make it beneficial and better for them to operate as a unit. If farming by large corporations is not desirable, and is to be stopped, then the kinds of farming and organizations of people who should be allowed must be spelled out clearly. The first recommendation recognizes that farm families, community groups and co-operative farming have been and should continue to be the pattern for Saskatchewan. Farm families have contributed to the development of our province and hold the key to safeguarding the well-being of rural communities in the years ahead.

The farm family should be permitted to choose the form of business organization they prefer. This may be the single ownership or partnership. In other cases, they may want to choose incorporation as a family farm, or a community group, or as members of a co-operative association.

If there is a family incorporation there should be room for some member of the family who is not actually farming to hold some stated percentage of the equity shares of the corporation. This is one way of planning the transfer of estates from one generation to another.

A community group should require that all of the shareholders of the corporation should be actual farmers. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is extremely important. This is where I disagree with my hon. friend from Cannington. Any legislation drawn up must be carefully drawn to cover these different types of desirable farm patterns, and yet to stop any possible takeover by corporate vertical integration giants.

2. Here we say that after a certain date no agricultural land can be acquired for agricultural purposes by a corporation except a farm family, community group or an agricultural co-operative.

After talking to farmers, businessmen, congressmen, senators, bankers, Federal civil servants in both North Dakota and Colorado, I am convinced that we, in this province, must act now and lock the door before the horse is stolen.

Let us not think that it isn't continuing to grow. Mr. Speaker, I have here the North Dakota Farmers Union Paper of March 8th, 1973 and I am just going to quote a bit from an article. The headline is, "Corporation Farming Increases in South Dakota."

The South Dakota Farmers Union says it has gathered statistics that shows the number of out-of-state corporations owning state agricultural land has increased over 40 per cent since 1968.

Leroy Hardy, registered lobbyist for the States largest farm organization told a joint committee hearing in the State Capital that 92 foreign corporations (I hope you noted that they use the word 'foreign' and this I presume is in relation to South Dakota) now own agricultural land in the State compared with 63 in 1968.

Hardy said that domestic in-state corporations in farming or ranching increased by 25 per cent, from 438 to 548 in the same period.

I just wanted to put that on the record, Mr. Speaker.

I say what happens in the United States in terms of the agricultural sector and the Great Plains in North America, really comes to Canada a few years later. I say that if we are going to save our rural communities we must act now.

I think of the community of Mott, North Dakota, where farms have grown to as high as 125 quarters. The town which had a population of 3,000 has dropped to 2,000. Businesses have closed their doors. Houses are empty, buildings not painted. People's life savings gone. Only one businessman said he liked the large farm concept, all the others said, "This way is no good."

3. This recommendation says that all corporations except a farm family, community group or a co-operative association, now owning agricultural land in Saskatchewan will be required to dispose of the land by a specified date 20 years from now.

This period, I believe is more than sufficient to permit the corporation to realize a fair market value when it sells the land. I personally believe that 10 years would have been sufficient, but go along with 20 years as a compromise. In 1932 in North Dakota, corporations were given 10 years to dispose of their holdings and it worked out all right.

4. This suggests that no incorporations be allowed under the new Act for agricultural purposes except as a farm family, community group or agricultural co-operative association. I believe this is necessary as I said before, we must endeavor to not only make a healthy vibrant agricultural industry, but we must do everything within our power to revitalize our small urban farm communities.

5. In No. 3 we said that those corporation farms that are

May 1, 1973

presently operating have 20 years to dispose of their holdings. In this recommendation we say that if that corporation is doing the actual farming, that is hiring the work done, then within five years it must stop this practice and rent it to farmers who would farm it. Here, again, the period of time is a matter of judgment. But this does give them time to get their value out of new equipment, etc. We say that such a corporation should be permitted to operate for five years but own the land for 20 years. Where land is presently rented by lessees, it gives them 20 years to either buy the land or make other plans.

6. This says that only a Canadian citizen or landed immigrant may acquire by purchase, gift or other inheritance, with the exception of the spouse, any agricultural land in Saskatchewan. I do believe any heir of such land should have the right to become a landed immigrant.

Here again, many of the people we interviewed, both in the United States and Saskatchewan, felt that absentee ownership whether in California or Toronto or in British Columbia contributed very little to the local farm community. And those outside of Canada took their earnings out of the country as well.

The report goes into the legal aspects, but I only say, if there are no legal grounds for this type of legislation, then the Saskatchewan Government must start fighting for the right to control the destiny of our rural communities and prepared to go to the courts.

7. Here we say that alien individuals now owning land should be able to continue as owners and to transfer the land to a spouse. After a number of years this will iron itself out. An heir should have the opportunity to become a landed immigrant.

8. Wherever we went in Saskatchewan and at all hearings, the subject of the ownership of recreational lands came up. This was beyond the scope of our committee, but I suggest to the Government that this is an urgent matter and should be studied in the near future.

9. Here we say that a register be maintained showing ownership and operator of agricultural and recreational land.

Once a complete up-to-date registry is completed, it would be relatively easy to keep it up with modern technology like the computer. I believe it can become of great assistance to the Government in monitoring new trends in ownership.

10. This deals with the Government being more active in assisting and promoting co-operatives. As I said before our visit to Matador and Beechy were certainly enough to convince me that much more could be done to assist in what I believe, this very desirable way of living. I believe that the Department of Co-operation should set up a program, an education program, to encourage co-op farms. There is much information that could be got from the records of these farms in regard to the ownership, transfer of ownership, operations, etc. I personally feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the extremely and very important recommendations.

In committee hearings there were many comments on Hutterites, both pro and con. There was a wide variety of opinions certainly they are good efficient farmers, living according to their religious beliefs. We visited two of these colonies, one at Rosetown and one 14 miles north of Saskatoon.

I personally was very impressed with both of them. I am inclined to believe that they are a much maligned group. I will admit I could not or would not want to live their life but I certainly will fight to give them the right to do so. It was said by some that they take no part, or support, the local community. I also suggest that there are many other members of our society, individual members, groups of individual members, that do not support our society.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning that this is a significant day in my life and my career. It is only if the Government acts on this report. I believe that over the summer it should be studied and at a fall session legislation of some kind should be brought in and enacted. I believe that if this is done, we may yet save many of our small urban centres. I believe that legislation of this kind, along side of the Land Bank, FarmStart, can make our agricultural industry a healthy, viable industry, and our people happy. I will take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, who served on the committee and considered the question put to it, I should like to have a few remarks in connection with it.

I was one of those who signed and prepared, in company with my colleagues, from Cannington and Morse, the minority report which appears as an appendix.

The difficulty with land is, as I have said on a previous occasion, and quoted an elderly politician, he said, “You can trifle with a man’s wife, but you must leave his land alone.” Without indicating any approval of the first mentioned conduct, he certainly has raised a point when he indicates that land is an emotional issue. And that is the way that it was treated in North Dakota and to a certain extent, that is the way the New Democratic Party wishes to treat it in Saskatchewan.

One of the things that the committee did was to limit itself to visiting those people who tended to support the point of view of the majority members of the committee. It is, therefore, not surprising that they found support in the people whom they interviewed.

The facts, however, come clear. The North Dakota experiment is illogical and foolish. The fact is that in North Dakota they have had an anti-corporation law for some 41 years. No corporations have been allowed to purchase land in North Dakota since 1932 and since 1942 they have not even been allowed to own the land that they owned previously.

Now my argument, I gather, is strengthened by remarks opposite that the legislation originally brought forth by a referendum in 1930. Now the fact is that for more than 40 years

May 1, 1973

corporations have not been permitted to purchase land in North Dakota. Nonetheless, I as a foreigner, if I could afford it, could go to North Dakota and purchase all the land I like. There is no restriction whatsoever upon my acquisition of farm land in North Dakota, but, if a farmer wished to incorporate his land with his wife and two children, or one child, he would be prohibited by North Dakota laws from doing so. That result, Mr. Speaker, is not logical.

This entire North Dakota land system is supported by the National Farmers' Union and they were very frank and open about it. They said, admittedly, that it was a matter of emotion and a question occasionally of prejudice. I asked one of them about this and he said, "Oh, yes we are prepared to foster the prejudice." I have no quarrel with the openness and the frankness with which we discussed this matter with the North Dakota Farmers' Union.

It does not lead me to believe that you can always come to a logical result. There is one type of corporation permitted in North Dakota, and that is the co-op form and we were told that there were three in North Dakota, one of which might be regarded as a success, certainly two of them could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as successful.

That is hardly justification for the kind of report and recommendations that we have here today. I will speak briefly about this co-op business again in a moment or two.

The fact is that it is good for the North Dakota Farmers' Union to have a cause. You keep your organization together by uniting your members in a common bond against some exterior evil. And the bogey man that has held the North Dakota Farmers' Union together all these years, is the corporate bogey man.

There are, however, a couple which they have not come to grips with and which, of course, the Hon. Member for Melville mentioned. And that is the question of size. We studied the corporation problem, and I use the word 'problem' in quotation marks — in North Dakota and Colorado. We discovered a place like Mott, North Dakota had the most severe kind of problems. Businesses were being closed, farmers were leaving the neighborhood, the population was dropping, farms were getting larger and larger. Every last one of the problems we talked about in committee, were found in Mott, and Mott doesn't have any corporations. They were less severe in place like Colorado, where we had such companies as the Ceres Land Company and Gates Rubber Company.

The point I wish to make is this, that it is so easy to make marvelous speeches attacking an unknown evil. And the less known about the evil, the more severe the problems can appear. I have no doubt that we are going to get a continuation of some of the discussions that we have had today, although quite frankly, I do agree with some of the remarks of the Hon. Member for Melville and more of the remarks of the Hon. Member for Touchwood.

The reason that I opposed the report generally, and on balance, I must say I oppose the report, is because of three or four specific items.

To begin with it is a restrictive sort of document. To begin with it is nothing less than an attempt to justify the

New Democratic campaign material. My colleague from Cannington has already mentioned page 1 of the pamphlet entitled “New Deal for People”, and it says:

As the first steps, the NDP Government will:

1. Restrict corporate ownership to family farms and groups of families farming co-operatively.
2. Keep farm ownership in Canadian hands.

This speech of the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) would have been identical without one step taken by the committee. That is the kind of speech that we heard before, it is the kind of speech that we will continue to hear, and the Report was intended to give some foundation to the speeches which the Members had already been making. The restriction on size is one that we were well aware of. We knew that the Members had already made up their minds on this. They have not actually put a size because they haven't been able to figure out a size. During the time we had the committee hearings we questioned a number of farmers on what they thought would be a viable farm size. And in every case it was just a little bit more than the farmer already had. If he had a half section he was convinced he would do very well if he had a section; if he had a section and a quarter he felt that he would do very well if he could only get another quarter or half section; if he had two sections all he needed was another half, and so on it went. But whatever was needed to make a farm viable was just a little more than the farmer already had. Therefore, I have no doubt that the majority members of the committee couldn't make up their minds on a particular size so they then recommended a formula.

In the pamphlet I have from that well-known farmer, Art Lloyd, a candidate for the New Democratic Party for Whitmore Park, it says and I quote:

We must create the kinds of conditions that will promote the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan.

Fairly innocuous on its face, but it's part of the program commenced by the New Democratic Party to restrict farm sizes. The Waffle resolution in Winnipeg in the fall of 1970 clearly spelled out the necessity, they thought, of restricting farm size.

The Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) said we must face the question of farm size. Going with that is the restriction on people who are to be allowed to farm and the first steps and the major steps were seen in the resolution, the recommendations of the report of the majority members. They have already stated their basic intentions. They did admit that farmers should be allowed some extra income. Farmers who are only beginning their career, farmers who have rather small farms and farmers who have had a series of low income years — they allow this as the sort of person who can get non-farm income. But they do declare, and this was reiterated by the Hon. Member from Melville, that farming must be restricted to persons defined as ‘farmers’. And this may well be one of the tests of whether a man is a farmer — whether or not he lives on the farm. And the New Democratic people who came before the committee, on more than one occasion, were prepared to indicate that farmers should be forced to stay on the farm. I can say that that kind of restrictiveness that we are talking about is unacceptable to me. If you are going to put restrictions on

May 1, 1973

income for people who are not legitimate farmers (to use the words of the Hon. Member from Melville) you must do the same to farmers. You cannot say to a mechanic that he cannot earn farm income unless you are prepared to tell the farmer that he can't earn income as a mechanic; you cannot allow the potash worker, if you prohibit the potash worker from earning farm income you are going to have to say to the farmers, you cannot work in the potash mine. The logic of it is irrefutable. There are many people who are government employees and farmers. An effort by the Government to limit the people who can earn farm income will result inevitably in restrictions upon farmers in making other income. Now that is not something which I would find acceptable.

I oppose the search by the Hon. Member for Melville for a legitimate farmer out of fear that what he will find is a restriction that he has created.

Now I want to suggest the kind of thing that can happen in Canada. I have before me a clipping from the Star-Phoenix of April 25th, 1973:

British Columbia Egg Marketing Board seizes 3,750,000 dozen eggs from Super Value stores because the eggs were brought in from Manitoba.

And it goes on to suggest that the only people who can sell eggs in British Columbia are people who produce eggs in British Columbia. Manitoba eggs may not be sold in British Columbia. The same is true of other provinces. And I oppose this kind of restriction because inevitably we will be the losers. What will happen is Ontario will pass a Bill saying that only beef produced in Ontario can be sold in stores in Ontario. Inevitably British Columbia will take the same steps with pork as they have taken with eggs and with the same logic. What will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that these restrictivists will slowly and steadily balkanize Canada, slowly and steadily these restrictivists will destroy Canada. What will happen is that these people, the movement that is encouraged by this report, will ultimately be the undoing of Saskatchewan agriculture. Eggs produced in Saskatchewan cannot be sold in British Columbia. If the same thing happens to our other farm products, the same kind of restrictions that they want to apply everywhere, Saskatchewan agriculture will be the loser.

Now, Mr. Speaker, something has been said about co-ops. And I want to suggest to the Members that the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) has misunderstood, because I don't expect that he of all Members on the other side, would have misrepresented the position that we take with respect to co-ops, at least not the position that I take. The Hon. Member said something like this. He said we are basically against co-ops. I have in front of me a document entitled, "Foundation of Prosperity". This is a resolution approved by the Advisory Council of the National Liberal Federation of Canada in September of 1943, and it says and I quote:

The long-run prosperity of farmers and fishermen of Canada will depend not on the exceptional demands created by war, but on secure markets at remunerative prices. We advocate a policy under which Canada will . . .

And then I will go to item (c) and quote:

develop the growth of co-operative enterprises.

That has been a foundation of Liberal policy through the years and continues to be a policy which I support. The policy of supporting co-operatives has been adopted by the New Democratic Party as well as the Liberal Party, but let them make no mistake, they have not stolen it from us so that we don't have it. It may well be possessed by more than one. I can assure the Hon. Member that I am not only a member of more than one co-operative, and the credit union, but am solicitor for them and I can assure you that they would not be willing to have an anti-co-operative member doing that kind of work.

Now I want to suggest also, that there is a little more logical explanation than that which was given by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). It is very possible to be a strong supporter of co-operatives without demanding that everybody should be involved in a co-operative farm. I believe that the farmers should be entitled to choose their own form of organization. If a farmer desires to form a co-operative I would be the first to say, go ahead, and give them every assistance. But the fact is, that in North Dakota where they had every opportunity and every assistance the farmers have chosen not to do so and I suggest to the Hon. Members that an attempt to force farmers into co-operative farming is inappropriate.

During the years from 1944 to 1964, I heard speech after speech by the then Premier Douglas, extolling the merits of co-operative farms, doing everything possible by that government to organize co-operative farms, supporting the Matador and Beechy farms, and yet through all the years there is hardly a burst of enthusiasm amongst the farmers for the co-operative approach to farming themselves. And this includes many people who are strong supporters of the co-operative movement. And therefore, I suggest that the Hon. Member could not have misrepresented us, he merely, I suggest, misunderstood what we had to say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a point on which I am less firm because I am frankly uncertain. I hope the Hon. Members will remember that the minority report would keep farm lands in Canadian hands, and that appears in the minority report and is supported by the Hon. Members who signed it and I believe the rest of the Liberal Party. Now frankly that is the position taken by us. Keep Canadian farm land in Canadian hands, and that is the cornerstone of our approach.

However, the question on corporations is less certain. The evidence was we studied two corporate farms, Ceres Land Company and Gates Rubber Company. The Gates Rubber Company came in, bought a bunch of land, farmed it, took losses, moved out and were in the process of selling off the land. They left a lot of money in Colorado. They took severe losses and they had, as one fellow said, a belly-full, and decided to move out. I don't know that that was any good to Colorado. Equally, I don't know if it was any harm to Colorado. I have likened it to a poker game in which there are six players and a stranger shows up, he's the seventh. In he comes, he plays for a while and when he goes away he leaves \$100. Now I don't know if the fact that he is short \$100 whether the remaining players have the \$100 on the table they never had before. I am not sure that it's good to have that occur. One thing is certain it was admitted that corporations were not as efficient at the farming game as the individual family farmer. The big corporations admitted this, the small people admit this. I think it is unanimous amongst the committee members that the ordinary

May 1, 1973

family farmers was more efficient than the big corporation. Whether this proves that you should not have corporations or not is certainly something I won't say. In any event, the evidence in Saskatchewan was not that there was a huge influx of corporations at all — in fact, with the losses that appeared to be sustained by corporations, one wonders what would possess them to want to come in here, and certainly we found no evidence of any influx of land-hungry corporations into Saskatchewan.

Now whether the predictions of Members, the gloom and doom predictions of the Hon. Member from Melville, will come true, is hard to tell and that is why we suggest that it be closely monitored and that the results be kept tab of.

Now the problem, of course, with the entire committee was that the report was filled with prejudice, a large amount of nonsense; it tended to be overly restrictive and in general avoided what was really happening anywhere. The one thing is clear, that this report is the biggest retreat from a Bill you ever saw. It is a bigger retreat than Napoleon withdrawing from Moscow.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture made it very clear when he brought the Bill down that it would be retroactive to April 1, 1972. We have heard nothing more about that. Now we will undoubtedly have to listen to all sorts of speeches about heartless corporations, despite the fact that at no time did we ever investigate a heartless corporation. We didn't find any that were heartless — one that was a good corporation and everybody admitted was a good corporation, was slammed as being a bad corporation because some day it might be one. Now that's the kind of logic we have listened to in this House for quite a while from the Hon. Members opposite and, therefore, it didn't surprise me that it came forward in the Bill. But the condemnation of the Monfort Cattle Company was amazing because everybody admitted that he was an outstanding citizen, his company was an outstanding example of responsible corporate leadership, but they said, "who is to tell that in the future some other corporation might not be bad." Now to condemn a practice because some day it might not be a good practice is totally illogical except in the minds of the New Democratic Party.

Now I do want to say a word or two about the report and the committee.

To begin with, I am disappointed in the size of the print of the reservations. I commented upon this on one previous occasion. It wasn't known to me that they would print the reservations in small print, but they did. It is clearly the intention of the majority committee members to print the majority report in bold type and the minority report to make it as small as possible, eliminate it if possible. Cheap politics indeed, Mr. Attorney General. There it is for all to see, easy reading of the report; get out your magnifying glass when you come to the reservations.

Now I want to suggest that I enjoyed the committee for several reasons. I did enjoy working with the other members of the committee. I found that we did have some differences. I particularly enjoyed the opportunity to get to know the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) with his incisive wit and his excellent judgment; the Hon. Member for Cannington

(Mr. Weatherald) who so cleverly analyzed the situations that we came to from time to time, and also the interesting comments of the Hon. Members opposite. I do say that the chairman (Mr. Kowalchuk) did a good job under difficult circumstances and he did attempt (and I think with more than a little success) to maintain a reasonable impartiality. Certainly he leaned to the New Democratic Party and certainly he tilted that way, but I don't complain, after all, the majority of the members were New Democratic Party and as I was reminded on a couple of occasions the New Democrats won the election. Well, I do think that he didn't depart seriously from this position until he came to the House today and then, of course, he went into a totally partisan speech, and he is entitled to do so. I worked on the Steering Committee, not only with the Hon. Member for Melville, but the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) and by and large I thought our meetings were reasonably conducted and the overall planning, once we had agreed upon a particular course of action, (I didn't always agree but I seemed to be outvoted 2 to 1 every time) once we agreed, or once the vote had been taken, we worked, I think, harmoniously and I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with those two Members.

I am disappointed, of course, that the Government which regarded this as a highly urgent priority matter a year ago has so downgraded the importance of the report and the question of foreign ownership. It seems that the Government either regards it as a matter of impending urgency or else of little import. The Government has difficulty in balancing something in between and it does seem to me that we should come to grips with the real problems and we should do so logically, coherently and come to the House with a reasonable Bill. The fact is that the committee members failed logically to come to grips with the real problem. When there is a flight of farmers from one territory they are disappointed if they can't find a corporation to blame it on. If they find that a number of businesses like in Mott are closing up, they are extremely sad that there are no corporations in the neighborhood that they can blame this disaster on. The fact is the same events are occurring around Saskatchewan, place after place, where there are no corporations and one wonders what excuse the NDP will use for the continued flight of people from our farm areas. I rather hope that the Hon. Members will come to grips with the real problems, avoid politics, be above politics and avoid all the difficulties and the partisanship that appears in the report.

I will support the motion to receive the report and nothing more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kaeding: (Saltcoats) — Mr. Speaker, before making any comments on this report, I would first of all like to express my appreciation for having had the opportunity to sit on this very interesting committee. I would also like to express my appreciation for the very good job done by the chairman of the committee, the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) and for his impartial handling of all the matters in conducting the meetings and keeping our members in line including the Members of the Opposition and expediting our activities and our deliberations.

Now I should like to comment on some of the remarks made,

May 1, 1973

first by the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). He came out and said that the committee was set up to rubber stamp policies of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I reject that assertion most emphatically. Had we written a report before the committee or our hearings were completed, I am sure that my report would have been much different than it was after the hearings we conducted. Recommendations by the committee were made sometimes in spite of preconceived ideas and absolutely no pressures were brought on us by anyone.

The Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) states that a committee went only to those areas of the United States which tended to support our point of view. Would he say, for instance, that when we went to Ceres Land Company and to Monfort Cattle Company and the Gates Rubber Company, that these people represented our point and view and would they fit into this category? Yet we spent many hours speaking and discussing problems and land tenure situations with these groups, as well as with many other independent people including bankers and lawyers and other businessmen. I would reject again his proposition that we went only to those people who were interested in our point of view.

The Member for Albert Park again showed his prejudice toward the co-operative movement. I hope that his co-operative clients he boasts about do not read his statements in the Leader-Post tonight. He may have lost a few accounts. Nowhere in this report, Mr. Speaker, do we insist that farmers join co-operatives. We have said that we feel that co-operatives are a desirable type of land tenure and we have said that we should like to see further developments in our extension services to show people what co-operatives are all about. But certainly at no time did we insist that farmers should join co-operatives.

Mr. Speaker, before delving into the recommendations of the committee as outlined in this report, it would be well to examine some of the statistics relating to Saskatchewan farms and to some of the pressures that brought about the formation of this committee in the first place. As has been pointed out by others in this debate, there has been a continuous consolidation of farm size in this province since the 1930s and a related continuous reduction in rural population since that time. Records show that farm population has decreased from 514,000 in 1941 to 260,000 in 1971. A reduction of approximately 48 per cent. In the same period of time the number of farms decreased from 138,000 in 1941 to 77,000 in 1971. A reduction of 45 per cent. The average farm size increased from 260 acres to approximately 760 acres. In the same period the prices of farm land rose from \$21 per acre in 1941 to approximately \$76 per acre in 1971. Whether this consolidation of farms has been good for the province or not is a debatable point. However, there is a great deal of concern amongst agricultural groups as well as non-rural people that this trend must be stopped or reversed if we are to maintain any kind of viable rural community.

Most of us will agree that with modern technology the original farm concept of a quarter section farm with a few cows and chickens has gone by the wayside and most of us would not willingly return to that level of operation. I believe also it is accepted that the original settlement patterns with elevators in small towns every six or seven miles may have outlived its usefulness and we must look at a community base

somewhat larger than this. However, there must eventually be a point where consolidation should cease in the best interest of society. Many people are now questioning the wisdom or even the sanity of the continuous migration of people into larger urban complexes and the social stresses which that entails. Part of the whole problem, and I want to stress that it is only one part of many, is the increased concentration of agricultural lands into the hands of fewer and fewer farmers. Along with that must be considered a slow encroachment of corporate and foreign owned holdings in this province. Our report indicates that the net increase in the amount of foreign owned land in Saskatchewan has been quite small in the past few years and amounts to approximately 2.34 per cent of all Saskatchewan farm land. Therefore, as an overall picture, it does not appear to pose too large a problem. What is disturbing, however, is the concentration of some of these holdings in certain areas. The report indicates that in Professor Brown's study there were seven municipalities where over nine per cent of the farm land was foreign owned. In some of these areas there is a continuing pressure by American investors to purchase even more. Because many of these holdings are concentrated in large blocks which are operated directly from a farm base outside of Saskatchewan they add little to the rural life of their community. Many of them spend only the time it takes to seed and harvest their crop and purchase only a minimum of inputs in Saskatchewan. As a consequence their presence constitutes a direct loss of local population in those areas.

While recognizing that the total acreage presently owned by outsiders is not yet excessive, our committee nevertheless generally agreed that this form of land ownership should be discouraged. Recommendation No. 6 would rule out any further purchase of farm land by foreign owners unless they indicate the intention of becoming a landed immigrant and of living on the land.

Recommendation No. 7 would permit foreign owners to retain the land to transfer it to a spouse. However, succeeding generations would be barred from accepting transfers, subject to their willingness to become a Saskatchewan resident. This provision would assure that land presently held by foreign owners would be gradually repatriated over a period of years to Saskatchewan residents. Because this land would be coming off the market over a long period of years there is little likelihood that it would distort normal land values at any one time and, therefore, owners should be able to obtain a fair market value at the time of sale.

With regard to corporate ownership the report sets out in fairly plain language the differences between farm family corporations, community farm corporations and co-operatives and with other commercial types of corporations.

Recommendations 2, 4 and 5 call for legislation to prohibit further sale of land to commercial corporations and for the gradual repatriation of those farms now held by commercial corporations over a 20 year period. Our committee heard evidence at their meetings throughout the province of some of the problems relating to this kind of land ownership. Here again the total amount of acreage held by these corporations has not yet reached dangerous proportions in many areas of the province. However, with the high investment costs now being experienced by beginning farmers, the likelihood of gradual expansion of

May 1, 1973

commercial farms can be expected if no counter measures are taken. Because corporate structures generally are not community oriented their contribution to community development is minimal. We have recommended that farm land now held by commercial corporations be disposed of within 20 years. This will permit their owners ample time to dispose of their holdings over a long period and prevent the possibility of large capital losses if immediate disposal were required. Some may feel that 20 years is not sufficient time. I would suggest that many an employee in the industrial world would feel very well protected indeed if he were given 20 years notice that he had to adjust his way of life.

The same is true of those farmers who now lease land from these corporations. Surely if they find it possible to make a living under a lease arrangement it should be possible for them to negotiate a purchase of this land within that period of time without any major dislocation. As I have said before the problem with corporate ownership is not yet severe in this province. We need only refer to many of the statements made to our committee during our American tour and they were referred to by the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), where they said, "Don't let this happen to you, the time to stop the problem is before it becomes acute." I believe most members of our committee agree with that assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal for one moment with the first recommendation of the committee:

That the Legislature enact special legislation, The Family Farm and Community Group Agricultural Incorporation Act.

Many farm families are seriously looking at multiple ownership units because of the high investment cost of machinery and the workloads involved in these larger units. We feel there should be a more simple mechanism for family farm incorporation than has heretofore been available. Under present legislation the cost of incorporation is very high. The incorporation laws are in most cases too rigid to meet the needs of farm families. Community groups also find themselves severely restricted by the present corporation laws, in attempting to set up community feedlots or machinery co-ops. There are no standard by-laws which can readily be adopted by such laws. Representations made to our committee by numerous individuals indicated a desirability in preparing such legislation as quickly as possible.

During the course of our study we visited a typical community-type farm at Lanigan, where a large group of fifty farmers banded together to establish a large feedlot enterprise of about 6,000 head capacity. A large hybrid swine operation with an output of approximately 15,000 hogs and a complementary feed mill which processed feed for both of these operations. Many of the shareholders who invested in this company were straight grain farmers who had large grain surpluses and little working knowledge of the livestock industry. Some joined because they lacked the labor resources to go into livestock on their own, others because of their age preferred this method of providing a market for their feed grain to investing in a private feedlot at their advanced age. Whatever the reason, the organization of these enterprises resulted in a guaranteed market for the grain produced by those farmers. It also served to provide a local market for feeder cattle so that they could be finished

here in Saskatchewan rather than exporting them as feeders, thereby adding additional revenues to Saskatchewan agriculture.

Because of the ability of the organized groups to hire financial and operational expertise which were not available to individual farmers, the Hybrid Swine Company has developed a highly technical breeding program which could serve as a source of breeding stock for the benefit of many smaller hog producers. Other operations such as these are in existence throughout the province, of various sizes, and with various types of operations. Some are owned partially or totally by individuals who have other businesses or occupations who are using this method to invest surplus funds or to complement a machine agency or some other enterprise.

Farm organizations have indicated strong exception to non-farmers becoming involved in active agricultural enterprises, since in many of these cases profits at the farm level are incidental to other benefits accruing to them. We have, therefore, recommended that community groups organizing themselves into production units should be completely farmer owned to guarantee that benefits accrue to the agricultural industry. Mr. Speaker, when one looks at one of these large production units, one can quickly get enthused about the efficiency and the ease of producing large volumes of agricultural products in a concentrated area. However, being a practical farmer who is seriously concerned with maintaining the production of agriculture products as close to home as possible, I am somewhat apprehensive of whether we should be encouraging the proliferation of these types of large community groups for a number of reasons, including problems related to environment, disease control and my general aversion to extremely large concentration of livestock in one area. I would suggest that our Government seriously consider limiting the number of livestock which could be accommodated in any one of such operations. There is no doubt in my mind that the pressure from local markets by these feedlots purchasing feeder cattle makes it very difficult for a small farmer with a small feedlot to get feeders on a local auction market.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to a matter of a somewhat more sensitive nature. During the hearings members of the committee heard numerous representations from individuals and groups expressing serious concern over the impact large farms have on rural communities. Generally the feeling was expressed that where large farms, which could probably be identified as those having acreages of good farm land of around five sections or a gross value of \$300,000 are concerned, it matters little if the owner is a private individual or a corporation. If he were farming those large acreages himself the impact in terms of loss of population and community involvement are just as severe. You will note from the report that the replies to the questionnaires showed that 38 per cent of those replying indicated they favour some restriction on farm size. It might be interesting also to note that the members of the Saskatchewan Youth Parliament which sat here last year, passed the following resolution and I quote:

To protect rural life, restrictions should be placed on the size of farms, absentee ownership should be prevented and co-operative farming should be encouraged.

I am sure that for the most part these people are seriously

May 1, 1973

concerned with the future loss of population which is bound to result if the present trend to larger farms continues.

There would no doubt be a great hue and cry if the actual physical size of farms were restricted by legislation. However, there could be many ways by which farm sizes could be reduced, by the use of disincentives such as progressively higher taxation or by upper limits on subsidy payments or stabilization payments or by incentive programs geared to assist smaller farmers to stay in business, such as FarmStart and Land Bank, which are not available to large farmers. Even progressively higher interest rates on farm loans as the size of holdings increase could act as a brake to restrain accumulation of large holdings. Possibly criteria could be developed which would require large holdings to employ a minimum number of employees for a specified size of unit. This would probably lead to an expansion of a grain operation within its boundaries into specialized lines such as livestock or other enterprise to justify extra labor costs. The argument will arise of course that by restricting farm size we are really restricting a farmer's income. This need not necessarily be so. In almost every case our present farms could well produce a great deal more income within their present fence lines, if operators would take advantage of development of livestock enterprises, put more emphasis on substantial yields through the use of weed control and chemicals and proper fertilizing use. Because the terms of reference of our committee did not encompass a study of the impact of farm size, we did not make any specific recommendation in this regard. However, because there was a great deal of public concern over this topic, we are recommending that a full study be made as soon as possible to examine what steps could or should be taken to discourage the present trend to large farm size.

It might be interesting to comment that there is a great deal of controversy over the land being farmed by Hutterite Colonies. Broken down to family size their holdings generally would be less than 500 acres per family unit, which certainly does not put them in the class of huge land owners on a per capita basis.

I should like to comment briefly on Recommendation No. 12, which calls on the Government to initiate consultation between Western provinces to examine the whole area of the ownership and control of agricultural land. Because many of the problems of the ownership of land come under federal law such a meeting could well lead to a reassessment of the constitutional problems and hopefully remove some of the roadblocks presently being experienced by provincial governments in setting up proper land tenure legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say again that I thoroughly enjoyed the work of this committee. Although I have made no reference to the enjoyable trip we had to the United States, I certainly feel that the time there was well spent as a background to the opinions finally arrived at by this committee. I am generally in agreement with the majority recommendations of the committee and I trust it will be of value to this Legislature in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper: (Weyburn) — Mr. Speaker, as a member of

the Special Legislative Committee which studied the agricultural and ownership question I wish to add a few thoughts at this time and make a number of observations which I formulated as a result of the work the committee did.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who was chairman of our committee. His task was not an easy one, and most if not all members of the committee felt that he did an excellent job. This Assembly, Mr. Speaker, owes him a debt of gratitude for the leadership he displayed as we went on with our deliberations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — When the decision was made, Mr. Speaker, to refer Bill 115 to a legislative committee, I am sure we all realized that a very important responsibility was vested in us. The responsibility to legislate rests with each and every Member of this Assembly. It is the elected representative who must answer for the actions which are taken when legislation is put into effect. Mr. Speaker, further to that point I believe that this report is one of the most important documents which this Assembly has had to deal with. I sincerely hope that the usual political arguments are left by the wayside, because the topic under consideration is much too important to be sacrificed for political reasons.

What we are talking about today is an issue which is going to have a tremendously forceful impact on our number one industry, agriculture. The decisions this Legislature makes on the land ownership question must be considered with very careful forethought.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, through its months of deliberation found that the issue is indeed a very complex one. There are many implications. There were many divergent views and conditions varied depending upon which area was visited. For that reason our whole task took on added significance. No doubt our task would have been made much easier had we been given the job of isolating problems and then recommending solutions based on local conditions. However, that was not the case. The recommendations that we have forwarded apply to the entire province and because of this, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must be extremely careful in choosing the direction we want to go.

I am sure that each of us is concerned about preserving and strengthening our agricultural industry. As has been pointed out many times in the past, this way of life which is unique from other professions must not be sacrificed regardless of economic factors. It is folly, I admit, to think that each family farm unit will continue to operate in the months and years ahead. However, government has the responsibility to ensure that every possible program and policy which is approved relating to agriculture reflects the commitment made to the people and that of course if to maintain the maximum number of viable farm units within this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Land Ownership question is perhaps the single most important factor which our farmers today are faced with. Regardless of how many other programs are brought in, if government does not face up to the reality that problems with land tenure and transfers must be dealt with, all

May 1, 1973

other supplementary assistance programs will do very little good.

Provincial governments have little or no control over such things as international grain sales, inflation or costs of production. However, the responsibility to legislate matters which are truly provincial in scope and directly affect the lives of people within the province does exist, and they must not only be accepted but acted on expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, there are many sets of statistics which can be used to justify legislative considerations for the agricultural industry. There are many sets of conditions which have existed over the years which can be utilized to support the direction we are taking. However, I should just like to comment on two factors which to me are very significant. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a publication called Agricultural Statistics in which the evidence is clearly stated. It quoted the percentage of the Canadian labor force engaged in agriculture fell from 33.5 per cent in 1935-39 period to 6.3 per cent in 1971. Considering this along with the fact that fewer than half as many farmers produced 25 per cent more product in 1971 than in 1949, I think it is very obvious that there have been many changes in the farming industry as we know it today.

There are, of course, conflicting theories and reasons behind the high de-population shift which has taken place in recent years. However, there is little argument over the fact that the social and personal costs which have been imposed have fallen directly on the farm and rural sector of the population. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has made it clear all along that these patterns are not inevitable and to opt for that philosophy is to admit failure. I do not believe that any Member of this Assembly is ready to accept things as they are and allow technology to dictate the fate of our farming community.

The second major point which must be dealt with is found in this quote from the 1971 census of Canada Report and I quote:

For every young person aged 20 to 34 in Canada there were 1.21 persons over 45. But in Saskatchewan for every young person there are 1.67 over 45 years of age.

This shortage of 20 to 34 year olds reflects the migration of this age group to other occupations outside of our province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate side effect of this migration is that most of the people leaving our province come from our rural communities. This Government has committed itself to doing whatever is legislatively possible to encourage and assist our family farmers. The report we have before us today is recognition of that commitment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't comment briefly on the events which have taken place following the introduction of Bill 115 last year. The White Paper legislation sparked an immediate outcry by Members opposite. I do not deny them that right, however, I will say that in my view it is unfortunate that they seized on the opportunity to use this subject as a whipping boy for their own political purposes. I am convinced that this whole issue would have met with more objectivity if politics was to be left out of it. Even before the initial Bill was brought forward, it was clear, Mr. Speaker, to all of us that something had to be done to correct the

problems which are intensifying as a result of corporate and foreign ownership of our farm land. The problems I do admit were not as serious to some areas of the province as they were in other areas. However, regardless of how much of a problem existed, in no way detracts from the fact that as a government we were obliged to study the implications of what was taking place, and where necessary we must offer corrective alternatives.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have honored that reality. The 12 specific recommendations included in this report I am sure come after considerable debate, deliberation and consultation with the public.

As we travelled around the province and listened to the people one point became resoundingly clear. That point, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the majority of these people were in agreement with the decision to study the farm land ownership question. The views which were put to the committee were wide-ranging in scope and it soon became obvious to committee members that there would be no single cure-all or no single solution to the problem.

The final report of this committee represents a major challenge now for this Legislature. From this report I am sure that all Members must decide which is the best direction to pursue. Each one of us must decide based on our experiences and exposure to the problem what is the best course to take.

If I might make a few specific comments respecting this report. For the most part I agree with the recommendations contained herein, as I feel they are an accurate assessment of conditions as they exist in Saskatchewan today. I say, Mr. Speaker, I agree with most of the recommendations. However, I do have reservations in relation to two of the recommendations. I have listed those in the report. At this time I should briefly like to elaborate on the reasons why I have questioned the two specific recommendations, Number 3 and Number 5.

The recommendation that corporations not involved in agriculture should dispose of their land holdings within 20 years and should not operate any agricultural enterprise after five years from now, to my way of thinking is undesirable, Mr. Speaker. If adopted it could result in serious ramifications for a substantial number of farmers in Saskatchewan. I admit that our committee ran into isolated instances where there were serious problems as the result of large corporate holdings operating. However, to legislate on this basis is not to my way of thinking, going to have the desired results. By bringing in legislation of this type we should no doubt solve isolated problems. However, we must remember, we must consider the fact and beware of the fact that we will be creating serious problems in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is the retroactive aspects of this recommendation that I am concerned about. I feel that the situation as it currently exists can adequately be attended to by bringing in legislation which does not include retroactive provisions. There are a number of examples even right within my own constituency where this type of legislation would have a very serious effect. I think we must recognize the fact that there are some corporations which were established many years ago and which were set up in good faith by people whose intentions were

sincere and honorable. Over the years a great number of farmers have rented and have released some of these holdings and in the process built up a family farm operation. If we come forward now with legislation which would force these corporations to dispose of their agricultural holdings within 20 years and force them to stop all agricultural activities within five years the effects which will be generated will be to the detriment, if not only the corporations, but to many, many farm families who have worked hard and long to earn their place in this society. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that if corporations were to sell, the people living on the land would have a chance to purchase this land. However, it bothers me a great deal to even think about the small farmer, and many of them fall into this category, who might not at this time be in the position to purchase the land outright. What happens to him is a very sombre thought. If the land then goes by default to a larger operator with a considerable cash reserve we are only eliminating one problem and creating another one.

I am very sincere about this, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that Members on both sides of the House will take this into consideration as debate continues on this report. I concur in the decision to take a hard long look at the land ownership question. I do not agree with the view that we should wait until there is a problem before moving on that problem. One woman, Mr. Speaker, during our public hearings put forward this viewpoint, that it will do little good to lock the door after all the chickens are out. I agree with that. However, at the same time I feel and am confident that we will all weigh the issues very carefully before proposing specific legislative changes.

Mr. Speaker, this issue represents but another indication that this New Democratic Government is concerned with the welfare of the farming industry in Saskatchewan. Since assuming office we have seen many bright indicators to back up this concern, the Land Bank, FarmStart, Hog Marketing Commission are only a few that come to mind. We have done much in the two short years since we assumed office and we have been rewarded for our efforts by viewing a favorable upswing in the agricultural economy. There is still, Mr. Speaker, a lot to be done, and I am confident that we will continue to bring in the types of programs and policies which will add to the economic and social well-being of our family farmers. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying I concur with the report. However, I urge all Members to carefully study the reservations that I have outlined to you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe: (Morse) — Mr. Speaker, much has been said this afternoon in terms of land ownership in this province and we have a report before us. I am going to keep my remarks rather brief this afternoon. Initially, I believe we had an excellent committee. I think it was a committee that worked very well together. I think that while during the summer most of us or practically all of us on one side or the other differed in philosophy and yet I feel that each one of us respected that difference and in spite of it, still worked very well together. I must, as well, congratulate all members of the committee and, of course, the staff. I must make one comment, though, that I am pleased that the motion which we are debating at this time is a motion that only says that this

report be 'received'. Because of that wording, of course, I can support the motion. Had the motion read that we adopt the report, there is no way that I could have voted in favor of that recommendation.

I must, of course, have some criticisms regarding the report and I believe they aren't that many. One criticism that I do have is that there wasn't enough opportunity provided to the people of this province to adequately discuss Bill No. 115. Of course, the Bill is dead, all of us realize this. But I must point out that the direction that we, as a committee was given by this Legislature, and I may just read part of it now:

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

Bill No. 115 not now be read a second time but that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to a special committee on the ownership of agricultural lands being comprised of . . .

And so on. Again, I go back — 'that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to a committee'. I don't feel that there was ample opportunity offered the committee or the general public for an opportunity to discuss the contents of that Bill. Nor is there any recommendation in this report or any comment in this report on what the attitude of the people were throughout the province in terms of Bill No. 115. Now possibly, and I'll admit this, that it was not necessary to discuss the contents of Bill 115 because each and every aspect in the contents of Bill No. 115 were rejected wholeheartedly by all people in this province and there was no doubt in our mind and there was no doubt in the minds of the Members opposite as to that rejection. People objected to friends and relatives being called foreigners, regardless of where they lived, whether it be in Saskatchewan, Manitoba or any other part of Canada or even the United States. I must comment as well on some of the remarks made this afternoon again from the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) and the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), "The Liberals are against co-ops. The Liberals hate co-ops. Liberals have an anti-co-op philosophy."

An Hon. Member: — It kept some of them in business.

Mr. Wiebe: — And here again, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but an NDP dream, nothing else but, Mr. Speaker. Time and time again, they have gotten up in this House and said that the Liberals are defenders of big business and they, the NDP, are the defenders of co-operatives and co-operative movements. And yet when in this House has any Member on this side of the House got up and spoken as viciously against co-ops as the Members opposite have got up and spoke viciously against corporations. When has that happened? In our seven years of Government when have we ever passed restrictive legislation against co-operatives in this province as the Members opposite have done in terms of corporations and big business in this province? I might point out as well that the co-op movement in this province started and was nurtured and grew under a Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — And I might point out as well that during that seven years the co-op movement increased and grew and developed even further during the period of seven years of Liberal administration. I might point out as well, Mr. Speaker, for the Members opposite, that the difference between co-operatives and the difference between corporations and the difference between community organizations, that there is no difference. The only difference is a form of organization where individuals, whether they decide to unite or get together under a co-operative way or under a corporation way or under a community development way, the basic idea is the same. The basic idea is people working together. But here again, the Members have decided to pass restrictive legislation affecting corporations and yet they fail to pass any legislation restricting co-ops and community development in terms of land ownership.

The problem with land in this province, Mr. Speaker, is not whether it's a corporation that owns it or whether it's a co-op that owns it or whether it's a community group that owns it, the problem with land ownership in this province is bigness. Bigness is a problem and you will have bigness with corporations, you'll have bigness with community organizations and you'll have bigness with co-ops. The influence that large corporations exert on the community is exactly the same as the influence that a large co-op would exert on that same community. And yet, the Members opposite for some reason appear to say that the small corporation is all right but the big corporation is bad, but they are saying that the big co-op is fine and the small co-op is fine. And if we are going to tackle the problem of land ownership and we're looking at it strictly from a land use or land bigness size, I think that both can be affected by it.

As well, I must comment about the chairman's remarks regarding Imperial Oil pulling out of the province and having no heart for the people of this province. He talked about Robin Hood Mills pulling out of the province and they had no heart for the people of this province. Why did they pull out? I'll tell you and it's exactly the same reason they pulled out as is the reason why the woollen mill pulled out that the NDP had, and they had no heart for the people. The shoe factory pulled out, they had no heart for the people. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) pulled out of Outlook, he had no heart for the people of this province. Why was it done? It wasn't a decision made in a big corporation or board room, Mr. Speaker. It was pure economics. And the Minister of Agriculture stood up in this House and said that's why he pulled out of Outlook. So here again, you are willing to chastise the large corporations when you, in turn, yourselves to exactly the same thing.

I must as well make some comment on the remark made by the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) in his terms of limiting the size of farms in this province. And he is quite correct when he says that from the questionnaires which we received from the people throughout this province that there was some indication that farm sizes should be limited in this province. But he stopped there, Mr. Speaker. He stopped there, he didn't continue on to say what the rest of the people said in terms of that limitation. I must point out that if the Government Members opposite are going to limit the farm size or the size of farm land in this province then they are going to have a tiger by the tail, because in each and every questionnaire that was returned to us, when asked what the suggested farm size should be, each and every individual said just a little bigger than I

have presently got. Just a little bit bigger than I have presently got and the answers were from individuals who had one section and individuals who had two sections and it was from individuals who had three sections. Each and every questionnaire that was returned to us said, yes, limit the farm size in this province but make sure that it's a little bit bigger than what I've got now. So that here again, limited of farm size is not going to solve the problems. You're going to have problems. What about the rancher, what about the grain grower, what about the mixed farmer? How are you going to work into a system that is going to limit the farm size and be equitable to all individuals concerned?

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some comments on why it was necessary to bring in Bill 115. What was the Government opposite looking at? Were they looking at political popularity that may be gained by hopefully knocking Americans or knocking big business or were they sincere in looking at the problems that land ownership does have in this province, or were they looking at the appearance that they may make to solving that problem? There is no doubt that we do have many problems in agriculture in this province. And I must point out that land ownership is just one of those problems. But why do we have that problem? Is it a problem because we have land hungry foreigners who are pouring over our borders to buy up our land? Or is it because we have land hungry corporations in their large board rooms who are infiltrating this province and buying up land? Or is it because we have land hungry individuals who are going out and buying up more land? Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this is not the problem. All three of these are not the problem. The major reason for the problem of land is economics. Unless we are willing to realize this and attack that problem from that aspect, all that we will do is create more and more small and uneconomic units.

We have to ask ourselves, why did that farmer sell to that big corporation, or why did he sell to that foreigner or why did he sell to the Hutterite Colony? Why did he do this? We must ask ourselves why our young men in this province are not flocking to the farms? Why are they not taking up agriculture? If farming, Mr. Speaker, was a feasible operation, if it was economically feasible for our young people to get into farming, if it was economically feasible for other people to stay in farming then we would have no problems with large corporations or Americans or the ability to keep the rural people in this province.

But what attitude have the NDP taken to this particular problem? How do they react to problems? I maintain that they react to these problems in a peculiar way. The NDP like to solve problems by putting on controls, regulations and restrictions as they have suggested in this committee and as was suggested in Bill No. 115. They are not willing to look at the real cause. The NDP I maintain cannot see the value of individual initiative and the value of individual freedom to solve these problems. The NDP are not willing to provide the young people and the farmers of this province with the tools to be able to go out and solve their own problems. Limiting the size of farms or ownership will not solve the problem and it will not put more young people on the farm. The problem I maintain can be solved by making it economically feasible for each and every individual to make a going concern on his land. And if the

May 1, 1973

youth of our province and the farmers in this province cannot see a future in agriculture, if they cannot see a good return on their investment and their effort, they will not go into agriculture nor will they remain very long in agriculture. I maintain that governments must not put in restrictions or controls. Governments must supply the tools and the opportunities that would make farming in this province a successful venture.

I should like as well to make a comment in regard to the Monfort operation that we visited in Colorado. I might just read from the reservations in which the three members on this side stated that the report is filled with prejudice. For example, the report speaks favorably of the Monfort operation in Colorado and the report states:

The committee found that the Monfort operation had conferred a number of benefits on the community and that the corporation has shown concern for the well-being of farmers and of the community.

But instead of favorable conclusions the prejudice of the Government committee members against corporations predominates as is shown by these words on page 18:

It cannot be assumed that future owners or managers will be so community-minded.

I should like to say, as a member of that committee, there was no evidence of this from any of the places that we saw or from any of the people that we visited. So how could we, as a committee, sit down and write into our report and make the assumption that it cannot be assumed that future owners or managers will be so community-minded?

I regret very much that this type of statement had to be included in this report. The report then went on to list the bad things that the company could do, not what the company did or what we saw that companies had done, we never saw any of this, but the report went on to list the bad things that companies could do and I think that if we are going to make a report to the Legislature we should make that report on what we actually saw and what we actually observed and not what we may think could possibly happen. I don't think that was our responsibility.

I should like to point out some of the comments that were made by Mr. Monfort when we visited him. Basically again, I want to say that the problems of economics is what has caused corporations and co-ops and community groups to be formed in this province. The fact that an individual farmer cannot make it on his own has been the reason why he has gone together with his neighbors to form a co-op, to form a community group or to form a corporation, and that is the reason why we have this type of a problem today. I might point out that the statement that was made by Mr. Monfort and it's a statement which I certainly endorse and agree with, that basically the individual operator is still preferable. Let me just read what he stated on page 18. I'll just go ahead and read this entire paragraph if the Members do not mind:

The second alternative to the large corporate feedlot was also suggested by Mr. Monfort who referred to the success enjoyed by a neighbor who fed 1,000 animals and farmed 160 acres with the help of a hired man. 'The one

thing that we agree with wholeheartedly is that he does a better job of feeding cattle than we do. We cannot compete with him.

Here again, I must emphasize, this is Mr. Monfort, the chairman of one of the largest feedlots, talking about an individual farmer with one hired man, and he says:

We cannot compete with him. We can compete with most of the small feeders that aren't as good as he is and the worry he has . . .

Here again, this is the point that I am trying to make, it is the Government's responsibility to the farmers in this province to provide the opportunity for them to be that expert in livestock operations, to be that expert in farming or to be that expert in any field. Also to provide the financial assistance for the young man or that individual to do it on his own. Not to put in restrictions to restrict someone or to hurt someone that has already done it through the means of a corporation, a co-op or a community group.

I might just point out that the last sentence in this paragraph: "Instead of one hired man he will have three or four and then he is going to have a different bookkeeping system and that sort of thing." This is referring to this young man growing larger, some of the problems which larger corporations and the larger co-ops have.

Here again, the last sentence: "But the small farmer feeder that is good can kick the heck out of us." This is a statement that was made by Mr. Monfort, it is recorded in this report and I might point out again this is an individual who owns one of the largest feedlots in the Middle West. He is referring to a single individual who is farming on his own. And again I would like to repeat what Mr. Monfort said: "But the small farmer feeder that is good can kick the heck out of us." So here again, I believe, that is the answer to our problems in Saskatchewan. It is our answer to our problems in agriculture. And it is the responsibility of governments not to put in restrictions, not to put in regulations but to provide the opportunities for the individual to solve the problems which he has in front of him. And the individual can solve that problem much better than legislation can.

If you look at the famous people throughout this world. You look at the famous people who have come out of this Legislature, they have been individuals. And the individual can do it much better than restrictions by government or by regulation.

If governments are prepared to provide those initiatives, if they are prepared to provide the education the young men need in this province then we are going to solve the problems of big corporations, of big business, and Americans coming in and purchasing our land.

There are some comments as well made this morning regarding the decline of rural population in this province. The decline of our rural communities. We all agree with this, this is quite evident. Comments though have been made that we must put more young farmers back on the land to stabilize the population in our communities; to stabilize or increase the growth of our communities and the businesses that these communities provide.

May 1, 1973

I should just like to point out one problem that this creates. Let's go back 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago a particular community with 150 farmers in that district could have supported two grocery stores, two garages, two machine shops and so on. Today, of course, that population has declined and so have the businesses in that small town. But if we wished to keep two grocery stores and two garages and two machine shops in that same town, putting 150 farmers back into that community is not going to do it. What you are going to require is about 450 farmers back in that area and in that district to maintain the town that we had 15 years ago. The reason for that is that the cost of wages has gone up; the cost of goods has gone up; the cost of taxes has gone up. The amount of farmers required to keep our small communities viable is going to be three times as great as what it was 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I said that my remarks were going to be brief and with those few words I will say that I will support the motion which we have before us, basically because it says that the report of the committee be received.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens: (Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to say a few words in support of this report on the Foreign and Corporate Ownership of Farm Land in Saskatchewan.

It was my privilege to be a member of the committee. Besides being a very educational experience it was also a wonderful social experience. The rapport of the members was excellent with many hours of off-duty fellowship. But this had to take a secondary position to the reception the committee received from the people of Saskatchewan who attended the hearings at the centres we visited.

The tour of the northern United States would have to be classed as a highlight in the busy schedule. At every call, we ordinary MLAs were treated in senatorial style. Genuine Yankee hospitality, second only to our own Canadian brand.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a comment or two on what the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) said and one of his statements was that the Liberals were not against co-ops. I am glad to hear that. But I cannot recall at any time that they ever gave co-ops a break in taxation whether it was in Saskatchewan or federally. So I can't see where they are supporting the co-ops that greatly.

One other comment he made, at least I hope I understood him correctly, when he said — at least I was glad to hear he was supporting our FarmStart program to help our young farmers get started to become independent operators. I am very pleased to know that the Member for Morse is going to assist us in helping our young farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment our Chairman for his handling of sometimes a very difficult assignment. His expertise as a chairman and his ability to communicate with all types of people in every conceivable situation fitted him admirably for this task. I consider it a genuine privilege to have learned from his leadership. I hope the Member for Melville, John Kowalchuk, will consider this document, that is this report,

as a memorial to the energy and enthusiasm he put into it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Mr. Speaker, the results of any committee of this nature can usually be measured by the efficiency of its ancillary personnel. If this is a correct yardstick, Mr. Speaker, then this report must surely be outstanding. Our Chairman commented during his remarks of their excellent performance and co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, this report is not an impressive appearing document. However, the important information compiled into it was sifted from a voluminous pile of material. Written and rewritten, edited and re-edited until every word retained is very precious. The report is well written and deserves the time and effort of every Member of this Legislature to read it carefully.

Problems and concerns for the ownership and use of farm land is widespread. Practically every province in Canada and many of the states in the United States are contemplating some type of legislation to protect this most basic natural resource.

Unlike some resources, farm land cannot be greatly expanded. We have what we have. Therefore, it is imperative that governments take immediate action to protect its exploitation and oversee the future use of this valuable asset. It is my hope that the report will not only be a valuable source of information for this Assembly but will also serve as a resource paper for other groups or committees delegated to investigate use and control of land for any purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the committee was directed to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of agricultural land by non-residents, foreign and corporate persons. This term of reference proved to be a bit restrictive. On many occasions our chairman allowed the discussion to widen considerably. The committee members accepted the relaxation with pleasure and the communication between the audience and ourselves was enhanced by this action. And furthermore, I believe as a result the report is more comprehensive as the result of easier and free flow of conversation.

Some criticism may be pointed at the committee for making the tour into the northern USA for a week. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I feel the report has been added to by the impressions and information that was gained from sources outside the confines of our own province. We learned first hand the results of the banning of corporation farms in North Dakota. We learned of the many and varied ways of farm assistance programs in several states. We saw integration in the production and processing of livestock. We learned of and saw the results of corporate farming. We learned something about irrigation farming. I could go on and mention many others.

But we learned from almost everyone we met, individually or in groups, one of their major concerns was the ownership and use of agricultural lands. It was quite apparent the problems related to agriculture are very similar in those areas of the US where we visited as they are here. The Legislature of Saskatchewan was highly commended for taking the initiative to study some of the problems.

May 1, 1973

Returning to our own province, the various chapters of the report indicate the feelings of the people who took time to attend the meetings held at the several centres. I leave you to draw your own conclusions, but mine are that Saskatchewan residents are very concerned about the future of the farming industry in Saskatchewan with the full realization that farming is still our basic industry, and upon the farm economy rests the economy of all Saskatchewan.

The farm land must be utilized to the best advantage whether it be for straight grain farming, mixed farming, livestock production or a combination of all. This utilization must have the companion concern of farm population. A concerted effort to increase the number of viable farm units should be the main thrust of the Government policy makers. Somehow, some way must be found to make farming a secure and stable occupation for the many young people who desire to make farming a life long occupation. And of course the availability of farm land is possibly the most important factor.

Mr. Speaker, to aid in future decisions of government policy regarding the ownership of farm land in Saskatchewan, the committee has proposed a number of recommendations for action. Hopefully these recommendations will be useful and will be the base for legislation if and when the government decides the time for action has arrived. Much time and thought were put into the writing of these recommendations and they deserve serious consideration.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have added reservations for two of the recommendations, with the others I am in agreement. For Recommendations Nos. 3 and 5, I have written a reservation. These recommendations affect present owners of farm land who in many, and in fact most cases, acquired the land a number of years ago in good faith and in conformity with the laws and regulations of Saskatchewan at that time. These recommendations would require these land holders to dispose of the land in a stated period of time, namely 20 years, in one class and in the other class end actual farming operations in five years. In both instances these recommendations have in a sense retroactive effects. I feel retroactive legislation is not good policy and further, other recommendations prohibit any further acquisition of land by these corporations. The result will be the eventual transfer of the land now held out of the control of corporation ownership. This transition may take a number of years. However, the acreages owned and controlled by these corporations is not a large percentage in Saskatchewan and does not have much effect on the total farming scene.

Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to make a few comments on the reservations submitted and attached to the report by the three members sitting in Opposition.

The first statement they make, Mr. Speaker, indicates to any one with a fair and open mind, who reads the report, that right here begins the biased political accusations of an otherwise honest and comprehensive report of the committee. It is not my intention, nor is it my make-up, to berate a member for his genuine belief. But, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case I wish to say in the strongest language acceptable to this Assembly that these gentlemen have made an accusation that is totally and completely untrue. Their reservation No. 1, first sentence reads, and I shall read it to you directly from the report:

The report of the majority members of the committee is and was intended to be a rubber stamp of policies of the Government.

Under no circumstances, Mr. Speaker, will I accept the accusation of being a party to a preconceived report or of being a rubber stamp for government policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — If ever the principles of the New Democratic Party stoop to this type of ‘gutter politics’, then, Mr. Speaker, I will not, and I repeat, I will not, be a member of the Party and I feel confident the other NDP members of this committee are of the same opinion.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to say so, but I feel the remarks made in this section spoil an otherwise very acceptable report. The smearing tactics used are not what the people of Saskatchewan expect from their elected representatives who are willing to accept appointments to a legislative committee, Mr. Speaker. These accusations and remarks are now a part of history of this Legislature, being included as an appendix to the report. Many readers of the report assess it in the context of the positive direction the people of Saskatchewan wish to move.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I support the receiving of the report of the committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.W. Carlson: (Yorkton) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter this debate in support of the Motion to receive the report of the Ownership of Agricultural Land in Saskatchewan.

I think this is a very important matter, one that has been dealt with by the committee. I must admit that our findings did not indicate that we are in a crisis position at this time. But I think it is to the credit of this Government that we tackled the problem before we are into a crisis.

I believe that it is an indication of foresight that we are studying this problem. We are making recommendations to the Legislature so that legislation can be prepared and brought into the House before we are in a position where it would be much more difficult to deal with.

Other provinces in Canada, states in the union to the south and other countries are grappling with similar problems, some of them much more severe than we are here in Saskatchewan. I believe we made a thorough study of the problem. We looked at all sides, we listened to all people who made representation to the committee. And I believe we had a good cross-section of public opinion. I believe that the recommendations that we have made are realistic recommendations.

During our initial meetings here in Saskatchewan some people indicated that we were anti-American. Let me repeat what the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) had to say. When we had made our tour to the United States and met with various groups, Farmers’ Union, business people, at each and every

May 1, 1973

meeting I posed the question; if we in Saskatchewan introduced legislation restricting foreign ownership would you consider us anti-American? The answers varied, but basically they were, no, we would not consider it anti-American, we would consider it would be in your own interest to protect your own resources.

Basically what we are saying in the report is, let's stop the foreign and corporate ownership situation where it is today. If we stop it where it is and not let it get any worse, we will not be faced with a crisis in the future. There is one exception and that exception of course, is the corporations. The only reason there is an exception there is because corporations never die.

I think we were being more than generous to allow 20 years for corporations to dispose of their holdings. This will not force all the land on the market at one specific time. People owning the land will be able to make up their minds when they want to sell within that 20-year period. Individuals may continue to own land and sell it at any time to somebody who qualifies as a Canadian resident.

I should like to comment on some of the remarks made by the Members opposite. The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) made the allegation that we only visited or talked to groups or individuals who supported the Government's point of view. I deny that statement. I don't know how he can make a statement like that when we had meetings advertised throughout all of Saskatchewan that anybody could attend and anybody who did attend will, I am sure, have to admit that anybody who was there had his chance to speak whether he had a formal presentation or not. He also referred to North Dakota's legislation which is basically anti-corporate legislation; he said they do not have legislation against foreign ownership. I agree, but we are not pretending that the North Dakota situation applies to Saskatchewan. We went down to study it and I do not apologize for that, I think it was a good decision to go and visit with the people in North Dakota and see what their legislation did say and see what the effects have been. He also referred to the situation around the town of Mott which was severely affected by the large holdings of individual farmers. The Member opposite said today and they agreed in committee that the situation at Mott was not a desirable one, that large farms whether they are private or corporate farms, or co-operative farms are not desirable for the community. Yet, in their reservations on page 47, 13(a), they say they oppose the majority recommendations because, it says, "That farms be restricted in size." We only recommended that farm size be studied. We made no recommendation that they be restricted.

The Members opposite in this Session have supported the FarmStart Bill. Let me say that the FarmStart Bill discriminates against large farm operators, as does the Land Bank, as does the Federal Small Farms Development Program.

The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says that the problem is bigness, whether it is private or corporate. Let me say that I am not one that suggests that we need to legislate farm size. But I do think programs designed as we said in our election program to keep the largest number possible of family farms on the land is one of the goals of this Government. I think that is a good goal, a desirable one and one that we are grappling with and I predict we will be successful.

The Member for Morse said that the people of Saskatchewan did not have enough time to study and discuss Bill 115. Yet the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said we had far too many meetings, shouldn't have had 13 meetings, eight would have been sufficient.

Going back to the comments of the Member for Albert Park, he said, he was referring to criteria to define a bona fide farmer. I don't know if he meant what he said, but he left the implication that we would be putting restrictions on who could farm land. Let me remind the Members opposite that the only time we considered defining a bona fide farmer was when we were talking about members who would be eligible to join the community group organizations. I want to make that point clear because I think that could very well be misrepresented and indicate that we were planning on restricting who could own land in Saskatchewan.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe the study was well worthwhile. We must be prepared to deal with problems before they become so overwhelming that we cannot deal with them. I must say I enjoyed working on the committee, including working with the Members opposite. I should like to say that dealing with others on the committee was a far cry from dealing with the Members opposite in the Legislature and I wish they would remember the way they acted last summer and bring some of their manners into the Legislature here.

I should like to compliment the Chairman for his unbiased way that he handled the meetings, I think he handled them very capably. I should like to thank the Members of the staff who did a tremendous job in supporting the committee right from the very beginning. Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a pleasure to support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.R. Messer: (Minister of Agriculture) — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief remarks in regard to the Final Report on the Ownership of Saskatchewan Farms. I think it was with the introduction of the legislation, Bill 115 becoming a White Paper intending to structure a committee to investigate the problems of land tenure and transfer in Saskatchewan, moved by myself, that in fact instigated the committee. In fact if we were to go to page 5 of the committee's report it has some quotes on the second reading speech that I made in regard to that particular piece of legislation, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to appoint a select committee to consider the questions of foreign ownership and corporate ownership of agricultural land in Saskatchewan.

The committee has taken into consideration those two problems plus some other problems that are now facing or will be facing Saskatchewan farmers in the future.

I do want, Mr. Speaker, especially to recognize the Members of the committee and the work that they contributed to this report, especially the Chairman from the constituency of Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk). It was certainly a time consuming task,

May 1, 1973

it was I think, a difficult task. There were certainly no simple, nor were there any ready answers to the problems that they were investigating. They certainly carried out a number of discussions with farmers, they did not restrict those discussions only to farms or farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan, but went afield to discuss with other farmers the problems that may or may not have been similar to ones that they were investigating that obviously gave them a broader perspective of what it was they had to contend with and what it was they had to make recommendations in regard to. By the report it is obvious that the committee tried to discuss with all levels of farmers and all types of farmers, the problems they were investigating. Their discussions and their visits with co-operative farms I believe would lead one to assume they were concerned about the merits of co-operative farms and the problems that co-operative farms have encountered especially in the Province of Saskatchewan over the developing years.

I am happy to hear some of the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, make some remarks in regard to the support of the co-operative movement in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am glad to hear that they now support the co-operative movement, they were certainly negligent in giving that kind of support to it in their seven years in power.

The committee though did not restrict itself to simply interviews and discussions with co-op farms, they interviewed and looked into the Hutterite Colonies in the Province of Saskatchewan, community farms and the merits of community farms, corporate farming in Saskatchewan and in other parts of North America. I think they recognized the problems of commercial corporations and the effect that they are now having on Saskatchewan agriculture and the effect that they will have on Saskatchewan agriculture in the future if they continue to grow without some actions being taken to protect the family farmer who is now established in this province.

They express, however, Mr. Speaker, the merits of incorporating, the merits of corporations, especially family farm corporations which I think all Members will agree facilitate the transfer of land. They provide more flexibility in regard to business management of farming enterprises and the committee ultimately made a recommendation. I believe it was the first recommendation in the report that the Legislature enact special legislation, The Family Farm and Community Group Agricultural and Corporation Act. I think it is a very worthwhile recommendation. I can assure the Members of this Legislature that the Government will be giving it serious consideration for a forthcoming session.

From all of this, Mr. Speaker, from the observations and the impressions of Saskatchewan farms and farmers, from the studies of the committee, the public hearings and from the questionnaires that were sent out, from the surveys and from I think legislation and action in other parts of North America, we have the recommendations, the 12 recommendations that the committee has brought forward. Ranging from the first recommendation that I have just made mention of, Mr. Speaker, to other recommendations such as the 10th recommendation that a central registry be maintained showing the ownership and operator of agricultural land and recreational land.

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

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30 I was just about to close my remarks in regard to this matter of debate.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that this was in fact a most appropriate time for a committee to be investigating the problems of land transfer and tenure in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think it is fair to say that all provinces in Canada are now concerned about the transfer and the ownership of land in their respective provinces. In fact a number of those provinces have been concerned enough about land ownership, land use and the transfer of the land in their provinces that they have instituted some action. Some have passed specific resolutions to correct the problems that they are encountering. Certainly a province or two in the Maritimes have taken that kind of action; Ontario to some extent has legislation in regard to that problem; Alberta and British Columbia also have. I think it is time that Saskatchewan has the opportunity to be able to recognize its problems and have some concise and precise information in regard to those problems so that it can contemplate and draft legislation to correct the difficulties that it may be confronted with both now and in the future.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think out of all the provinces in Canada, Saskatchewan should perhaps be most concerned about its land and the ownership and transfer of that land. We certainly have the largest farming area of any province in Canada, it has tremendous productive potential and when we recognize that we have to maintain the farming industry in our province it is I think a duty of the Government to recognize these problems. I think to some extent, this Government has in its 20 some months of power recognized those problems and recognized the fact that farming does in fact have to be the backbone of the economy in Saskatchewan.

We have introduced programs to try and fortify that economy with programs such as the FarmStart, Land Bank program, a priority in the area of marketing and the decentralization of the Department of Agriculture to provide better services to farmers. But I think we realize that none of these programs nor any other programs that a government can introduce will really solve the problem, unless there is some true and positive action taken in regard to the land tenure and the transfer problems that are confronting us and will magnify themselves in the future.

The preservation of the family farm I think must be ensured and must be ensured in the not too distant future. Not simply for the sake of fortifying a family farm system in the Province of Saskatchewan, but to firmly implant in our province that type of farm as the basic industry of this province. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chairman, the Member from Melville and the members of that committee, especially the Government Members have done a creditable job in formulating and gathering together the evidence and the recommendation that it takes for a government to act in regard to drafting legislation that will give this kind of assurance and protection to farmers in Saskatchewan.

Having said those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I have 15

May 1, 1973

pages of notes here for rebuttal. I know that it is a rare opportunity having been given the last chance in this debate. As the mover of the motion, I received the first chance to open debate, then as the last person to close it. I am not going to take up the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, to discuss or even go through what I intended to say in rebuttal.

I want to make a number of comments in regard to some of the statements that were made by previous speakers. The Member for Morse indicated, and I quote, "Not enough time was given to discuss Bill 115 by us or by the people of Saskatchewan." You know, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate that remark because for the first few days in committee the Opposition members took extreme steps to try to resurrect Bill 115, that derelict, that corpse. They did everything possible to bring it to life. May I say that is one of the reasons why for a few days we had difficulty and we had a lawyer to assist us in convincing the Opposition that in fact Bill 115 was dead and done with. That, of course, does not say that I agree with the Member for Morse when he says that more discussion should have been given, not to the Bill though, but to the matters pertaining to the Bill. That's where we differed, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to talk about the Bill because it made good political hay to talk about it. We knew that wasn't the necessity, nor was it within our terms of reference to talk about the Bill, but about all matters relating to the Bill. All matters related to foreign and corporate ownership were very acceptable and I remember repeating many times that all matters connected in any way to land tenure, I as a chairman, accepted discussion on it, but not on Bill 115 itself.

There was another matter that the Member for Morse brought up, where he made quite a speech about 'individual freedom' and the individual's rights. I have it here where he ended up by saying that, "Government must supply the tools to make farming ventures successful." After having said all those things about the freedom of the individual he then said, "Government must supply the tools." That is exactly what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. The Government must indeed supply the tools and some of the tools that we are going to supply are contained within these recommendations. I am sure that the Government is going to come back in the near future and bring in legislation that will deal with land tenure.

Another thing I can never get over is the fact that Opposition Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, continuously champion the big boys, the corporations. The comment in the report on page 28 by the Opposition, "The corporation structure is really only a form of organization and therefore corporations are hardly a threat." That they are only a form of organization and hardly a threat, is a senile argument, Mr. Speaker. If carried to further analysis, what they are saying is that if it is only an organization it can't be harmful. The committee in stating that the corporation structure is really only a form of organization, is merely a term of definition and nothing else. The Liberals in saying that corporations are no threat because they are only a form of organization is just unacceptable to me, Mr. Speaker. To them some corporations as corporations are no threat but at the same time they say you've got to be careful of 'some' forms of corporations. Community farms, they go along with, yet they say you've got to be careful of some others. Now if you carry it a little farther about the application of the term organization, you could say that the Marathon Realty Company is also an organization. Yet I think it is a threat to

that kind of life, the rural community and the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am not going to say any more. However, I agree other factors affect farm stability. We certainly need a farm stabilization program but this in itself is not going to help us save the family farm, nor the rural community. We need a stabilization Bill to guarantee an income for the farmer, we need price controls and regulations and if inflation isn't stopped, even stabilization won't help. We need orderly marketing of our products, we need a fair and equitable freight rate structure for the West, we need rationalization in the agricultural industry, rationalization of policies that help build up the community and the rural community, not just destroy it. Mr. Speaker, we also need the implementation of most of the recommendations that we in the committee recommended re land tenure in Saskatchewan. My sincere hope is that we continue to study the other very important problems of agriculture but that we proceed in the very near future to implement legislation regarding land tenure in Saskatchewan.

We have heard from the free enterprise people before, Mr. Speaker, including Liberals, even those here today who are more inclined to socialistic programs only because if they weren't they would never be re-elected. "You can't interfere with that man-given right of personal exploitation." This is what they say, even if it means the loss of rural communities and the loss of small towns and villages that means the dispersal of farm people into city ghettos. Going back in history, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of years, back to the days of the big landlords because eventually if this form of annexation of land continues — corporate bigness — then that's where we will find ourselves, back in the days of lord and vassal.

We have in Saskatchewan a problem of land tenure. The committee, Mr. Speaker, has brought in some excellent recommendations. My sincere hope is that most of the recommendations will be implemented in the interest of the preservation of family farms and the rural communities in the not too distant future. And with these last remarks I want to say in full confidence that I sincerely support the report and the recommendations contained therein.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

Second Readings

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 110 — An Act to amend The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act, 1972.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act, 1972, was passed at the last session of this Assembly and came into force on the day of assent, April 21st, 1972. The necessary documentation as to the 1971 population was received sometime in June, 1972 and the Commission was appointed on July 18th, 1972. As all Members know the Commission consists of the Hon. Mr. Justice McGuire, judge of the Court of Appeal, as chairman, Mr. John Archer, Mr. Gordon Barnhart, Clerk of this Assembly and its interim report is expected very shortly.

May 1, 1973

Under Section 4 of the Act, the Commission should have had its interim report prepared by about March 31, 1973, that being nine months from the date on which the official information as to the 1971 census was received by the Clerk of the Executive Council. Section 4 of the Act is to be repealed and a new Section 4(1) is to be substituted in the light of the circumstances.

In Section 4(a) and 4(b) of the Act, the language used is that:

The Commission shall be established within 30 days after the Clerk of the Executive Council obtains a copy of the census population return.

The use of the word 'return' appears to be incorrect. The Statistics Act of Canada uses the words "compilation of the count of population.". These words will be substituted in the place of the word 'return' where they appear in those clauses, clauses 4(a) and 4(b) of Section 4.

Further experience has shown that the 30-day period from the date that the Clerk of the Executive Council receives the so-called compilation aforementioned when the Commission must be appointed, may be too short. It is therefore proposed to further amend Section 4 by adding a new subsection 2 under which the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will have the power to extend the 30-day period mentioned by a further period not exceeding 30 days.

After Section 4(a) and 4(b) are amendments deleting the word 'return' therein and substitution of the words, 'compilation of the count', as already mentioned, then consequentially the language must be substituted in Section 12. Further, Section 12 refers to census taken under Sections 16 and 17 of The Statistics Act of Canada. These two sections have been replaced by Section 18 of The Statistics Act of Canada. The whole Section 12 will therefore be repealed and a new Section 12 will be substituted to incorporate the amendments i.e. the amendments in terms of reference to sections which I have already talked about.

Then Section 13, subsection 1, also makes reference to the word 'return' under Section 12. This subsection will also be amended by deleting the word 'return' and substituting the words 'compilation of the count of population', so that it will be consistent with the amended Section 12.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Section 20, subsection 1, provides that the Commission shall complete its interim report not later than nine months after the Clerk of the Executive Council receives the census return from Ottawa; and Section 21 provides that the Commission shall make its final report within one year after the date of the Clerk of the Executive Council receives the return from Ottawa. It is proposed to amend Section 20, subsection 1 and Section 21 to provide that the Commission shall complete its interim report within nine months after it is appointed and to complete its final report within one year after it is appointed and further to grant power to the Cabinet to extend the period of nine months and one year, respectively, for a period not exceeding four months each. Section 20, subsection 1 of the Act will therefore be repealed and a new subsection is included in the Bill to incorporate the

amendment that I have just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, further my attention has been drawn to Section 21 of the printed Bill and the fact that under it as it is presently printed, the final report of the Commission could be delayed for a period considerably longer than the date of the year the Commission was appointed plus the additional time extended under Section 20, subsection 1. As all Members will know from last year this is clearly not the intention. Therefore a House amendment will be introduced to Section 21. Under this House amendment the Commission will still be required to submit its final report within one year from the date of its appointment but if for any reason that may not be possible then the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order an extension of time for the final completion not exceeding four months after the expiration of the one year period. A further provision for an additional four months extension is also provided. In result, Mr. Speaker, assuming that all extensions of time are granted as provided under Section 20, subsection 1 and Section 21, the total extensions from the date of the appointment of the Commission may not exceed 19 months. Basically we have to do this because we got off the mark a little late because we got the Federal census late.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that I have been informed by the officials of the Boundaries Commission that it has not been able to complete its interim report within the ninth months from the date of the Clerk of the Executive Council received the official documents as to census population from Ottawa, or within the period of nine months from July 18, 1972. The time will have to be extended as soon as this Bill has been passed, in all likelihood. It may also be necessary, although I hope not, to extend the time for the completion and filing of the final report of the Commission. The Bill, if approved, will be retroactive to 21st of April, 1972, the date the Bill received Royal assent last year so that the amendments of the Bill will take effect as of that date.

Mr. Speaker, these are purely routine amendments which bring into effect the fact that the Commission has started late and it gives me a great deal of pleasure, therefore, to move second reading of Bill 110.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I don't like to see this Bill passed we should like to have the Leader of the Opposition have the opportunity to make an observation if he so desires. I am sure he will only be a minute or two. There is only one basic principle involved in this Bill as I see it and I should like to urge the Premier and the Attorney General in discussing this problem with the Boundaries Commission — I put in an Order for Return at the beginning of the Session asking for the number of meetings that the Boundaries Commission had held — in almost a year or ten months, eight months, they had only five meetings. This Bill would make it possible for within 15 or 16 months prior to the next election if it was on the normal four-year period, to have the final report received. Then in all probability it would have to be debated in the House. The Bill would have to receive final approval from the House. It might well, in fact, be within a very short time before the next election if there is any delay in the passage of this Bill.

May 1, 1973

I am sure that Members on both sides of the House recognize the tremendous job of re-organization and the necessity of every constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan having its boundaries changed. I do appreciate the need and the problem of extensions if this can't be done. I would suggest that the Premier and the Attorney General, whoever is responsible for this, contact the chairman of this Commission and urge him with all speed to get the final report in to get this conclusively passed in the House. It has real practical problems for every Member of the Legislature and I think it would affect very seriously the democratic process in the next coming provincial election unless the final report is received with the utmost speed and put through this House with the utmost speed. Certainly that is not the intention of the Boundaries Commission, it is not the intention of the Members of this House.

That's the only comment I am going to make. I beg leave to adjourn the debate, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition's remarks will be very brief.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 128 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act, 1972 (No. 2).**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill 128 is an Act to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission Act. As Members know, the present Human Rights Commission Act limits the number of members of the Commission to five. It further provides that a decision of the majority of the Commission shall be the decision of the Commission. There is some legal doubt that the Act presently, sorry there is absolutely no doubt about it, the Act would not bind the Crown as it is presently worded. The restriction of the number of members of the Commission is being removed under this amendment so that additional representation on the Commission can be made to represent various interests and groups of persons not presently represented on the Commission. This is accomplished by proposed amendments to Section 3 of the Act.

Provision is being made for a quorum because it is considered that the present provision which enables a decision of the majority of the Commission to be the decision of the Commission, may be somewhat impractical as it may be difficult to have a majority in the Commission present at all meetings or hearings. Provision is also being made to have the Crown, as I have mentioned, bound by the Act because it is believed desirable that the Crown should not be exempt from Human Rights legislation.

The amendment to Section 3 simply removes the maximum number of members which may be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The amendment to Section 10 removes the provisions whereby the majority of the Commission is required to be present before a decision is made. A new Section 10(a) is being added to make provision for a quorum and it also provides that a decision of the majority of the members of the Commission present and constituting a quorum shall be the decision of the Commission. If the votes are equal, the chairman or in his/her absence the vice chairman has a casting vote. The Bill also makes provision to ensure that the Crown and its servants are bound by the Act.

Those are the three provisions of the Bill; one, to allow us the possibility of increasing the representation; two, to bind the Crown; three, to change the majority of decision provisions to allow the chairman to have a casting vote, the majority to be present who are constituting a quorum to be a decision of the Commission.

With those few brief words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition cannot support this legislation, for two reasons. One, that we have not yet had a commitment out of the Government that political appointments to the Human Rights Commission would be ended as we wish to see in the legislation that we have proposed which is still before the Legislature. We have no commitment from the Government that the Human Rights Commission . . .

Mr. Romanow: — You're not going to have one.

Mr. Lane: — No, he says we won't have one. That's precisely the attitude that is getting this Government in trouble. They make political appointments to the Human Rights Commission, the one body that shouldn't have political appointments, Mr. Speaker, and then hold this up as the body that is going to protect the human rights and the civil liberties of individuals in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Attorney General has got up and defended the activities of Judge Taylor, and I make no apologies for criticizing the activities of the Judge. If she is going to use the title of Judge, and speaking at NDP meetings around the province, she shouldn't use that title, and she is going outside of her capacity as Judge in speaking for the Human Rights Commission. We then have a well-known political appointment to the Human Rights Commission that is the full time secretary, or whatever position running that, from the Government of Manitoba that the Government opposite brought in. Now make no mistake, we will not be a party to the attempts of the Attorney General to open the Human Rights Commission up to an unlimited number of party politicians whom he intends to appoint. He takes the lid off on this particular Bill and he wants to have an unlimited number on the Human Rights Commission. We will not be a party to those activities. We have given the Government opposite the opportunity to take the political stigma away from the Human Rights Commission and they have stalled and deliberately held up that opportunity. We can't accept any reason for that other than the fact that the Government does not want to take politics out of the Human Rights Commission, and for that reason we oppose this legislation. As I say we will not be a party to the efforts of the Government to open up and give itself an unlimited number, the opportunity to have an unlimited number of political appointments and allow political activity in the Human Rights Commission. If there is one organization that should not be tainted in any way, shape or form, of political partisanship and political activity, it's the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Romanow: — What about John Turner?

May 1, 1973

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — I would hope that the Government opposite would see fit to stand this legislation . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) will have an opportunity to close this debate and I wish he would remain quiet while the debate is going on.

Mr. Lane: — I think the House, the Press and the public all know how the Attorney General stands on the rules and I don't think further comment on that is necessary. Make no mistake. I'm surprised that the Government opposite would even allow the slightest taint of political partisanship to enter into the Human Rights Commission. As I say, we cannot support legislation that will make it possible for the Attorney General or the Government of Saskatchewan to have in effect an unlimited number of political appointments in the Human Rights Commission. If the Government opposite had taken our Bill that we have proposed and committed this Government to a non-partisan Human Rights Commission then we could certainly support this legislation. Without that commitment and the Attorney General has said we will not get the commitment from that Government, we certainly will not support this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, some of these Bills tend to generate a fair amount of heat and for good reason sometimes. The name of Mrs. Tillie Taylor keeps cropping up. I observed in one of the latest issues of the Gazette that I received that Mrs. Taylor had received another appointment by this Government, I believe, to the Medical Care Insurance Commission. It does cause us more than a little concern that the Government should be putting Mrs. Taylor in this kind of an awkward spot. Consequently, unless I am mistaken, she is now carrying the title Judge Taylor because she is, in fact, a judge and she carries a position with the Human Rights Commission and the Medical Care Insurance Commission and we wonder if the Government does not thereby embarrass one of our judges.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't see the name of Judge Taylor mentioned in this Bill and we're not dealing with judges, we're dealing with the amendments and I wish we would stay with this Bill.

Mr. MacLeod: — I may conclude the remarks very quickly because I think the makeup of the Commission is of some consequence and we are talking about the membership of the Commission, we are talking about the numbers of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker: — But not the names, whether it's a judge or anyone else. Don't mention that, that's incidental.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I don't wish to debate this point with you but when we start talking about

the membership of a commission or a body or an authority or an agency in this Government without talking about the qualities, the composition, the background, the jurisdiction and so forth of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't make any sense and I would ask you to reconsider that decision.

Mr. Speaker: — As I see it, this Bill is to change the number of five and there can't be more than five. To the best of my knowledge Judge Taylor is already a member of the Commission and this Bill neither seeks to take that away from her or to reinstate her. And therefore it's just a matter of additional numbers we are debating and not the chairman of the present Commission.

Mr. Lane: — Speaking to the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, we are merely trying to show that based on the existing numbers where are reasons why we cannot support the extension and surely our analogy or our comparison is knowledge in order to argue against further extension.

Mr. Speaker: — Whether it should be three, five or ten, that is within order, but to mention names as to whether this one is qualified or that one is qualified or the present chairman is not in order.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly respect your ruling on this despite the fact that I do think it's clearly far too restrictive and I cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, that it's fair, but you've made your ruling and . . .

An Hon. Member: — Challenge it.

Mr. MacLeod: — No, a challenge to the Speaker isn't really a challenge to the Speaker at all, it's simply a question of how many votes are in one hand as compared to votes in another hand. It isn't a question of a judgement weighed and appealed to an impartial court at all. A challenge of a Speaker's ruling is a challenge that goes back to a very partisan crowd and therefore there is no fair challenge to the Speaker's ruling. So I'm not going to do that. Mr. Speaker, because of the limitations on the argument, I have no further desire to quarrel with this. We are concerned with the makeup, we feel that we have the right to discuss it but I have nothing further to say about this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, we've been through this argument once before. I'm very sorry to see the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) vacate his seat at this particular time. I am very much disappointed about this because he was the one who raised the arguments about the political appointments that are involved with respect to human rights. He was the one who pontificated to this Legislature a minute or so ago about the fact that there has to be an impartial body of people investigating human rights. He was the one together with all the Liberals who chastised this Government for the implementation and for the appointment to

May 1, 1973

and the composition of the Human Rights Commission. I want to remind the Member from Lumsden, who has just come back to his chair. I want to remind all the Liberals that this is very much better, this Bill, than anything the Liberals ever conceived. Because I want to tell you that under the Liberal administration whenever they had a Human Rights Commission complaint, who did the investigation? Who do you think did the investigation? Some non-partisan person by the name of Gary Lane who was executive assistant to the Liberal Minister. I want to tell you that when the Liberal administration . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I would suggest to Mr. Speaker that the remarks of the Hon. the Attorney General are out of order. If he is replying to specific matters raised by my learned friend which I was expanding on, if I was out of order, and the Hon. the Attorney General ought not to be dealing with the thing in this way. I think his remarks are out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — On that Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that just two second ago you said that we could talk about three or five or seven.

Mr. Messer: — The Attorney General was only answering the questions that the Member from Lumsden left unanswered in the innuendo that he made in the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling was that the name of Tillie Taylor or Judge Taylor is not mentioned in this Bill and therefore it was out of order. The Attorney General has not mentioned any names. He has not mentioned any names in the Commission at all. He is answering the questions of the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). If the Attorney General starts referring to the present names of the present Commission then he will be out of order.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to proceed to tell the Members of this House that the Liberal Members opposite when they attack the present composition of this Commission they are really once again expressing their disdain and their opposition for human rights legislation in this province. Or once again, like the Member for Lumsden when he was executive assistant for the Liberal Attorney General; when the Member from Lumsden was writing all the poison pen speeches for the Attorney General opposing the War Measures Act, yes he was indeed; when the Member for Lumsden was then the Human Rights Commissioner; when doing all of the political investigation of the Government opposite, that's who we're talking about in this House and make no mistake about it. When, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Lumsden talks about impartiality, he would have us refer to the impartiality he dispensed when he was executive assistant. He would have us refer back to the impartiality when the then Attorney General, Mr. Darryl Heald and the Member for Lumsden went around placing the iron chains on working men and women through Bill 2 in this province. That's what he would do. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Saskatchewan has rejected the Member from Lumsden.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to remind you that if you want this side of the House to co-operate, you know and I know, that you don't bring up new evidence and new arguments, you only reply. We haven't talked about Bill 2, we haven't talked about who investigated, we haven't talked about the former Attorney General. The Member from Lumsden didn't mention any of those things and if you are going to call us to order, Sir, you are also going to call him to order.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Lumsden raised the impartiality of the Human Rights Commission and I said that was within order but not to mention names. The Attorney General, as I see it, is answering the statements made by the Member for Lumsden. He is not at liberty to go into details of Bill No. 2 or anything else. He is referring to the Human Rights Commission now and what in his opinion was the Human Rights Commission before. I don't know whether it was or not.

Mr. MacDonald: — Could you tell me when he mentioned who was the investigator, the inquisitor as he calls it, of the former administration. He mentioned the Attorney General Heald, he mentioned Mr. Lane. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, for goodness sake, if you are going to call this side to order, make that side come to order.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The partiality or the impartiality of the present Human Rights Commission, he obviously didn't know what happened before 1971 and he shouldn't comment on it.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Hon. Attorney General should be strictly limited because . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — He limited us.

Mr. MacLeod: — This matter that we are talking about is pretty important because we are talking about impartiality of members of the board. And I gave a specific example of a person on the board. He's giving names of people who aren't on the board and never were on the board because it was not in existence. Mr. Speaker, it is totally unfair of you to suggest that I can't talk about a specific person who is on the board and then allow him to talk about Attorney General and other people writing speeches for a past Attorney General, all that sort of thing. That's completely unfair, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I can't see that as a Point of Order. The Member for Lumsden raised the point that the present Human Rights Commission was biased and prejudiced. The Attorney General was trying to answer that.

Mr. MacLeod: — If that's in order, and he suggests that it is politically appointed and prejudiced and I give an example of that, I give a specific example of that, I don't know how he can be in order and how I can be out of order, if the Speaker is being fair with me. Maybe Mr. Speaker isn't being fair

May 1, 1973

with me.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be much longer in this because obviously the Liberal Party thinks it's in order to criticize any appointments that we made of a judicial or semi-judicial nature, but are very, very sensitive when we start criticizing any of their judicial appointments or semi-judicial appointments. Somehow a Federal Liberal Cabinet and a Federal Liberal Minister of Justice can appoint all sorts of defeated Liberal candidates as Justices and that's not out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we've got to stay closer to the Bill. The Federal Government isn't involved in this one.

Mr. Romanow: — All right, somehow it's all right for them to make political appointments but that's the typical approach to these matters. They have been so used to what they think is a natural right to control the judiciary and semi-judiciary functions that they can't accept the fact that there is another agency doing it impartially. And I want to say this to you, Mr. Speaker, bluntly, and make no mistake about it, that I find this type of comment about Judge Taylor — sorry — about the members of the Human Rights Commission to be absolutely unworthy of all the Members on that side of the House. I simply say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I would not have expected very much more from the Member from Lumsden. I would not have expected much more from any of the Members on the opposite side because their history for seven years has been to oppose the human rights legislation. Their history for seven years when they were in power was to drive human rights to an end. Their history of seven years when they were in power was to intimate and to frighten human rights.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Stick to the Bill.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the history is simply relevant because that's why they are opposing this Bill. The Member from Lumsden said he was going to oppose it and I want to make it clear to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan why he's opposing it. He's using that as an excuse. The Member from Lumsden and all of the Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan, especially as represented opposite, are against human rights legislation and make no mistake about that. Mr. Speaker, if they had their way they would go back to the days of Bill 2. They would go back to the days of bringing human rights legislation down. And I say to you, Sir, that the Province of Saskatchewan won't accept it. They won't accept the Liberals opposite. They are antediluvian in their approach. They are absolutely undemocratic, and I am urging all Members to vote for this particular motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Yeas — 36
Messieurs

Blakeney

Brockelbank

Faris

Dyck	MacMurchy	Flasch
Meakes	Pepper	Cody
Wood	Byers	Gross
Smishek	Whelan	Feduniak
Romanow	Engel	Mostoway
Messer	Owens	Comer
Bowerman	Robbins	Rolfes
Kramer	Cowley	Lange
Thibault	Taylor	Oliver
Kowalchuk	Matsalla	Feschuk
Baker	Richards	Kaeding

Nays — 12

Messieurs

Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	Lane
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald
Guy	Weatherald	(Moose Jaw North)
Grant	MacLeod	Wiebe
	McPherson	

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 129 — An Act to amend The Attorney General's Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 129 is an Act to amend The Attorney General's Act. No doubt the Opposition will oppose this as well because they will see some Machiavellian intent in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 an amendment was passed to The Attorney General's Act providing that where the Law Society of Saskatchewan operates a plan under which legal services are made available to indigent persons the Attorney General may authorize payment to members of the Law Society who have rendered services in accordance with the tariff established between the Attorney General and the Law Society. The Attorney General pursuant to this authority has been paying legal fees and disbursements incurred in the furnishing of legal aid. In May, 1972 Dean Roger Carter of the College of Law of the University of Saskatchewan was named chairman of the Saskatchewan Legal Aid Committee, along with six other appointees representing indigent people, the Indian and Metis people of Saskatchewan, a representative of the public and two members of the Law Society of Saskatchewan. Their job was to review the system of legal aid within the province, to examine and make recommendations as to the existence for the need for subsidized programs of legal aid, to determine whether there was in fact under-utilization of legal services by indigent persons, to articulate preconditions for adequate programs and to compare the various systems of legal services in other jurisdictions. This report has now been received and consideration is being given by your Government to the implementation of an entirely new approach to legal aid in this province. I hope sometime by late this fall or perhaps a little earlier, to have a more comprehensive report for the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the existing Section 3(a) of The Attorney General's Act now only authorizes payment to members of the Law Society of Saskatchewan rendering legal services to indigent persons under the present legal aid plan operated by the Law

May 1, 1973

Society of Saskatchewan. It is considered advisable that this section must be extended to as to allow some preliminary planning of ways and means and of the implementation of some aspects of the Carter report say, for example in northern Saskatchewan, which may be found acceptable to the Government and which can be implemented without any further legislation. In addition, federal contribution in respect of legal aid granted in prosecutions under federal statutes is available at fifty cents per capita. But eligibility has been denied until such time as certain revisions can be made to our present legal aid system under the present law in the Province of Saskatchewan. Eligibility further requires a contract between provincial and federal authorities. In order to qualify for these federal payments a provincial agency will have to be established to operate a plan acceptable to federal authorities and agreements to be signed as may be required.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we require this amendment in order to rectify our present plan to allow us to receive the federal contribution. We also will likely move a new Bill this fall or sometime as soon as possible with respect to the Carter Commission or some basis thereof for a new comprehensive legal aid plan.

In the meantime, we are proposing these amendments to The Attorney General's Act for the two purposes: 1. To provide perhaps where necessary implementation of the Carter Report. An obvious example is the northern services where Dean Carter urges immediate implementation. 2. To amend the present legal aid system in order to allow us to receive the federal contribution on a per capita basis, and thereby receive some compensation for the expenditures made out of the present system in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I move second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane: (Lumsden) — Mr. Speaker, there is of course a very drastic change in the proposed legislation. Under the amendments in 1967 brought in by the former Liberal Government (for the edification of some of the Members opposite) there was a criminal legal aid plan for the Province of Saskatchewan. That particular plan and the previous amendment made it quite clear that the plan was to be administered by the Law Society of Saskatchewan. The proposed amendments of the Attorney General make it quite clear that this is going to be a legal aid plan administered by the Attorney General of Saskatchewan. It makes it quite clear that the Attorney General will have the opportunity of making any arrangements, agreements whatever that he decides to do. We find it regrettable that in the second reading remarks of the Attorney General we didn't get specific indications from him about what this Bill means when he says, "The Attorney General may enter into agreements or arrangements with the Society or any person, organization or association." What type of plan are we getting into?

We are quite aware of the suggestions made in the Carter Report. We realize the problems in northern Saskatchewan which are well detailed in that report, but we have no commitment from the Government opposite of what exactly they mean when they say the Attorney General may enter into any agreements. We would wish that the Attorney General had given more detail as to

exactly what the Government policy, the Government program and the Government direction is going to be. Unfortunately he saw fit to avoid that question. We will have further comments and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of **Bill No. 130 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Protection Act, 1971.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Family Farm Protection Act. The Family Farm Protection Act, 1971, was passed at the second session of this Assembly in August, 1971. Except for two sections the entire Bill expired on July 31, 1972. After careful consideration of these sections of the intent of the Bill it was felt that the remaining sections should also be repealed so as to put an end to the whole Act. The Bill now before the House will repeal Sections 72 and 73 as of August 1, 1973 and will repeal Section 25 on the date of assent of this Bill.

I move second reading.

Mr. E.F. Gardner: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, we are not of course going to oppose this Bill, we didn't feel that The Family Farm Protection Act did any good to anybody in the first place. You will recall it was brought in immediately after this Government was elected at a Special Session in 1971 where in the flush of victory they thought they had to have a grandstand play and bring in some kind of an Act of this sort. Everyone knows as the time has gone by, that it was really of no use to anybody. No one made use of it and I notice the Attorney General in telling us that he was doing away with this Act didn't mention any of the values of the Act because of course there weren't any. We are pleased to see the end of this Act. It served no useful purpose for anybody in the province. If this Bill in effect is finally killing The Family Farm Protection Act we will support it with enthusiasm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, naturally we will support the end of this Act as far as the Legislature is concerned. It was an ill-conceived Act as my colleague the Member for Moosomin has said, an extremely ill-conceived Act. I think it should be noted that the Attorney General in the second reading introduction laid no claim to any good deeds that the Act actually did whatsoever. I think this is indicative of the fact that even he recognizes now that the Act was not in the best interests of the province. We pointed out at the time that it would put financial responsibility on a number of small implement dealers which I think is well documented now by the number of individual cases that it did. It also put responsibility onto a number of credit unions and that too is well documented as I have had individuals mention this to me. This was the reason we opposed it at the time because we felt it wouldn't do much good for any individual in Saskatchewan, but would cause considerable financial difficulty for small implement dealers and credit unions. It is therefore with pleasure that we will be supporting this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

May 1, 1973

Mr. Lane: — We note that this Bill removes those sections (Section 7 for example) that would have provided compensation, limited though it may be. That section, the one redeeming feature of the Bill, is now being repealed which will certainly mean the demise finally, a welcome demise, to The Family Farm Protection Act. My learned friend from Cannington has made it quite clear that all pitfalls of the Bill were well documented by the Opposition when the Bill came up for second and third reading. The Government chose to ignore the suggestions of the Opposition and the obvious pitfalls. We hope that now this Bill is forever dead. I would hope too that the Government's scare tactics on depression that we heard argued from the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) about depression coming so we had to have this Bill. The great scare tactics that came about for The Foreign Ownership Bill from the Members opposite, and we would hope that not only does this Bill end The Family Farm Protection Act but ends the scare tactic type legislation we have been getting lately.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, as usual the Liberal Party and the Members opposite simply misconstrue legislation. If they think for example in 1971 that when we were elected one of the things that we were not elected on was the question of the economic and the farm discontent that was about, they have got to be whistling Dixie. If anybody doesn't think that in 1971 . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — The Attorney General persists in breaking the rules constantly. I hope that you will check up on him. He can answer our arguments, but our arguments did not involve . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, what is your Point of Order?

Mr. Weatherald: — My Point of Order is that the Attorney General is not speaking to the information that was brought in, he is adding new information.

Mr. Blakeney: — I rise on a Point of Order. I heard the Member for Lumsden talk about the allegations of depression and the so-called phony legislation to deal with phony . . . with so-called phony — that wasn't the word — scare tactics, but it was an allegation saying that there was not in fact an agricultural depression in 1971. I am saying the Attorney General is recalling a few people's mind to what was a pretty obvious fact.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to be very brief in summation and in rebuttal, as I expect is my right, as mover of this Bill. To sit here and to listen to the Liberals opposite pretend that in 1971 there was no farm or economic recession is absolutely not the truth. Everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan knows that things were difficult. Everyone knows that we were partly elected, among other things, to try and take some action on behalf of the farmers in Saskatchewan. We sought to do that with The Family Farm Protection Act. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, we sought to do that despite the dire

threats and the dire warnings of doom and gloom that the Members opposite were telling us about. They were telling us that credit would be denied to farmers, that farm machinery and implement dealers would dry up in the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to remind the Members of the House that far from that being the truth, that in fact the reverse is the truth. There have been more farm machinery sales and probably a healthier farm community, not because of this Bill but because this Bill was one of the things the Provincial Government advanced to try and help the family farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — When the Members opposite tell us that I didn't in my moving speech talk about the advantages of this Bill, I didn't think that anybody in their criticisms of this Bill would deny that self evident fact. I didn't think that the Liberals would, even today in 1973, still oppose this Bill. Because I want to tell the people of this Legislature and the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, that I for one am proud to be associated with a government that has got the guts to take on all the financial and lending institutions of Canada in the interests of the family farmers of Saskatchewan. I want to tell the Member for Lumsden and I want to tell the Member for Cannington that when it comes down to speaking up for John Deere or Massey Ferguson of Toronto and speaking up for the family farmer of Saskatchewan I'll always side for the family farmer of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I am not going to stand like the Member for Lumsden and the Member for Cannington in their places and be the mouthpiece for the Eastern corporate interests of farm machinery companies and implement dealers. I want to tell you, if you think The Family Farm Protection Act isn't popular, then you had better get out and start listening to the family farmer to learn the lesson.

I move second reading of Bill No. 130.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of **Bill No. 124 — An Act respecting the payment of certain sums of Money to Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, if it isn't John Deere or Massey Ferguson, it's a German bank.

The item before us deals with a loan negotiated by the Leader of the Opposition in 1969 when he was Provincial Treasurer. A loan negotiated in Germany for 60 million Deutsch marks, which at that time was about \$16 million in Canadian funds. It was a five-year loan negotiated at 6 ½ per cent. The actual price worked out to about 6 ¾ per cent at that time. The reasons advanced the other day when the Leader of the Opposition and myself had a chance to discuss this in Committee of Finance, the reasons advanced by the Opposition at that time and today, for making this loan in Germany, was the fact that the money could be obtained at 1 ½ to 2 per cent lower than Canadian rates, which

May 1, 1973

was true. And also the fact that the Canadian market was tight at that time and it was difficult to borrow Canadian funds, which I agree it was, although I find it hard to believe that Saskatchewan's credit rating was so poor at that time that funds could not have been obtained here.

The risk that was involved for the people of Saskatchewan was that there would be an upward revaluation of the German Deutsch mark. And all one has to do is to look at the value of the German Deutsch mark today and one can see that that risk has come home to roost, in excess of 30 per cent upward revaluation of the German Deutsch mark. What was a \$16 million loan has now turned into a \$21 million loan. The interest costs have risen some \$200,000 a year. The Government of Saskatchewan is now faced, and has been faced with for some time, a decision to make good on the Deutsch mark loan, which was negotiated for SEDCO.

I think first of all the Members on this side of the House and Members on the other side of the House would agree that SEDCO should not bear the brunt of the loss that is going to result from this particular loan. We have always viewed, both this Government and the previous government, the borrowings of the province as a whole and we wouldn't want to inflict the loss on the businessmen of Saskatchewan, who would have to pay higher interest rates if SEDCO was to absorb the loss itself.

Two options are open to the Government, to repay the loan at a loss of some \$5 million or to roll the loan over, which would mean borrowing more Deutsch marks, exposing ourselves to further risks. It would also mean paying a higher interest rate. It would mean paying a higher interest rate because we are talking in our terms about \$16 million Canadian dollars. We have to borrow another 60 million Deutsch marks and we would have to pay the interest in inflated German currency.

The Government has decided to introduce this Bill which will take off the shoulders of SEDCO the cost of this particular loan and the Bill will pay up to \$5.4 million to SEDCO to cover the losses.

Mr. Speaker, I could go into more detail on this and I think we could easily repeat the debate of the other day. I have tried to lay out the history of this particular loan, the problems associated with it and the reasons for our particular decision. I think the political debate took place the other day and so, therefore, I would move second reading on this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod: (Regina Albert Park) — Mr. Speaker, we have chewed this moccasin before and I have no intention of repeating the thing.

Mr. Feduniak: — Why don't you swallow it?

Mr. MacLeod: — It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Members are not anxious to get out this week and we are quite prepared to accommodate them if they want to stay on for another week or two.

The credit rating of Saskatchewan was, of course, good during the entire period referred to by the Minister. In fact I heard the man who now occupies the Premier's chair in Saskatchewan, state that on several occasions, and that he concurred with the type of budgeting that produced a balanced budget for the Province of Saskatchewan. He commented that not only had the Liberals done it, but during a period when, I believe he was the Provincial Treasurer, that Saskatchewan had balanced its budget. And so for a long period of time Saskatchewan has had balanced budgets under both Governments. The result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that Saskatchewan, through prudent management of its financial affairs did, and has, particularly in recent times, had a good credit rating.

I want to make it abundantly clear that we say Saskatchewan had a good credit rating. It continues to have a good credit rating and I hope that it will in the future continue to have a good credit rating.

The purpose of the Deutsch mark loan has been discussed before and I have no intention of going over it. But I do want to say that had the Government not changed, and had the Hon. Leader of the Opposition today continued in his office as Provincial Treasurer, he would very carefully have kept an eye upon the motions of the German Deutsch mark and in addition to that, he would have remembered the terms of agreement he had arranged for the borrowing of the loan, the borrowing of that money. The result of it would have been a substantial saving of money. Nonetheless the Hon. Minister of Finance is correct, the Deutsch mark tended to inch upward and has continued to do so steadily, and the result of which today is that we have this Bill before us. I think that the fact is that the borrowing by the Provincial Treasurer of that day, coupled with the failure to pay it off at an earlier date, or the failure to hedge the loan, is what causes this Bill today.

It behooves us, Mr. Speaker, to be more prudent or more careful in our handling — of our watching — of these agreements in the future. I should like to refer to the comments of the Provincial Auditor. He set forth a page of commentary, dealing with the handling of the Deutsch mark and he concludes partly this way:

Because of the materiality of the matters referred to in the preceding paragraphs in my opinion the financial statements do not fairly present the financial position of the corporation as of December 31, 1972.

I am concerned (and have expressed it, and the Minister of Finance has already acknowledged receipt of that communication) that we should be more careful with the funding of our debt; more careful of the anticipation of events. I merely state that the Minister of Finance and his officials today, have learned a lesson, and it may well be that we have learned a lesson too, in careful management and watching of these agreements. Because I have no doubt that in 1975 Members on this side will be on that side of the House and we will be put to the same kind of a test that the Hon. Minister is today.

The only argument that he did raise on one occasion that I should like to challenge is this: He has said because of the borrowing in the first place he was put in the position of having to make a decision. We didn't know that the people were going to turn out the Liberal Party, so we didn't know that we

May 1, 1973

were going to put upon the present Government a decision which was heavier than they might want to have borne. I also say that that is not a very good argument because it is like saying, if you hadn't started the motor and put the ship of state in motion, I wouldn't have been obliged to steer it.

Consequently we support the Bill. I must say that the Minister pleased me today in that he did not get overly political. He must have had a good argument because he didn't shout.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one brief comment if I may.

The Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) said that if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was still the Provincial Treasurer he would have kept his eye on the loan. He had his eyes on the loan when he made it and they were both shut.

As I said before one of the problems was, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that the international exchange markets are difficult. The gnomes of Zurich are the only people who are supposed to know much about this, and the trouble was that we had the gnome from Prince Albert looking after the affairs of the province at that time and we got ourselves into considerable difficulty.

I should like to make one further comments as well. While there are grave difficulties in dealing in foreign currencies in foreign exchange markets, this loss to the province is the direct responsibility of the former Government. That \$5 million loss exceeds by more than 2 ½ times the loss that occurred in the shoe factory, the box factory, the tannery or the woollen mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Richards: (Saskatoon University) — Mr. Speaker, it is some comment on this Legislature that we manage to generate more heat and fury over the \$20,000 which allegedly it is going to cost to distribute this piece of Liberal propaganda to the residents of Saskatchewan, than we do over the question of \$5 million. The \$5 million would roughly pay for the proposed Dental Care Program for Children for one year. It is obviously a time for sadness, when the people of Saskatchewan find themselves having to pay out of their hard-earned tax money \$5 million because of the vagaries of international finance.

However, I must disagree with my colleague from Saskatoon, to the extent that I think that if there is any partisan criticism to be doled out, that it goes out in roughly equal proportion. The chief villain, if there is a villain in this, is the inadequate financial market analysis being done by the Department of Finance under either the Liberals or the NDP.

As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated when he was assessing this, if we start attributing how much of this \$5 million is to be attributed to the Liberals as opposed to how much is to be attributed to the NDP, very roughly it is half and half in terms of what happened to the value of the Deutsch

mark by the time of the change of government. The argument that we are not to blame, in the NDP, because we inherited the loan which already had been entered into, I think is of dubious value, Mr. Speaker, because one is always faced in the world of financial capitalism with having to make the best of a bad deal.

There is a risk of paying too much interest as opposed to a risk of capital losses because of revaluation of foreign currencies. It is always going to be a dicey job deciding exactly how we can do the best by the people of Saskatchewan in raising the necessary funds which have to be borrowed, given the ability and the power of financial institutions to assure that they get their rake off.

In conclusion, I think it is a sad day for the people of Saskatchewan to have the necessity to pass this kind of legislation. I hope the people of Saskatchewan draw from it the lessons about the cruelties and the difficulties in dealing with such powerful financial institutions. With that, I shall take my seat, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, just a comment. I hadn't intended to get involved. I want to say that I am not like the Member from Nutana Centre. I am not a financial wizard. I want to say that also neither is the Provincial Treasurer, the only experience he has ever had is to keep the financial records of the NDP.

Mr. Blakeney: — That's not easy.

Mr. MacDonald: — I want to say this — that may not be easy and that may have been good experience. But I want to suggest to the Member for Nutana and to the Members opposite, if you want us to turn around and criticize the financial arrangement on the foreign exchange market of a loan and try to point out to the fiscal responsibility of this Government, consider this: I want you to know that in the Liberal Government there was one thing that Ross Thatcher did and I say this with a great deal of respect for one who is no longer with us; he had the respect of the financial community in Canada, he had the respect of the business community in Canada and he had the respect of the people of Saskatchewan for his financial management. And don't ever misinterpret. I also want to suggest that if you want to make an analogy go out on the street, if you want to make an analogy of the financial responsibility of the fiscal management in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would suggest you go out on the street and ask the people today of the business community, the bankers about Intercon, about IPSCO, about all the other financial transactions. The giving away of the money for the pulp mill and so forth and I would suggest to you, Mr. Member for Nutana Centre that there is just no comparison, because the people of Saskatchewan will tell you in a few brief words, they will tell you there can be no comparison. The fiscal management of this province is something that we make no apology for over here and I don't apologize for the former Premier, Ross Thatcher. I also want to say I agree with my friend from University. When you start talking about the intricacies of international exchange and the fluctuations on the international market it is something that you can't lay the blame on anybody.

When the Minister of Finance stands on his feet and points his finger over here to the Opposition and says because a former Finance Minister made the loan at a time when the financial terms were good that it is his responsibility but all the time when the financial deficit was going on, when the Deutsch mark was increasing in value and our loan was going down, he was the Minister of Finance. There were arrangements within that loan which were very specific and the Premier knows it, and so does the Minister of Finance, which made it possible to repay that loan in order to prevent just the thing that is the purpose of this Bill, to prevent just that thing. I would suggest that if there was any time anybody could anticipate, and I don't think it is easy despite what the Member for University says, that we would all be millionaires if we could anticipate the fluctuations on the international or foreign exchange market. The banking industry can't even do that.

I don't think it is a lack of research. I would suggest that if there was any opportunity for anticipation, any opportunity to examine the financial arrangements in the international market, if there was any opportunity to assess what was happening in the world in the economic future, if there was any opportunity that the Japanese and the German currency was without question the most valuable, the time when that assessment could have been done the easiest was when the NDP were the Government of Saskatchewan. I don't think you will find a member of the financial community who would deny that. I don't think you could find one anywhere. I am not speaking politically. I think the Member from Nutana South would agree with me and so would the Member for University. And I am sure that the Premier and the Minister of Finance would agree with me. So I am not supporting anything because as I say I am not a financial wizard. All I am suggesting is that I don't believe this should be that partisan. I just believe that if you want to point the finger as the Minister of Finance does he should turn it on himself not towards others.

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, would the Member permit a question?

Mr. MacDonald: — No. I told you I am not a financial . . . I will but I . . .

Mr. Robbins: — He wishes to take credit for the good credit rating of the Province of Saskatchewan related to the management that occurred in the years when they were in power. Would he not admit that basically the reason for that good credit was the availability of roughly \$200 million out of the Canada Pension Plan?

Mr. MacDonald: — Of course. There is no question about that. I would suggest to you that that expanded the credit of every government in the Dominion of Canada. But that did not suggest that Saskatchewan's credit rating in comparison to other provinces, all I am saying is that the Canada Pension Plan funds were available to every government in Canada. I also want to say that when you say the credit of the Government of Saskatchewan is good today, I suggest it is going to go down, when the financial community in this nation and the world examine what this Government has done in the last three months.

Mr. Robbins: — Would the Member permit another question?

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think we should debate cross the floor this way.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I just like to reply to a few of the remarks made by Members on both sides of the House. I think that a couple of things need to be pointed out.

The Member for Milestone apparently makes the suggestion that somehow the stewardship of the previous Government was exemplary. May I point out that in the years from 1944 to 1964 the financial stewardship was in fact also exemplary. During that period the debt of this province on the net basis was reduced from approximately \$150 million to zero and we had a net surplus in 1964. This was done during all the years when the Members of the Liberal Party were bitterly critical of many, many of the financial decisions. Bitterly critical of Government entry into business; bitterly critical of — well they used to talk about box factories and things like tanneries. They used to talk about the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office until it became a success. They used to talk about the bus company until it became a success, and all the others. They predicted that this was going to bring financial ruin and in fact it brought not financial ruin but brought the Province of Saskatchewan into a very, very healthy position in 1964. And that healthy position continued to some extent during the intervening seven years, in spite of a good number of financial blunders during that period.

I won't recite for the House the story of Primrose Path, \$2 million worth of nothing in northwestern Saskatchewan. Or some roads which were equally valueless.

Mr. MacLeod: — You're not going to recite that.

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm not going to recite that. I could elaborate for the benefit of the House just the full degree of the folly but I feel that I will spare the House that and will point out that in not just the same way as between 1944 and 1964 the Members of the Liberal Party were predicting ruin because of particular financial transactions by the then government.

The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has once again started predicting financial ruin. And once again he says that we are going to run this province bankrupt. I am sure that when we assess the situation, not in 1971 but in 1991 we'll look back on those 20 years and see whether we are bankrupt or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But I think notwithstanding the alleged financial management — good management of the Government from 1964 to 1971, the reason why we are debating this Bill is that they couldn't borrow any money in this country in 1969. The reason why we are debating this Bill is not only could they not borrow any money in this country but they couldn't borrow any money in the United States. They had to go to Europe for a sum of money

May 1, 1973

larger than any sum ever borrowed off shore in the history of this province. Now it may be that it wasn't the fault of the then government. It may be that it was the fault of the then Federal Liberal Government with some sort of misguided tight money policy. But it certainly does not speak well for Liberal financial stewardship, Federal or Provincial.

I think I agree with Members when they say that the misfortune that has befallen us is not all to be laid at any one government's door. If the Members opposite when they were the government had had clairvoyance they would never have touched the Deutsch mark. If they had thought that there was a problem they would have set up a sinking fund arrangement whereby they would have hedged against it over a period of the loan. In fact they didn't have clairvoyance and they went to Germany. They didn't have clairvoyance in 1969 when they went to Germany. And they didn't have clairvoyance in 1970 when they did nothing about hedging. They didn't have clairvoyance in 1971 during the time they were in office — the six months they were in office because they did no hedging or no sinking funding.

Mr. MacDonald: — Three months.

Mr. Blakeney: — Six months. So they didn't have clairvoyance. And when we came in we didn't have clairvoyance. We didn't continue the sinking fund that they hadn't started because they hadn't started it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We didn't set one up, and we didn't hedge. And we are now faced with this problem in the order of \$5 million.

May I say in response to the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) that it is easy for us to pick out now with all the clarity of hindsight, the error made by us and presumably to some extent by the staffs who work for us. But I think it is worthwhile to point out that we have borrowed for this province in the last 15 or 20 years probably a thousand million dollars, probably a billion dollars, maybe not quite that much but not too far off. Five or six hundred million for the Power Corporation and two or three hundred million for the Sask Tel and the like. The record is a pretty good record. The record particularly in borrowing in the United States when we had exchange risks is pretty impressive. I know when I was Provincial Treasurer in 1962, I took off some figures on how we had done on our American borrowing. Took them off on what our exchange gains were, what our exchange losses were and what advantage we had because we had borrowed for fractionally lower rates of interest, a half to three-quarter per cent lower in the United States when we had gone there. And we were money ahead in large sums.

I suspect that we could do that today and still be money ahead and we could do it today with respect to the Deutsch mark loan and if we put that in the whole pot we would be money ahead. So I don't think we can fault our staff all that much.

Now this one happens to be a spectacularly bad decision in the scheme of things because it's the only large German loan that we have ever made and it proves to be a dud. But that is the sort of thing that happens. It is a judgment made by the then

Government of the day and a judgment continued by us. I don't think we should try to shift blame on our public service. I am not suggesting that anyone was but I want to underline that because of possible inferences which might be drawn from some of the earlier remarks.

I think they have served us well. In hindsight they didn't serve us well here nor did we serve ourselves well. But as I say if we all had 20-20 foresight equal to our hindsight we then probably would be much better off than we are now.

So in general I say that this loan is most unfortunate, divided responsibility in my judgment, at least, major responsibility with those who negotiated the loan but someone may argue about that. And clearly some others do, I take it by the look on their faces. The responsibility is ours as political persons and not primarily the responsibility of the staff and is part of a policy of borrowing outside of Canada which policy has yielded rich dividends with this province in the past, primarily our American borrowing. So I think that while we regret this, we see it as part of a whole picture which is not particularly a cause for regret. It is a picture of a province which has steadily managed its financial affairs in an appropriate way in the context of the world in which it lives. A province which has a very high credit rating and still does, notwithstanding the remarks from the Member for Milestone. Our current interest rate is slightly lower, our bonds sell a little higher than those of the Province of Ontario and that is not bad under the circumstances.

I think that we have seen steady progress of relatively good financial management now for many, many years. This is an unfortunate lapse but one which is necessarily going to happen in the many transactions which are made. In my judgment we should pass the Act and see that the consequences of this lapse do not fall to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation but rather to the Province of Saskatchewan as a whole. This is the recommendation that the auditor made. That, it seems to me, is fair to Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. That is what this Bill does. I will be supporting the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, it's always amusing to listen to the socialists talk about financing. It is a great experience, they seem to talk about a system whereby nobody is supposed to make any money but they can always get up and give you a lot of advice on it.

The fact is that the previous government was astute enough to go at the time to the location where money could be borrowed under the best conditions. And they were astute enough to do this. Just because this present Government wasn't astute enough to pay it back when they should have they are now blaming the people on this side of the House. We are also amused at the Premier talking about the money that he has borrowed from the Americans. And of course we are well aware of this. When we became the Government in 1964 we found out that the Power Corporation for example was owned about 92 per cent by Americans due to the fact that the NDP Government had got up and talked about this terrible capitalist system and the Americans. They

May 1, 1973

didn't want anything to do with them and then they would sneak down to New York and borrow another hundred million dollars.

This went on for years and years. I am surprised at some of the back benchers who are presumably socialists in the true sense of the word, that they are not criticizing their Government at this time for the fact that they are going down to these terrible Americans and borrowing this kind of money. And the Premier said himself that they had borrowed perhaps three-quarters of a billion dollars by both Governments in the past 20 years from the foreign countries and chiefly United States of America. I think this is a tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the capitalist system in the United States, that they had this kind of money available and also that they are good hearted and generous enough to lend it to socialist government up in this country whose creditability they must consider rather low.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I listen to the Members over there and I get a little surprised. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) talks about the previous Premier. He talks about the previous Premier being such a great financial wizard, so well respected by the financial community. In 1969, if we believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) they couldn't borrow a penny in Canada. They couldn't borrow a penny in Canada. Then he criticizes this Government, he said our credit is going down, our credit is going all to pot. Just recently we borrowed \$30 million on the Canadian market, twice as big a loan as we had ever made and it was trading through Ontario Hydro not just above it. Mr. Speaker, his arguments are full of contradictions both in this area and in every other area that he chooses to speak on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin took some time to show us his financial ignorance when he said, you know these crazy socialists they went down to the States and they borrowed the money from the Americans. The problem is that in Canada those crazy Liberals sell our companies to the Americans instead of borrowing the money, so that when it is paid back we own Canada not somebody south of the border.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, our party both at the provincial level and the federal level, has never opposed borrowing money in the United States, it is when we sell equity in Canadian companies and Canadian mines to Americans and outside interests that we have objected.

Mr. Speaker, they talked about the staff of the Department of Finance. I want to say that if you review the history of the German mark loan you will find that the Department of Finance's staff was only very marginally involved, that the loan was negotiated by the present Leader of the Opposition who flew to Germany himself to sign the deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I have tried to make the point over and over again that the foreign money market is a very dicey area to be in and there simply are not any experts in this world — you can look over the past three or four years and you can find out that there aren't any.

The point I tried to make when I talked on this Bill before, and when we discussed it in Committee, the point I tried to make, is once you have borrowed in the foreign money market then you are into the guessing game with all of those wizards in Zurich and all those other places in attempting to guess what is going to happen to the German mark. That is the position that the Leader of the Opposition put the Government in. When they were the Government they were in it, when we were the Government we were in it.

The Member for Milestone said that there was no increase in the Deutsch mark while they were the Government. I should like to tell the Member for Milestone that in 1970 the Deutsch mark went up over 10 per cent, that is over \$1 million.

The Member for Milestone continues to amaze me. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition borrowed the money then they as the Government had to make a decision as to whether or not they would repay the loan or whether or not they would borrow Deutsch marks and they chose not to.

The Member for Albert Park says, you know had the Leader of the Opposition remained as Provincial Treasurer he would have kept his eye on it. He said the result would have been we would have saved \$3.6 million. I want to remind him, the Leader of the Opposition said had he remained as Provincial Treasurer he would have probably made the same decision as this Government. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said. The problem with you people is that you can't even agree with one another.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — The Member from Albert Park talks about the Deutsch mark inching upwards. It went up 10 per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent. Maybe that is inching upwards.

Mr. Gardner: — On a Point of Order. Is he allowed to refer to something the Leader of the Opposition said in another debate or Estimates or some other place? He has gone on and on on this. I notice nobody is calling him to order on it.

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I only referred to it because the Member for Albert Park referred to it and I simply wanted to correct his erroneous reference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Member for Moosomin asked for a ruling and you got up and called a vote. You did that yesterday, Sir. The Member for Moosomin asked for a ruling. When you stand on your feet we have no right to

May 1, 1973

stand on our feet. Mr. Speaker, he asked for a ruling not a vote and he sat down for the ruling. Not for a vote.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Member for Moosomin raised a point. The Minister of Finance got up and he said he only referred to the statement the Leader of the Opposition made because it was referred to by the Member for Albert Park. Then he sat down and concluded his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: — When the Member for Moosomin asked you for a ruling, Sir, he didn't expect a reply from the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, all I want to point out that this is the second day in a row . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There is no Point before the House. There is no Point before the House and the Bill is now read a second time. The Clerk has called, "Second reading of this Bill and when shall this Bill be considered in Committee?"

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, the Member for Moosomin rose in his place and asked for a ruling from you and you stood on your feet to give him a reply and you called a vote . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I did not. Sit down! Order! I am on my feet now so you sit down!

When the Member for Moosomin rose on the Point of Order the Finance Minister admitted that he was referring to what the Leader of the Opposition has said because it had been brought out by the Member for Albert Park.

Mr. Lane: — You didn't make a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — I didn't have to! Because the Minister of Finance acknowledged it.

Mr. Weatherald: — On the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of interest we intended to support the Bill in any event.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We did. You were just paying a Bill so we can vote how we wish and we can vote in favor and with the Government which is paying the Bill. We are not against paying the Bill.

But I do wish to — I think the Point of Order is important, Mr. Speaker, because we have had a number of difficulties and I don't wish to place the blame on anyone — but the fact is that the Member for Moosomin did rise on a Point of Order asking for a ruling on the debate. The Finance Minister then spoke on the Point of Order and resumed his seat. Now we are waiting for your ruling and we never received that ruling. You asked for a vote.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling if I have to make one is that he was answering statements made by the Member for Albert Park who had referred to the Leader of the Opposition's statements in a previous debate which I assume happened in Committee.

Mr. Gardner: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I have made a Point of Order and the Minister got up and spoke on the Point of Order and then sat down. He in no way concluded his remarks in this debate. And when he sat down on the Point of Order you got up and called the vote.

Mr. Speaker: — I shall ask the Minister, had you concluded your remarks?

Mr. Cowley: — I thought I had, but if they want me to carry on.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I was listening very closely and the Minister in concluding his remarks, if he was finished, did not ask for second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! He didn't have to because he was closing the debate. What is the matter with the Members? This Bill is now read a second time.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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