

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature
32nd Day

Tuesday, March 19, 1974.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I should like through you to introduce to this House a group of 22 high school students from LeRoy High School who are seated in the west gallery. The students came accompanied by their teacher and two other adults from the community of LeRoy and have been here, I believe, all afternoon and part of this morning. I spoke to them and talked to them about procedures of this House this afternoon and I know that they are looking forward to gaining something from the debate that is carried on here this afternoon. I hope that their visit will be of benefit to them and that on their trip home they will have a very good trip back.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J. R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I want to introduce to you a group of 14 adult students taking an up-grading course in the Parkland Community College right in the Peepeekisis Reserve, northeast of Balcarres. This isn't a new venture in that area. They are noted for taking up-grading classes; this one is taking Grade Five to Eight. They are noted for taking up-grading classes in the Abernethy and Balcarres area. I think this shows that they have got initiative and are willing to move on ahead.

Mr. Speaker, their teacher is with them. His name is Mr. John Nordvahl and also Gordon Townsend, the Education Councillor of Indian Affairs from Fort Qu'Appelle. I am sure that all of us here wish them well in their studies and I am sure that, as I have indicated to them already when I met them this noon hour, that this is their Legislature and we are the people here representing them. I hope that they will have the benefit of what goes on in this House this afternoon and that it will be beneficial and educational to them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to yourself and to the Members of the Legislature some 30 Grade Eight students from W. C. How School in Regina. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Yee Toy. They are, I am told, in the east gallery. They have had a tour of the building and at 3:00 o'clock I shall be very pleased to have the opportunity of meeting with them and speaking with them for a moment of two.

This is the third contingent, Mr. Speaker, from this outstanding school to which I have referred previously in this Legislature. We welcome them and I hope they enjoy their stay in the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the House a group of 41 or 42 Grade Seven students from Hugh Cairns School in Saskatoon. Hugh Cairns School is very dear to me because it is only about one-half block from where I live and many of the students who are here either live on the street that I live on, or in very close vicinity.

The students are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Francis, and their student teacher, Mr. Kreeft. I have already spent 10 or 15 minutes with the students prior to them coming to the House. I hope that our deliberations will help them in understanding what goes on in the House this afternoon and I wish them a successful trip back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Distributing of Farm Equipment

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the latest publication, March, of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association. On the back page it says, "Be please advised Pay Way Feeds, a division of Intercontinental Packers Ltd., are the distributors for a new idea farm equipment." The question, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Industry is: Since the Government is a substantial owner of Intercontinental Packers, is this the first step of the Government getting involved in the distributing of farm equipment in the province?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry & Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't had the opportunity to see that ad or to check on this in detail. So far as I am aware there is no general policy of the Government entering into the distributorship of farm machinery.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Government is in the distributing of farm equipment. They have on the Board of Directors of Intercontinental Packers representation and it must be their policy through the Board of Directors to get into . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Hon. Member can ask questions but not make speeches at this time.

Drop in Beef Prices

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). On Friday last, most Members are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government in the person of the Hon. Eugene Whelan announced a subsidy of about \$7 on certain grades of beef

designed to help both producer and consumer. Now, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last beef prices A1 and A2 in Saskatoon were \$46.50 to \$46.90, that was Thursday, last. Yesterday when the markets opened again across the country pretty well, the packer buyers walked out of most markets throughout the country, not only in Saskatchewan. Today I am informed just before dinner that in Saskatoon the same classes of beef that were bringing \$46 to \$47 on Thursday are today bringing \$41.50 to \$42. In short, Mr. Speaker, there has been a drop of about \$5 and I suggest that it is an obvious effort by the meat packing industry to drive down beef prices and to subvert the objectives of the Federal policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister of Industry this Government and his department is a major shareholder in a major meat packer in Saskatchewan and I hope that the Minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the Member come to his question?

An Hon. Member: — It would be a lot easier if they would keep quiet Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McIsaac: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. In view of this effort, obvious effort I say, by the meat packers to subvert that policy, has the Minister of Industry directed Intercontinental Packers not to be a part of this obvious effort, as I say, to beat the purpose of that subsidy?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a great deal of uncertainty about the market for cattle of all kinds and in fact the latest news story I heard indicated that no price pattern had been set for the cattle market after the announcement by the Federal Minister of Agriculture last week. So far as Intercontinental Packers are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are and the company is waiting to see what pattern develops. We have not, certainly, instructed anybody to enter into any collusive arrangement with any other meat packers to subvert any federal policy of the Government or to artificially depress the prices that farmers are paid for their cattle when they deliver them to market.

Mr. McIsaac: — I am glad to hear the Minister say that there is no collusion as far as he is concerned. It is interesting to note that Intercontinental wasn't buying on the Saskatoon market this morning. Whose orders they are following I don't know but it certainly is to be hoped that the Government and the Minister would make every effort to ensure that indeed that subsidy does get where it is supposed to be. As a major shareholder in that company I hope they are certainly influencing to that end.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish when Members are asking questions that they would be questions because this is not a place for a statement at this time and I wish they would frame their remarks with a question.

Increase in Motorcycle Licences

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General. A young person informed me that motorcycle licences had jumped from \$18 two years ago to something like \$78 in 1974. If this is a fact, it is a tremendous increase. I know the fatality rate and so forth on motorcycles, but my question is: Is this a fact that young people are now being charged \$78 for motorcycle licences?

A second question, is there any of the three cent gasoline tax subsidy — because certainly motorcycle operators buy gas and use gas in their motorcycle vehicles — being directed to the reduction of motorcycle licences at the same time as automobiles?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would advise as follows: The rating system of motorcycles, private passenger cars, farm trucks and the like was struck on the basis of the loss ratio that the individual categories experienced. It was after that rating system was struck that the three cent transfer was applied throughout, to apply to everyone, the result being the end rating figure that comes out in the documentation.

With respect to the motorcycle there is a substantial increase. I don't know if the top is \$78. There are two other categories over and above the minimum of \$30. Motorcycles have had a very unsatisfactory loss ratio experience and the new rates reflect that. So the Member is right there is a substantial increase for them.

Mr. MacDonald: — One other question to the Minister. I am not sure if he had the opportunity of watching the national television program last Sunday night on motorcycles. There is a tremendous increase in the casualty, fatality rate and accident rate of motorcycles across the country. I am wondering and I know the kind of haphazard way in which our motorcycle licences are given out in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is a very minimal kind of testing that goes on for motorcycle vehicles. Is the Minister or the Government intending to utilize some of this three cents for some kind of driver instruction in the motorcycle field as there are in the driver training in the high schools? If they are not I would recommend the Government immediately look into this because now the number of motorcycle vehicles being used in the Province of Saskatchewan and across Canada is increasing daily. I am sure there is a safety hazard and the increased rate charge was warranted. Is there any type of consideration being given to any kind of a driver training program in the field of motorbikes?

Mr. Romanow: — I would answer the Hon. Member firstly with respect to the three cent transfer, this is strictly a transfer for premiums and use for premiums only.

With respect to the suggestion of the driver training or form of training for motorcycles, I think this is something that is long overdue. Quite frankly there is some preliminary work being done within SGIO and the Highway Traffic Board but only preliminary. I am afraid that our position is that we await the final report of my colleague, the Member for Kinistino

(Mr. Thibault) and the Special Committee on Highway Traffic Safety. I do believe they have received submissions from various motorcyclists and motorcycle groups. I am not sure whether the interim report talks about motorcycles but we anticipate something in the final report.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 134

Mr. D. G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 134 showing:

Copies of letters and/or telegrams received by the Government of Saskatchewan in support of the royalty tax on oil, which came into effect January 1, 1974.

Hon. E. L. Cowley (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, just a very short comment with respect to this. I think it is well known that when people write to the Government in respect to anything they write assuming that whatever is contained in their letter and/or telegram is confidential unless otherwise stated. I think it has been a long standing policy in this Legislature that these sorts of things aren't tabled and I would, therefore urge the Members of this Assembly to defeat this motion.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the attitude of the Government and of the Minister. Surely there are some telegrams I would respect and, of course, Members on this side would understand if letters or telegrams or submissions had been made to the Government of a private nature but just to arrogantly refuse to give this information, I would ask that the Minister reconsider this. He could check with these people and I am sure he would find that most of the people and not all the people who made presentations through letters or telegrams — Well to begin with I don't know if there were any letters or telegrams or not but I presume there are some or he wouldn't have bothered to ask the Members over there to vote against this motion. I would ask him to reconsider it if he would and tell me privately or after so that we could resubmit this or check with these people. I think that with the oil issue as important as it is to this province and to the whole nation that this is withholding information. It is unnecessary to withhold this information, the information should be made public. There is nothing wrong with it, in fact there is everything right about it so that the Opposition and through us the people of this province can judge if the Government has taken the right stand, and has done the right thing. Or if they have ignored or given proper consideration to the submissions they have received.

I am amazed that they have turned it down. I agree that there are some submissions made to the Government that are of a private nature and must remain that way but just to get up and off-hand ask the Members over there to use their majority to vote this down is a denial I think of legitimate information that should be given to us. Of course, there is nothing we can do about it. The Minister sits there smiling and is very confident that the rubber stamps over there will do as he has asked them and there is no question in my mind but that they will. I just want to go on record as protesting this very, very strongly

and say that I think they are withholding information that belongs to the public. I think it is a very arrogant and secretive attitude to take about something that is definitely public business.

Any government that can walk out and seize the oil rights and can arbitrarily put hundreds of people out of business and have the Premier of this province get up and say he didn't even know they were out of business. He didn't even know that they were being struck down and pushed out of the province by the axe of the Government. Then when we ask for information about this whole situation for the Minister to very nonchalantly get up and say we are not prepared to give this, I ask the Members to vote against it. I don't think it is good enough but I think it is part and parcel of the attitude that is developing in the NDP Government all too rapidly to say, what we know we will keep to ourselves, we are going to do what we think is best and we are not prepared to hand out any information to the Opposition or to anyone else, if we don't feel inclined or if we think it might embarrass us a little.

Again I say it is all part and parcel of the attitude of the Government and I regret it very much and I ask the Minister to reconsider.

Motion negatived on Division.

Return No. 163

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 163 showing:

- (a) whether any individuals or firms, during 1973, were found to be in contravention of the terms of the Direct Sellers Act; (b) If so, (i) the names of these persons or firms; (ii) the action that was taken by the Department of Consumer Affairs; (iii) which of these individuals or firms continue to be licensed under the Act.

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, just a few short words on this motion. I have discussed it with the Member opposite and we have agreed that in light of the fact that the Motion as it is worded on the blues, would require that we also list the names of persons who may not have been convicted under The Direct Sellers Act, although they may have been charged or although it might have been alleged that they were in contravention of it. The Member agrees with me that in fact we should not be providing names of those people who in fact, are not guilty nor have been and therefore seconded by Mr. Cowley, the Member for Biggar, I move the following amendment to the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

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

- (a) Whether the Department of Consumer Affairs was involved in the laying of any charges under The Direct Sellers Act during the period April 1, 1973, to March 15, 1974, against individuals or firms for alleged contraventions of the provisions of that Act; (b) if so (i) the names of the individuals or firms convicted; (ii) the

nature of the offence; (ii) which of these individuals or firms convicted are currently licensed under the Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Return No. 164

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 164 showing:

With respect to Land Bank Commission Lease allocations or Appeal Board allocations: (a) whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program; (b) If so, the names of persons who received the leases and the description of the land involved.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware that land leased from the Land Bank Commission is supposed to be allocated on a point system and I don't think anyone would disagree with this principle. I think it's been pretty well established that if you're going to have a Land Bank Commission, which we don't agree with, that at least the land should be leased out in as fair a manner as possible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Now, if there is any variance from the procedure of allocating land by a point system, then the farmers are entitled to know of those particular cases, because this would destroy the credibility of the whole system if there was some feeling that the land was not being leased according to some rather fair point system. So I believe the Government certainly has an obligation to make public any variance from this procedure. If you go into any area in the province right now, I'm sure most rural Members are aware of this, you hear a great deal of talk and various stories about Land Bank transactions. And I suspect that many of these reports and stories that you hear around the province, a good number of them are not true, but some are true. But, again the Government has an obligation to give full details so that the people in an area are informed as to just what is going on with the Land Bank.

I'm sure that any of you from rural areas know that nothing is a greater topic of concern than the price that somebody got for his farm, who got the farm, what it was sold for and so forth. And this is probably information that they are rightly entitled to. It's part of their community, they should know the details, and at the moment they are just not getting them.

Now, we need information on individual cases. It's simply not good enough to group these together, either from an area and say that so much money was spent or so much land was purchased. It's the actual details of each transaction that are of value. It's something like trying to find out the price of potatoes in Regina, and somebody said, yes, there was \$800,000 worth purchased last year. This doesn't really give you any indication of the actual value. This is the type of thing that people want and I think they are entitled to. It's not good enough to say that the information will come out in the annual report. It will happen perhaps a year or so later

and it certainly doesn't give the details of these transactions. It's not complete.

I'm sure most of you have seen the editorial that appeared in the Leader-Post, just several days ago, 12th of March 1974 and it's headed, "More Details Needed on Land Bank Business." I think most people in the province would agree on this.

This is a specific type of a program. It's government money that's being spent. Already, \$50 million allocated, or partly allocated and partly spent on buying farm land in the province. Another \$1.9 million budgeted this year for administration alone. This is a lot of the taxpayers' money and the taxpayer is entitled to know just what it is being spent for.

So, I feel that most people would agree with the editorial that at the moment we are simply not getting enough information on this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The whole operation of the Land Bank seems to be clouded in a good deal of secrecy and speculation. We do know that rental rates were increased in the last few months and I don't quarrel with this. I don't think that they are that unreasonable yet, but again the true information, I believe was not given.

From the headlines in the local paper, near my home town, they apparently got a very cleverly worded press release from the Department of Agriculture and as a result of this, put it in the paper. It said, "Land Bank Rental Rates Guaranteed for Ten Years." And I would question this very, very much. I would like the Minister to tell us, if in fact this is correct. It's my understanding — and perhaps the rental rates for the individual who signs a lease today has his percentage guaranteed for ten years — but I don't think there is any guarantee that I can see any place that the rental rate won't be raised or changed within six months or next year or the year after. It's already been raised three quarters of a per cent in one year and I can't see anything to prevent it being raised at any time again. So to have a statement to come out such as this, that rental rates are guaranteed for ten years I think is very misleading to the people that have this land. Again, it's causing a great deal of controversy.

Another point that the information doesn't seem to be specific on is on the option to buy. I've talked to a number of people in fact . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would remind the Hon. Member that his Motion is asking for whether the leases have been granted to one with the greatest number of points. The Motion does not refer to interest rates or other points which he is raising. I wish to give him latitude, but I think we must get to the Motion.

Mr. Gardner: — I thought, that I was dealing with the Motion, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to point out the fact that we were not being given information that we have asked on the Land Bank and there are various types of information we require and I would think that

they have to do with the Land Bank and all part and parcel of the same thing. If you are . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would suggest to the Hon. Member that the Motion should have included those points. The Motion is restricted just to leases, on whether the highest, the one with the highest points got them or not and that is all the Motion is asking for. It isn't asking for other phases of the Land Bank Commission's work.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it may not then cover the question I had regarding the option to buy. I say that there was no option to buy in anybody's lease and I will leave this.

Apparently the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture then doesn't agree with the Minister of Agriculture, because they think there is no option to buy. In the very first Resolution on their presentation to the Government of a few weeks ago was that you do put in an option to buy.

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, you have asked the Member to come to order twice. He is now talking about an option to buy which is not included in the Motion in any way and he insists and persists on wandering all over the water front in regard to a subject that is very specific in the Motion.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, that is a factor and a consideration with respect to the lease, and certainly the Motion does deal with leases. Whether or not they have been granted, in what manner and so on. So any factor in the lease is most certainly subject for debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to read to the Hon. Member what the Motion asks for. "Whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program." It's asking under the point system. "If so the names of persons who received the lease and the description of land involved." If persons weren't the highest ones.

I realize the Member is asking for additional information but his Motion doesn't require that and I find it very difficult to keep order in the family, if a motion asks for specific item and the debate goes all over the field. I think additional motions should be placed if they want additional information.

Mr. D. G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is important on a Point of Order. We just saw a Motion turned down. Now, we never spoke to it because we never dreamt the Government would take that attitude but, I think it is very important that when a question is asked that the Member be allowed a great deal of latitude to make his case, to try and convince the Government that . . .

Mr. Messer: — What case?

Mr. Steuart: — Well, he says automatically,

“What case?” So this indicates why the Member must be allowed a great deal of latitude, to try and make a case for the Government to give legitimate information to us and to the public. I think you should in all fairness give him a great deal of latitude because there are a great many reasons why we need this information. Not just specifically to do with the name of the person and the point system, but Why? I think it’s important that those people over there recognize their responsibility to give us the information that we are asking. I think you have to allow a wide latitude.

Mr. Speaker: — I think Hon. Members will realize that regardless of how wide this speech goes, if this Motion for Return passes the only thing that the Legislature can ask for is what is covered by the Motion. And asking for other phases of the Land Bank could not be answered on this Motion. Therefore that is why I am suggesting that if additional information is sought, put on an additional Motion asking for the additional information, as the debate becomes redundant because this Motion doesn’t deal with it. I am hoping that, I’ve tried to allow some extra latitude on presenting his case, but I hope he can stay to the Motion.

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, it is quite correct that when there is a legitimate case or argument, the Government supplies the information. On the one he referred to, of course, there was not a legitimate question. And on that point, Mr. Speaker, I think it’s quite obvious to this House that no legitimate argument has ever been strengthened by more words from the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner).

Mr. Gardner: — If I may say so, I won’t comment on that. It’s about what we’ve been led to expect. This is typical from the Member for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and he can’t even go down and hold a meeting in his own seat any more. At least I can do that.

Mr. Speaker, if this is your ruling I realize that this is something that they are reasonably touchy about and I won’t pursue this matter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) as usual has wandered all over the water front in regard to an area that I think was quite specific, specifically stated in the Order for Return. He has mentioned some generalities which I hope you will give me the opportunity to respond to, Mr. Speaker, before turning directly to the two points that he has asked for in the Return.

He has referred to rumors that are about the province in regard to the sale, the allocation of Land Bank land and the price that was paid for that land. In doing so he referred to an editorial that was in the Leader-Post, March 5, 1974. I should like, Mr. Speaker, in responding to what the Member has said in the debate which relates to the Order to refer to a letter that I sent to the Editor of the Leader-Post, re the

accusations that were made pertaining to the activities of the Land Bank in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I would like for the records of the House then, to read the editorial and the letter that I sent to the Editor. The lead editorial in the Tuesday, March 5, 1974 edition of the Leader-Post entitled . . .

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. It's fine, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Member for Moosomin to stop reading, but here you are permitting the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to read a letter — that has nothing to do with the subject of the Motion — to the Editor of the Leader-Post in reply to an editorial in the Leader-Post. If you are going to call the Member for Moosomin to order surely you can call the Minister of Agriculture to order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Hon. Members will realize the position that we get into in this House when a Member strays from the Motion and brings in these points. It gives others the right to answer the statements made. That's why I was trying to condense this and keep it down. It's difficult for the Chair to prevent another Member from answering statements made if the statements were made on this Motion. If the Minister strays away from answering statements as raised, I shall call him to order. And I hope in future motions we can stay strictly to the Motion.

Mr. Messer: — Thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I would have normally stayed directly to what the Order asked for but the wanderings of the Member for Moosomin, I think, obligate me to respond and clarify the innuendoes that he brought forward in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — If I may then, Mr. Speaker, read the letter that I sent to the Editor of the Leader-Post, which says:

The lead editorial in the Tuesday, March 5, 1974 edition of the Leader-Post entitled 'Spending Shortcuts Erode Accountability' deals with a most important question about the accountability of government to the public.

I agree with your view that the politicians and senior officials must take great care to see that public money is spent wisely and that the principle of accountability to the public for the spending of funds is honored. Just as I feel government must act in a reasonable way in the spending of funds, I feel the Press must act in a reasonable way in handling the facts.

Our Press is the main source of information available to the public about the activities of government and a press that is careless with facts does a great disservice to the public that it serves.

The editorial to which I refer alleges that the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission, an agency funded by tax

revenues has never been required to make its transactions public and does not do so. (The same as the Member for Moosomin insinuated.) This is quite wrong. On December 14, 1973, I tabled in the Saskatchewan Legislature a copy of the first annual report of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. Copies of this Report were and are available to the Press and many members of the Saskatchewan Press did take the opportunity to study and analyse this report.

The report contains three detailed statements of the financial accounts of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. These statements include the balance sheet for the Saskatchewan Land Bank fund, a statement of revenue and expenditure for the Saskatchewan Land Bank fund and a detailed accounting of receipts and payments under the administration account of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission.

In addition the report contains an Appendix B entitled 'Statistical Summary of Land Purchases'. This statistical summary described in detail each individual land purchase including the land description by quarter section and provides the total purchase price for each transaction individually. The report of the Land Bank Commission includes a report from the Provincial Auditor indicating that he has examined the accounting procedures, accounting records and other supporting evidence and he indicates that the statements are correct and are in order.

I am not aware of any agency of government having ever before me published its financial affairs in the amount of detail that is provided in the Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. I very much favor having public agencies accountable to the public in this way and this is the reason why the Land Bank Commission does publicly report its affairs in such detail.

I go on to say that I feel this error contained in this editorial does the public a great disservice, however, since everyone wishing to review the affairs of the Land Bank Commission is left with the impression that it is impossible for them to do so. This is completely incorrect.

I won't go on further quoting that letter, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the editor of the Leader-Post as the Members opposite would use the facts and statistics that were brought forward in that annual report. But it was unfortunate and I again refer to the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) bringing to the attention of this House a subsequent editorial by the editor of the Leader-Post dated March 12th, where he again stated that the Land Bank Commission does not bring forward information in regard to specific sales of land. And that, Mr. Speaker, is completely untrue, and is not factual. As I pointed out in my letter to him of March 6 and as I have pointed out to Members of this Legislative Assembly on a number of occasions, each and every quarter section of land is shown in the annual report and the price paid for that land is also shown. It is unfortunate that we have Members, such as the Member for Moosomin, and obviously the editor of the Leader-Post who is somewhat confused but continues to say that this Government has refused to give the kind of information that they are asking in relation to each and every parcel of land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may turn more specifically to the Order which asks for whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program, and if so, the names of persons who received the leases and the description of the land involved.

I believe the Member for Moosomin said that everyone in Saskatchewan knows that all land is allocated by the point system under the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. That is not, in fact, so. He knows as do I, that there is a regulation, Regulation Number 18, which says and I will read it for you:

The Commission may refuse to offer a lease of Commission land to the lease applicant scoring the highest point total pursuant to Section 15 where; (i) in the opinion of the Commission unusual circumstances exist, which result in another applicant being more suitable to farm the land.

The reason for that section, Mr. Speaker, was one which is consistent with lands that are allocated under the Saskatchewan Lands Branch, Department of Agriculture, a section which was administered by the Members to your left when they were the Government, whereby land may not be allocated to a person who has the highest points scored due to the fact that the land in question is already being rented by an individual who scores something less than that applicant for the said lands. It would be folly and silly, I think to remove the person who is already relying for his livelihood on continuing to farm that piece of land simply because somebody else has been allocated a higher number of points in making application for that land when it came up for lease. So there are times when the Commission has to exercise some discretion in regard to hardship that we create for another farmer, we have such situations develop. This is the reason for Section 15, subsection (1).

It goes on to subsection (2) saying:

That the applicant has made a false statement in his application to lease Commission land.

And again, I therefore say that where false applications are made and the false applicant may be the high scorer, surely it is not the responsibility of the Land Bank Commission to then allocate the land to that person who has made a false application, even though he has scored higher points than someone who has made a legitimate and honest application.

In subsection (3):

The applicant's land base and total farm resources including land applied for, fail to meet size limitations established annually by the Commission.

Subsection (4):

The applicant will not utilize improvements where the Commission has advertised that the use of such improvements will be a condition of the lease.

Here again, it is obvious that we have a number of farming units in Saskatchewan that have attached to the land a house and perhaps intensive livestock operations. If we find a high-scoring applicant is not going to use those facilities, surely the

Commission should look at someone who is further down in points scored who needs and requires the living facilities and will also put the intensive livestock operations to use. So again, I think a valid and legitimate reason to have consideration given to an applicant who is not the highest scorer.

In subsection (5), it says:

The lease applicant fails to satisfy the Commission that he has (a) access to adequate machinery with which to farm the land, (b) adequate operating capital with which to operate his farming enterprises during the first year of his lease, (c) proven sources of funds for expansion of livestock enterprises proposed by him, (d) expected income adequate to meet family needs, (e) an acceptable arrangement with any person who will be associated with him in his farming enterprise.

In that particular subsection, Mr. Speaker, we have to relate to what a person has stated his resources are and consequently points will be allocated to him in relation to those resources. In many instances he may have overestimated the amount of capital that he may get from a lending institution which would give him higher points than he would normally have gotten, if that estimate had been more accurate.

When any of these unfortunate circumstances for that applicant arise, then the Commission, I think, has to have the freedom to allocate the land to a point scorer other than the highest.

Also another section of the regulations relate to the Appeal Board and Regulation No. 61 says:

Upon hearing an appeal, the Appeal Board may make such order in the matter as the Board considers just, including referring the matter back to the Commission for further consideration or for determination or making such an order as the Board considers ought to have been made by the Commission in the matter.

So that when we have a number of applicants for a given parcel of land and even though it may have been tentatively allocated to the high scorer, others may feel that some injustice was done and they consequently appeal the tentative allocation. It, I think, has to be within the power of the Board when reviewing those appeals in the cases that are brought forward by other individuals who feel that they should have had the land allocated to them, that they have to have freedom in reversing the order or the tentative allocation that the Land Bank Commission has obligated itself to adhere to.

The Leader of the Opposition has some smart remarks to toss across the floor. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite I think are fully aware of the points that I have brought forward to the Assembly this afternoon in regard to the needed flexibility so that there is, in fact, no hardship suffered by those who are making application for land.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Leader of the Opposition is still chattering in his chair, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to say that he knows full

well that they had an appeal board that operated in a very similar if not identical way as does the appeal board that is now operating in relation to Land Bank allocations and Lands Branch allocations. They had the same freedom and the same kind of powers in reversing decisions as related to the point system. Consequently it is impossible for us to be able, I think, to provide the information that the Member for Moosomin has asked for. Certainly the second portion of his question would be embarrassing to a number of people who have falsified their applications, who have for some reason incorporated in their applications estimations in regard to what may be available to them when in actuality this would not be made available to them. Mr. Speaker, it is because of these reasons that I ask the Assembly to turn down Order No. 164.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, this is a rather sad day, I think, as far as the Land Bank Commission is concerned. We have just listened to an oration by the Minister describing a system whereby the point system that he uses doesn't really mean anything. We have been given so many excuses and so many reasons that the point system doesn't need to be abided by, that in actual fact it doesn't mean anything.

You can think of practically any single individual situation of allocation in land where an exception could be made under one of those rules that he has enunciated to us here.

I want to refer momentarily to the letter that he speaks of in the Leader-Post. For example, I have the copy of the annual report and I admit the Leader-Post was partially wrong but the Minister is also very substantially wrong. For example, this edition of the Land Bank Commission Report is for the year ending March 31, 1973, one year ago. Now there is substantial reason to believe that this Session may well have adjourned before we even receive the copy of the year up until March 31, 1974. And in essence, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose that legally the Commission is required to publish a report and table it in this Session prior to March 31, 1974.

Mr. Messer: — It was tabled in December.

Mr. Weatherald: — It was not tabled in December. The December one which was tabled was approximately nine months behind time. The year was up March 31, 1973 and we didn't receive it for nine months after the thing was supposed to be produced. If we don't receive the 1974 copy for nine months afterwards, that report will be one and a half years behind the times before we ever receive it and will be totally useless.

We told the Government when the Land Bank Commission was being discussed here that it was folly and bad judgment on their part to produce a report ending March 31, because that was not reasonable for discussion in this Legislature. The report should have been produced and should have been completed by December 31, 1973, which would have given them three months and it would have been available for this Assembly. They paid no regard to us whatsoever and that is one of the points that the Leader-Post brings out. The information which is being provided by the Government is so far behind that it is utterly and practically useless. And the Minister apparently wishes to overlook that.

I want to say a few words about the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — On the motion, Mr. Speaker, one of the most flimsy excuses that we have ever heard this afternoon was the one just given by the Minister of Agriculture. He says that it is going to embarrass some people who had filed a false report if he gives their names. If he read the Resolution carefully he would find that we didn't even ask for such information. The Resolution, in fact, says that we want information:

- (a) Whether any leases have been granted to persons who did not have the greatest number of points under the lease allocation program.

That need not suggest anyone who filed a false application.

- (b) If so, the names of persons who received the leases and the description of the land involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that the Government needs to clear up is at least the number of individual cases that went to appeal that the appeal board overruled. That would be of interest. But the Minister has totally refused us that information.

A second point would be that there would be absolutely nothing wrong because it should have been his staff and his department that provided the information to him. If the department thought legitimately that a person should not get a piece of land but had received the most points, there should be absolutely nothing wrong whatsoever for the Minister to table in this House that situation and the information put on it by his officials who recommended that the person receiving the most points should not receive the land. We would accept that type of an explanation and I think the people of Saskatchewan would accept that type of explanation. But as long as the Government continues to try and hide every single case where people did not receive land and they had the most points, and unfortunately there are getting to be more and more of these situations around the province, as long as they continue to hide the point system, refuse to say how many were changed by the Appeal Board, we cannot help but conclude that the Government is attempting to hide and is juggling the system through the point system for political purposes, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 12 — Preserve Integrity of Canadian Football

Mr. E. C. Whelan (Regina North West) moved, seconded by Mr. Baker, (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly recognizes the importance of Canadian

football as a distinctly Canadian recreational and cultural activity, urges appropriate action to preserve the integrity of Canadian football and supports statements by the Honourable Marc Lalonde, Minister of National Health and Welfare in this regard.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the matter of our position and the need for support to retain professional football in its present form in Canada was raised by some young football fans in my constituency.

It was urged by the group that we should support the Federal Government's position and, first, we get the backing of the Government caucus; second, of the Saskatchewan Legislature and third, the people of the province. The Resolution on the Order Paper indicates support by the Government caucus. Some of the Members opposite have met with me regarding the Resolution; therefore, I anticipate support from the Opposition.

It is hoped that the Resolution will eventually have the endorsement of the people of Saskatchewan and I hope that we shall be able to forward it to the Hon. Marc Lalonde and to all party leaders at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Football League has five teams in western Canada. All of them are community-sponsored. Saskatchewan has a team in the league known as the Roughriders, that is not only community-sponsored, but provincially sponsored. In spite of adverse weather conditions, competition from television and the rising cost of operating, this professional team — the Roughriders — has remained near the top of the Canadian Football League year after year. In addition, although they are a professional team and although it is a professional game, and although there have been increased costs, the population of this province has increased its support. Seating capacity at their home field — Taylor Field, in Regina — has been enlarged to accommodate the team time and time again.

Why should we support them? Why should we take this position? Because the game is a Canadian game and is played in a manner that Canadians like. The way the team is handled involves the community and the province. The Saskatchewan team has been in the Grey Cup finals year after year. And year after year the Grey Cup has created an interest in the sport that I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, unifies the nation. It has a co-ordinating significance that we, I am sure, as representatives of the people of this province must benefit Canada, that it is of immeasurable value to us as Canadians.

Aside from the fact that Canadian football is a unifying force, it has developed Canadian athletes who are known for their achievements on the field. Some of them have used football to extend their leadership in the business world, in the community and in politics. The rivalry that once existed between the East and West had gradually dissolved. Today the Canadian Football League is functioning as a co-operative endeavor. The five western clubs are community owned, the four eastern clubs are privately owned. But even so the differences have been, Mr. Speaker, quietly reconciled. An equalization fund has been worked out which has been advantageous to clubs such as the Saskatchewan Roughriders who, at the same time, when confronted with the amount that they have drawn from the equalization fund, can show that since they have finished in the playoffs

consistently for the past ten or twelve years that they have been great contributors, they have contributed greatly in equalizing. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the proceeds from all finals and semi-finals go into a pot that is split equally among the team.

The introduction of the World Football League into Canada I suggest to this House will challenge the very existence of community sponsored football, whether it is in Saskatchewan, Winnipeg, Edmonton or British Columbia. What do we have to lose? Well, as I said, the Grey Cup and all its significance, the sponsorship of junior teams like the Rams and the Hilltops, community affairs functions such as the Quarterback Club, the assistance that the Roughriders give to organized football in the high schools, the very identity of the Canadian game itself. Though the argument may be put that we need the American influence. Well, my knowledge of other teams is not complete but in Saskatchewan, as the Resolution says, Canadian football is a distinctly Canadian recreational cultural activity and, Mr. Speaker, we should preserve it.

What are the arguments for the intrusion of the World Football League? They say they need more teams in centres like Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. Well, if that is the case the answer could be another Canadian football team, if there aren't enough tickets available for football fans in those communities. As well, possibly, teams could be organized in cities like Oshawa or London or in the Atlantic Provinces. They say, too, that people like to watch American football. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are very close to the United States border and American football in eastern Canada, they are within driving distance. Certainly American football is on television sets the length and breadth of the country. They say something else and perhaps this is true, and it seems to come through loud and clear — we want to make profit.

Mr. Speaker, I concede the right to make a profit but not at the expense of the Grey Cup or community football, or the Canadian recreational and cultural activity. Canadian football belongs to this country. It is our game. It is part of our lives. I suggest that it is not for sale to entrepreneurs and financial barons who by the existence of their American franchises would snuff out a Canadian sport as a national game. This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, asks the Minister to take appropriate steps. The Minister who held this portfolio before him, as early as 1972, sounded the warning to these same Canadians who would welcome the trespassers to the Canadian football scene. They should have known that we would meet them with the stiffest body belt we could hand out. They should have known that. To the Minister we say, pass legislation that will put a stop to those who threaten the Canadian Football League, this community team and the Grey Cup.

Some may argue about the legality of such action and some may forget that this is a Canadian project, that it is a Canadian custom, that it is a part of the Canadian way of life and it cannot be taken away. Many times in many ways, year in and year out the people who support teams like the Roughriders have said, we like it the way it is. The Hon. Minister Marc Lalonde knows that and he should know from this Legislature, speaking with one voice, that we like the Canadian game and we like community sponsored football and we want it to stay in Saskatchewan. If there is need for expansion I suggest it should be in Canada by Canadians in the Canadian way. It is necessary that this be preserved; if it is necessary, be preserved by legislation, fine.

In short we are saying, Canadian football for Canadians as opposed to American football for profit. Not only for profit, we are told that the World Football League team that has their franchise is already operating in Toronto and is looking at Canadian teams for talent and thinking of hiring coaches, coaches who have been long established in Canada.

It is my hope that this Resolution will receive unanimous support, that we will deal with it today and forward the full text of the debate to the Minister and Opposition Party Leaders at Ottawa. The questions before the House that we must answer when we are giving directions to the Minister are: Do we want to preserve Canadian football as it is with the five community teams in western Canada, the Roughriders, the Regina Rams and the Hilltops in high school football, and equalization payments and the Canadian game with some professional players from the United States, with our own rules and the Grey Cup. Is this worth preserving? I think the answer is here. We could give the answer by supporting the motion which I now move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a few words and in initiating my remarks I am going to tell the Member that I am going to support his Resolution but not for some of the reasons that he indicated in this House this afternoon.

First of all I want to say at the beginning that I want to caution Members of the House and perhaps members of the Canadian public that I do not support the principle of Government interference in locating franchises in professional sport. I think that franchises should be located by fan support. However, I think this situation is a different one for which I should like to explain.

I believe that the Government's role in the field of sport, whether it be amateur or professional, should be limited to specific areas. 1. Its major role should be to protect the athlete, whether he be a 15 or 16-year old boy from getting tied up with a professional team, whether it be the option clause, whether it be his right to market the talent that he has available. 2. The Government should enter into the sporting field to prevent illegal gambling or betting or anything that can distort the end result of the game itself. 3. They should set up the kind of controls and regulations to see that we have an honest product. That the game is played for the game itself. But I do not agree with the Member when he says that we should prevent the Americans from coming in and taking over American franchises. I don't believe that this Resolution in any way should be considered anti-American. I would like to point out to the Member that this is not a question of foreign control. John Bassett is a Canadian. His football team would be a Canadian team in a World Football Association the same as Edmonton, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Quebec and Toronto in the World Hockey Association participate in a North American League. And I don't think that we should confuse this as an anti-American or any way a move to keep professional sport from anywhere across the border entering into Canada. For example, I think that the Montreal Expos have become a part of the Canadian scene. Certainly I would welcome a baseball team into the city of Toronto and the city of Vancouver or perhaps even the city of Winnipeg. Even Regina at some future date. We the people in western Canada would have the same opportunity of enjoying the thrills of the National Baseball

League as those of the people in Montreal. I think of the tremendous opportunity that young Canadian boys have got in going to the United States to play in the NHL and that NHL originated in Canada. I think of what the Canadian hockey player and the Canadian athlete has done for world hockey.

Today all of us watched here Team Canada a year ago playing against the Russians. This originated in Canada and we exported hockey, I think we should be proud of it and in no way should we try to monopolize an individual sport for an individual country. Therefore I cannot agree with the reasoning that we want to stop Americans from coming in to get franchises in Canada. We are not against any Canadian taking out a franchise in any kind of a team.

But the Canadian Football League is different and that is the reason we should support this Resolution because we are not concerned about individual franchises in the Canadian Football League. I think the fan support will determine the success or failure of the Toronto Argonauts or the Montreal Allouettes or the Saskatchewan Roughriders. What we are, what we must remember is that the Canadian Football League and its success is not related to individual teams, it is related to the league as a whole. The Member has brought up two or three of the reasons. First of all, as we know, it is an expensive operation. The Saskatchewan Roughriders now spend in excess of \$1 million just to operate the Roughrider football team that we like and respect so much. But we have now a gate equalization formula as the Member indicated, where fan support in Toronto helps to pay for the Saskatchewan Roughriders if they do have a bad year or the Saskatchewan Roughriders might contribute to Calgary or Edmonton because of the fact that it is a national league with national interests.

Second, the TV market is perhaps the most important thing; because if all of a sudden there is competition for the TV market, then the TV contract such as is available to western Canadian football teams where they will get a share, and the TV market of Toronto and Montreal which is not available to us in western Canada, certainly the TV receipts are going to be much less. So I suggest to you that if we happen to lose Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver, it could destroy the league and particularly those teams in western Canada.

What is even more important, Mr. Speaker, and the reason that I want to support this Resolution is, as the Member has indicated, the Canadian Football League is a distinctively Canadian game. We are not talking about bringing in a baseball team like the Montreal Expos, we are not bringing in someone to compete against a distinctively Canadian game. For example, one thing that I really dislike is to watch the Spokane Rockets competing for the Canadian Allan Cup. When I think of the Canadian Football game I think of the 12 players versus the 11 players. I can remember coaching a university club and going down to Mexico and my team played half the game on Canadian rules and half on American. If everybody had seen that particular game they would have recognized the distinction between the two games. The wider field, the longer field, the punt return and so forth and we could go on and on to indicate those other aspects that make our game distinctively Canadian. It is something that we want to hang on to. But even more than that the Canadian Football League is a national pastime in Canada. I don't care what beer parlor or what café or what living room a person goes into in western Canada or in Canada today during

the football season and everybody is talking about Ronny Lancaster or George Reed or the pass that Gord. Barwell caught or the touchdown that was missed.

The Grey Cup is the top Canadian attraction and I am afraid if we get competition from an outside league with an American market we may endanger that very, very important Canadian attraction. I would hope that if the Federal Government and Mr. Lalonde does anything to interfere with the coming of the Toronto Northmen, if that is the name of their world football team, it will only be for a specific time and then it will be reviewed at a later date. There may be an opportunity in Canada for two professional football leagues and I think the situation at this time makes it important that we examine that.

I also want to say that, as the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) has indicated, the Canadian Football League is also perhaps the strongest single thing in Canada that brings about a Canadian identity. We don't really wonder whether the Montreal Allouettes speak French or English. I don't think when the Saskatchewan Roughriders play in the city of Montreal whether the people there are worried about western alienation or whether or not they speak English. They don't really worry about race or color or creed and that is the great thing about sports of any kind, of any type.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that was rather interesting was that Lorne Harasen in a hot line had a survey as to what the people of Saskatchewan felt about this particular subject. The number of people in itself was significant because I have never heard of a survey on a hot line that had the kind of response that Lorne Harasen got for this one. It was something like over 2,000 people in one day telephoned in. It was almost 2 — 1 in favor of Mr. Lalonde's position. So I am going to support this motion, I am going to support it because of the fact that I do believe that the Canadian Football League has not matured at this stage sufficiently to stand on its feet in competition because of the Canadian population and its size. I hope that it is not for an indefinite period of time but until such time as we do mature I will be glad to support it and I hope that all Members of the House join with me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — In seconding this Motion I am very pleased to do so and I want to commend the Minister of Health, Mr. Lalonde in Ottawa, for having the courage in trying to do something, to preserve the Canadian identity in the area of football. It will no doubt also be a future step for the identity of other sports in this country.

I want to support it because as you know Regina is the home of the famous Saskatchewan Roughriders. We won one Grey Cup Trophy since 1909 in 1966, hopefully we will win a few more. But this has made our city a sports community. It is good to have a professional team in a city like Regina, it does much for that community and because of this we are known as the most sports-minded city throughout this country and being the smallest in the league for Canadian football.

But there is one thing we are overlooking and I think the Minister of Health sees in it, that you can have too much professional sport at the expense of amateur sports. You take

the World Hockey Organization, while it has filled the gap to take more of our hockey players, but it has also become a haven for a lot of the 'has been' hockey players too and has become a very costly thing.

The NHL and the WHA are in and out of court most of the time. I think the NHL failed because they didn't expand the hockey franchises to more cities over the years.

I say that had the hockey players all come from the United States, NHL would never have been in Canada over these years. The only reason we shared it with the people across the line was because we produced 95 per cent of the hockey players.

I make it abundantly clear that the NHL is a great organization and that it is unfortunate that it didn't expand because we wouldn't have needed the World Hockey Association today.

An Hon. Member: — It had to come.

Mr. Baker: — Yes, I agree with you, it had to come because they didn't do their job. I think Canadian football has to do its job too in expanding to other centres. Cities like Halifax should have a team; Quebec City, Victoria and even Roy Romanow's little city of Saskatoon should have one.

I think that this is where the crux lies and that is about the extent of our professional sports such as football could go. To have another competitive set of teams across Canada, would break either one or the other. There is only so much money to be spent by 23 million Canadians and it is only a small percentage that takes part in professional sports or go as spectators. I think that Canadian football has given Canada a real identity.

I know from a lot of American people whom I have talked to would like to have our football there as well. They think that ours is, in many ways, much superior to their own. I want to preserve that identity. The Canadian football league does give us a real image and Canada in many ways must develop an image. We must develop an image in the cultural field and here we are doing it in the field of sports. We are trying to become masters in our homes from the standpoint of industry. This, in essence, is the same thing.

If we are going to participate in football, then why don't we have world tournaments. I think the American people are beginning to realize that our football players and teams are getting to be quite good. True enough we bring in American imports and that is good. I am all for that. But by expanding more teams in Canada we can utilize and take care of many more of our young people in the amateur field in football or in any other sport.

We are doing a lot of these things at the expense of amateur sports and Canada cannot afford too many professional fields of endeavor of this sort. It does cost money. I know what the Roughriders expend each year and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Regina has been indirectly contributing towards this team for many, many years. For instance, we reduced the rent on Taylor Field back in 1960-61 when the Riders were in the hole. Today they are the richest club in Canada and have the most money in the bank.

The equalization payments work out fine, but I want to say that it is done co-operatively through memberships. It is a sort of a publicly owned team, and I want to keep it that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to add my words of support to the Minister of Health in Ottawa and I should hope that everyone in this House does likewise. I love football. I have my season tickets like many here and I want to keep the Saskatchewan team here. When we are winners we are known as the Saskatchewan Riders when we lose we are known as the Regina Riders. However, I still give them my loyal support.

There isn't more that I want to add, but let's give this man in Ottawa real support because I think it took a lot of courage on his part, as I said earlier, to come right out and say, 'We want to save Canadian football'. Let's not only save it, let's expand it so that many more of our young people can play football, as many more are coming up through the ranks of amateur sports, through junior teams like the Rams, Hilltops and so forth. We want to utilize these fine players. The only way it can be done is by expanding the leagues we have. Let's keep it Canadian. If we are going to participate, let's participate at world tournaments as Canadian teams with a Canadian identity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, we are interested in the comments of the Members opposite and we were a little disappointed in the strident anti-Americanism of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan).

It is very, very interesting to note when we try and attack certain American interests in Canadian sports that we seem to forget some things like the extremely popular Vancouver Canucks, which wouldn't have gotten off the ground in spite of its being Canada's national game.

We get basketball participation in Canada through the Buffalo team, which plays a lot of its games in Toronto. The same thing with the Seattle Sonics they play many of their games in Vancouver.

It is disheartening, as the Member for Milestone said, to see particular American teams winning Canadian championships. Portland was mentioned. There is also the Warroad Lakers that have come into our national game and cut a wide swath through western Canadian hockey. But to take the anti-American approach we ought to remember that the investment in the Toronto team is Canadian investment. I think the proper argument in this case is the one the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) used, and that is, recognizing Canadian football as being a distinctively Canadian game.

The game, when it is shown in the United States, draws more people, more television viewers than the American sport. It is a more entertaining game. Certainly there is every justification for the actions by the Hon. Marc Lalonde, Minister of National Health and Welfare to take the actions that he has to protect the Canadian game.

Just a little out of curiosity, this afternoon we have taken quite a political interest in football and I wonder how

many Members have season tickets to the Saskatchewan Roughriders. Hold up your hands. Just a very interesting little note here that the Members of the Opposition have more season tickets than the Members on the Government side, although they are outnumbered 45 to 15. I think the same question could be asked of how many Members in the Legislature are on the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Roughriders and I am willing to venture a guess that there are more on the Opposition side actively participating in this community organization than are on the Government side.

I question whether there is not a little bit of political opportunism on the part of the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), which, again, is a little disheartening because this is a community club in Saskatchewan of which we are very proud. It is certainly an asset to the Canadian Football League. I am not so sure but that the Members opposite are not doing a disservice to the Saskatchewan Roughriders by encouraging expansion. I have every confidence in the CFL in being able to decide whether or not there are sufficient moneys for expansion in order to maintain cities that take from the gate equalization and don't contribute.

I think there is another aspect that has not been considered and that is that I personally would like to see the CFL increase the number of Canadians playing in Canadian football teams. I think that that would increase the opportunity for our Canadian athletes to be able to participate in Canadian football. I think that it would add to the game and I think that is the direction that I personally would hope, speaking for myself, that the Canadian Football League would take. That would be the proper method in my concern of increasing so-called Canadian content and Canadian football.

I will support the motion.

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, as one of those Directors referred to by the Member for Lumsden, and as well as football fan and a season ticket holder for many years, I should also like to support the Resolution.

The Canadian Football League, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a uniquely Canadian institution. It is true that the game, today, is dominated by many American players but it should be pointed out as well that many of those players live in Canada during the off-season and many of them stay here after their careers are over.

The League's history can be traced back to the earlier history of this country. I believe there are records of football games being played in eastern Canada in the 1880s. I say the League is a Canadian institution, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the American domination, in that over half of the players are Canadian, that all of the teams are owned by Canadians and in particular western Canada where they are community owned.

The League has its own unique set of rules and I think that when the game is compared with the American game, there is really no comparison and that the Canadian game comes out on top every time.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Lalonde has been criticized to some extent for this decision that he has made. It has been

pointed out that the Government of Canada did not intervene when the World Hockey Association moved into this country nor when the Montreal Expos moved into the country.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to those people that both of those institutions were international in character and that hockey and baseball, for many years, have been played on both sides of the border. The Canadian Football League is not in this position. It is in the position of being a body unto itself and as such should be protected.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the World Football League on its budgeting will spend anywhere between \$5 million and \$7 million on any team. The CFL budget, I again advise, is anywhere between \$1 million and \$2 million. It is obvious that the teams in western Canada and perhaps even Ottawa and Hamilton in the East, simply could not compete at the same level as the World Football League will if it does get off the ground when it has a budget of that nature.

If we can't compete it would mean the end of Canadian football, as we know it today, and I don't think that anyone in this Legislature wants that to happen.

Accordingly, I welcome the comments by Mr. Lalonde. The only thing I can say by way of criticism is that I wish he had made them some time ago, before the Toronto team got the foothold that it did.

I think it is significant, as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister made his remarks in the city of Regina. I think that the city of Regina is really the capital of Canadian football because of the fine teams it has fielded in the past, and perhaps even more important, in the number of executives that it has had serving on the Canadian Football League and the earlier organizations. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I can think of my predecessor in this Legislature, the late Don McPherson. I don't think anybody in Canada worked harder for Canadian football than he did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — He spent many long hours with no pay whatsoever and he only had the satisfaction of seeing the league become the success that it has become.

Mr. Speaker, many of the remarks that I had intended to make have already been made by other Hon. Members so I will not repeat them, however, I do indicate that I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might add my words of support to the motion.

There are people who have said that this is similar to baseball and hockey and I deny that this is so. When the Expos came to Montreal there was no professional league of that calibre anywhere in Canada. Consequently the addition of

professional baseball to Canada was, without a doubt, a worthy addition to our sporting scene.

With respect to hockey, while we had all the players, we had very few of the teams. In fact, it was only with a great deal of pressure from governmental and other people that the National Hockey League was induced after a round or two of expansion, to add a team from Vancouver, making a total of three teams professionally at that level in Canada.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the situation is not at all similar to hockey or baseball. We have here a fully organized and developed viable professional league in Canada, which is now threatened, I suggest, by the intrusion of the new league into Canada.

The presence of the new football club in Toronto would, in my view, spell the death knell to the CFL. There is no question, in my view, that financially they cannot compete if one of the major markets for television is, in fact, taken over by this new dominant force. I might say that football will suffer at all levels in Canada. I have no doubt that college football would suffer and I have no doubt that the junior teams, which today receive tremendous financial assistance and other help from the CFL would deteriorate. Young players, in Canada, who play for the joy of playing without any thought of going professional would, in fact, be deprived in short order of the opportunity of playing football at a senior-junior level. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion wholeheartedly and I concur with the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone).

I do not agree with every remark made today. I think we tend to get a little bit oversentimental about some of these things and perhaps that is fine on occasion. I believe that government involvement in sporting and athletic programs is worthy and essential. I agree, however, it may well fall short of a lot of financial assistance to professional clubs. I have not totally come to grips with what should be and should not be the level of participation by the Federal Government. Perhaps it is sufficient and perhaps the maximum of its contribution to the CFL in Canada should be a protection from intrusions of leagues from outside Canada.

In any event those who remarked that the Government should not be involved in the athletics and sports field do not receive my support. There is no question about it . . .

Mr. Cody: — Division again!

Mr. MacLeod: — Someone has suggested that there is division in our caucus. I would have to suggest in response that our caucus tends to be a very free and open caucus where Members have no hesitation whatsoever in expressing their views and the right of free speech is totally protected.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that so many Members on this side of the House have memberships in the Roughrider Football Club, that they are in various committees of the Club, are directors of the Club and have a number of season tickets.

I understood one Member to suggest that the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) did not have a season ticket or

a pair of season tickets and I would be disappointed if that were so because it would, indeed, tend to smack of political opportunism. I trust that the Hon. Member in closing debate in due course will clarify this matter for us, because certainly I would not want to suggest or accuse him of political opportunism. I did notice that the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) did have his hand up when it was suggested that he had a membership. I know that he attends virtually every football contest in Regina and consequently I have no doubt that he has done his part and he has season tickets and may well have had them almost as long as people such as myself.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I indicate my support without reservation, without any attempt to an amendment of the motion.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion but for really a very different reason, I have to admit, than anybody in this House.

I went to one football game in Taylor Field and really to me that was three hours of the most wasted time. I don't enjoy football, I don't watch it on television. I am just not a football fan. On the other hand I rise to support this motion because I realize that I am a minority. I am sure that the great majority of my constituency like to watch football. I have personally got quite a bit of complaints that we have too much football and they wished the national football wasn't on TV. I have heard this in rural areas quite often but I do know that the majority of the people of my constituency are football fans. I just can't see anything in it, I am not a football fan but I will still support the motion because I think it is a good motion.

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture & Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I think I should like to add my words of support to this motion as well. I want to — I regret that I must get into this but I think I must — but I want to state very explicitly that I regret very much that the debate on which we obviously have got unanimous approval has become mired by the remarks of the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I don't say that to kind of play a little bit of politics in here, I say it because I mean it. Because that was an awful lot of nonsense. Sure, as the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) has just got up and said, he does not enjoy football and that's his right. There are certain activities that I don't enjoy either so I do not go and participate in them or watch them and that's my right too. I happen to have a season ticket to the Saskatchewan Roughriders; I attend only about one-third of the games because as Members opposite will know in the political business there is a lot of work and you don't always have the time to attend. There are other Members who do not buy tickets because football isn't their thing and that's their right. I am really seriously sorry that the Member for Lumsden would bring in that kind of debate and then proceed to praise himself and display an ego that is somewhere, I don't know how high, and thus lead away from the quality of this debate which I consider a very important one.

Some Members in this House are from constituencies that are a long way from Regina and it is impractical for them to attend. The MLA for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) is probably an example, a great distance from Regina and he does not have a season ticket

probably and maybe he does, but his son and daughter go from Saskatoon. But what has that got to do with this Resolution? I know that the Member for Redberry supports every community activity in his constituency that are near by. He's a supporter of his community and that is good.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the remarks of the Member for Albert Park who said that he does not agree with those who say that there should not be governments involved in sports or recreation activities. I agree with him because I think there must be to some extent. If there is not then only those who are most able financially or otherwise will have the opportunity to participate and I think any government has some responsibility to provide opportunities to the greatest number of people or the greatest number of citizens in this country or in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the points that have been raised are good ones and I do not intend in this debate to repeat them. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), as has the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) mentioned television rights and the money that comes from there to the Canadian Football League and that is a very important factor in the maintenance of the league. They both mentioned equalization and that makes it possible for some even in our largest city such as Montreal to exist during periods or during years of depression for them. And if the team, which I believe is the Toronto Northmen, is established in Toronto there is no question in my mind that the television rights eventually and that the equalization payments eventually will become eroded very seriously. I think we all know what that means. I think we all know that that means that the Saskatchewan Roughriders, that the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, that possibly Calgary or Edmonton, or both, are not going to exist and we will have lost what we have in the embodiment of the Canadian Football League.

I don't think any of us want that. I don't think anybody in Canada wants that and that's why we lend our support to Mr. Lalonde in the campaign which he has now undertaken. I want to put on record in this House that I did, along with the Minister in charge of Recreation in Manitoba, Mr. Toupin and the Minister in Alberta, Mr. Schmidt, jointly send a telegram to Mr. Lalonde several weeks ago lending our support for making some effort in keeping the Canadian Football League intact so that it can contribute in the way that it has in the past so they can continue to do so in the future. We have done that because we agree with Mr. Lalonde and we are prepared and willing to lend them all the support that we can.

I noted in the newspaper in the afternoon an article about the lack of support by the Canadian Football League itself to Mr. Lalonde. The league has been quiet about its position. I also want to say that I am a little disappointed in that because the Canadian Football League has a great deal at stake here it has a responsibility and I think that they should be staking a position on this matter. Up to now they have not done so and I think they should. Now with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I want just to re-emphasize that along with, I am sure, all of the Members of this Assembly, I will support this motion wholeheartedly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words on the Resolution as moved by the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter the debate but I am going to be very, very brief. I notice that most of the people who spoke on this Resolution are from Regina. I am not certain who the individual was but I heard someone say Regina Roughriders and I resent that remark, they are the Saskatchewan Roughriders. In my opinion the Saskatchewan Roughriders would not be successful if they did not receive the support of all the people of this province. I also wish to take the opportunity to state that even though I don't attend very many games, only two in my life, that I should like to attend a lot more.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that even our sportscasters especially on radio when they broadcast the games between Saskatchewan and any other team often make the mistake of saying the Regina Roughriders and I want to put it on the record that we from the rest of Saskatchewan resent those remarks. Through raffles and other community activities such as organizing groups and tours, we do make a conscious effort of sending people from Saskatoon to Regina to support the Saskatchewan Roughriders. I am absolutely convinced that if the World Football League is allowed into Canada or whether it is Bassett, a Canadian or whether it is another individual, an American or whether it is a European, I am convinced that Marc Lalonde is doing the right thing to protect Canadian football; maybe not to protect Canadian football in Toronto or Vancouver or Montreal but certainly in Saskatchewan. We just couldn't survive, just no way and so for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my support to the motion that is before us. Because I think it is in the interest of Canadians and certainly in the interest of those of us who enjoy on a Sunday afternoon or Monday afternoon sitting in our back yards when we can, turn on the radio, and have a barbecue and listen to one of those exciting games that only Ronny Lancaster and the Saskatchewan Roughriders can provide for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have gained the support of the Legislature for this very worthwhile Resolution. When I was speaking I thought I was very careful to be non-political and not anti-American but pro-Canadian.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Most of the remarks used or quoted in the speech were remarks that came from the Hon. John Munro, the Hon. Marc Lalonde and people who were closely associated with football in this province down through the years. I can hardly be anti-American. Many of my relatives and some of my closest relatives have been very closely associated with American sport. For instance one of my relatives is the business manager of the Detroit Tigers.

You know they raised the matter of who has a season ticket to the Saskatchewan Roughriders. If I never went to a Roughrider game or never bought a ticket I would support this Resolution but my neighbor and I have had a season ticket on a shared basis for years, Mr. Speaker, even though my attendance is sometimes difficult to arrange at Roughrider games.

March 19, 1974

I just want to ask a question by way of answering some of the criticisms that were fired away regarding asking the Hon. Minister to use legislation to help protect, yes protect, is probably the right word, Canadian football. I ask the question: could we survive as a Saskatchewan team? And I am being very pointed in saying Saskatchewan Roughriders particularly after the remark the Hon. Member — what's that Saskatoon Constituency, Nutana something or other?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — If the World Football League gives the franchise to some leading businessman in Saskatoon, could we survive as a Saskatchewan community sponsored team? You know we stop importation of other items and challenge other less important aspects of our day to day living and I say to the Hon. Marc Lalonde don't hesitate to stop the importation of the World Football League if it threatens this Canadian game.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the support of the entire Legislature on this Resolution. It is my intention to forward a copy of the Resolution to the Hon. Minister and the Leaders of the Opposition Parties at the earliest possible date.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

Resolution No. 16 — International Development Programs

Mr. D. L. Faris (Arm River) moved, seconded by Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that: (1) the Government of Saskatchewan should match annually dollar for dollar the money raised for international development purposes by non-governmental agencies in Saskatchewan; (2) part of this money should be spent in international development education in the province of Saskatchewan; (3) there be on-going consultation between the Government of Saskatchewan and the non-governmental agencies as to these international development programs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Resolution which pertains to international development is that the Government of Saskatchewan participate with the people of Saskatchewan in attacking the greatest single problem that faces mankind. That problem is the widening gap between the rich nations and the poor nations. The churches in Canada have recently been active in "Ten Day's For World Development." Bruce McLeod when he visited Regina described the world situation as follows. If you were to imagine the population of the world to be four people and the wealth of the world to be four apples — the people of North America would be represented by something less than one of those persons but they would possess three of those apples and be biting into the fourth one.

It's of such a world that Barbara Ward said:

To live simply, to love greatly, to give without stinting, to see a brother in all mankind. This is no longer a remote theory of human behavior. It is the inescapable recipe for planetary survival.

Let's look a little closer at this planet of ours. What are the facts? Cansave, one of the voluntary agencies says that these are the facts:

1. Poverty is a fact. In the developing nations families struggle to live on \$200 - \$400 per year and many of the families on less than that. Yet in Canada \$5,000 is considered the poverty line for a family of four.
2. Hunger is a fact. Seventy per cent of the world's children under six suffer from malnutrition. Besides leading to disease, malnutrition and protein deficiency in early life causes permanent mental and physical damage.
3. Sickness is a fact. Fifty per cent of the world's children are chronically ill. Only 10 per cent of the population is reached by even the simplest of health services. This is understandable when you consider that there is only one doctor per 25,000 people in many countries. There is one doctor in Canada for every 825 of us. Of every 100 children born in developing countries, 20 will die within the first year. Infant mortality rates are 20 to 40 times higher than in Europe and North America.
4. Illiteracy is a fact. Forty-five per cent of the world's children will receive no formal education at all. And of those who do enter primary school only a small number will be able to finish. Barely 10 per cent of the world's population is literate. In Canada there is one teacher for 85 of our children. In Africa there is one teacher for every 600 children.
5. Overpopulation is a fact. The annual population growth in the underdeveloped nations is 3½ times that of the developed nations. One hundred children are born every 30 seconds.

Now if these facts are too large for us to grasp, I think the example given by Robert Heilbroner in his book "The Great Ascent" helps bring the situation down to our size. Here are 12 things we can do to reduce our standard of living to that which is endured by millions of people living in the developing nations:

1. You can give away all your furniture except a table, a chair and a few old blankets.
2. Take away all except your oldest suit of clothes for each person. The head of the family keeps the only pair of shoes.
3. Move into a tool shed in a shanty town having no public services.
4. Empty the pantry and the refrigerator of all food except a little flour, salt and sugar, a few mouldy potatoes, some onions and dried beans.
5. Remove all electric wiring and plumbing. Carry your water from a village shed.

March 19, 1974

6. Give up all appliances, tools and pets as we know them.
7. Cancel all your subscriptions: The Family is illiterate.
8. Listen to the one radio in town, and probably the one station.
9. Find that the nearest medicine is ten miles away, with a midwife in charge of the clinic.
10. Dispose of all insurance, pensions, bank accounts and savings, leaving only a cash hoard of \$5 for the family.
11. Of the \$100 to \$300 cash income scratched from your three tenant acres, give one-third to the landlord and one-tenth to the money lender.
12. Plan that your life will be shortened by 25 to 30 years.

If we would do this we would be able to experience something of the situation of the average person on the face of planet earth.

This Resolution is brought about due to the efforts of the non-governmental organizations in this province. They have been doing a great job over the years, some of them are church organizations, there are other non-governmental organizations such as Oxfam and Cansave. These are the organizations that have been pioneering the efforts to try to get people on our part of the globe to take our responsibility towards those who don't have what we do. There are these organizations and also individuals, like Fred Brown, a businessman here in Regina who saw a film on the hungry in Ethiopia and was moved by it to take some personal action to buy the film and see that it is transported around the province for groups to see. Fred got in touch with us here in the Legislature and together with Gordon Grant the Member for Regina Whitmore, we got our caucuses together and saw that film. It is a very unusual thing for our parties to get together on anything but I believe that here is an issue that all people of conscience throughout the world are, in fact, concerned about. I certainly hope that we will see support for this Resolution from both sides of the House.

I have seen to it that material was distributed to all the Members of the Legislature on the background of this Resolution. Therefore, I won't bother to go through that material in great detail.

I want to point out however, that the first part of the Resolution, that is "That the Government of Saskatchewan should match annually dollar for dollar the money raised for international development purposes by the non-governmental agencies . . ." has a number of important aspects.

One is that we want to see this done annually, that is on a regular kind of basis. The Government of Saskatchewan has previously in 1968, for instance in regard to Nigeria, Biafra, and in 1971 in regard to Bangladesh, made contributions. There is an on-going problem in the world. And the only way for us to meet it responsibly is for an on-going kind of program.

The other point I want to make is that the importance of these international development programs sponsored by

non-governmental organizations. These are the organizations that have taken the initiative in this area. They are organizations that are extremely effective, they are aggressive, and they have an independence that governments don't have. They can move into very touchy international political situations when no government could hope to do so. I believe they are a very logical instrument to serve this purpose.

The second part of the Resolution says that part of this money should be spent in international development education in the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to say that I think this is equally important with the first part of the Resolution.

The first part of the Resolution might cost the Province of Saskatchewan something like hopefully \$1 million or so a year, that is if we were to match grants. The non-governmental organizations currently are raising something like \$750,000 a year. I would hope to see that increased. If we were to match it with provincial grants that in turn would be matched by federal money, dollar for dollar through CIDA so that one dollar contributed by an individual would grow to be four dollars. This would be significant.

But as I say this second part in regard to development education is equally important. Because as I look at the problem in the world, I think one of the roots of the problem is that we don't understand why this situation is the way it is. Far too many people don't understand that it is not just an accident that this situation has arisen. That, in fact it is not only that these people are in a terrible condition but that in large part we are responsible for this situation. That the wealthy, the developed nations of the world through the terms of trade have in fact, been riding on the backs of these people. I think we should understand that even in our efforts to aid them that through 'tied' aid our country has benefited more than these countries.

For instance, in Saskatchewan since 1970, government and business in our province have received almost \$3 million in aid contracts through CIDA. And then of course in the food-aid programs our province through our farmers has again benefited, so the net benefit to our province has far exceeded what we have done for these other parts of the world. We should understand that and not think that what we have done or even what we are going to do can salve our conscience. It is this matter of sensitizing the conscience of the people of Saskatchewan, of Canada, which I think is going to be one of the important things that happens, if we are going to really tackle this problem.

The third part of the Resolution suggests that there be on-going consultation between the Government of Saskatchewan and these non-governmental agencies as to these international development programs. This is equally important. There is no way that a Resolution can deal with everything that has to be ironed out in this regard. That is not the purpose of the Resolution.

I want to see this on-going consultation because we live in a rapidly changing world and we don't want a program in place once and for all, we want a program that will change to meet the changing situations and this consultation aspect is again very important.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I move this Resolution No. 16, seconded by the Member for Saskatoon South.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to address to this Resolution and indicate on the one hand that I support the Resolution and on the other hand that I am pleased that the Party opposite is prepared to give this kind of tangible support to foreign aid.

I want the House to remember that a recent study done within the last two years, indicated that since 1945 of all the aid given to developing nations by industrialized or developed nations, those nations which had governments which called themselves socialist governments had contributed the very, very least. The nations such as Sweden had given one-fifth per capita the amount that Canada gave, and Canada has given shockingly little to foreign aid. Yet governments such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark are far below Canada on the scale of giving from industrialized nations to developing nations. Consequently it's a great pleasure for me to see that we have at last some recognition that this materialistic kind of movement, the socialist movement, is prepared to do something for their fellow man.

I have long come to the conclusion that if the good Lord again walked upon this earth, the one party he would not join is the NDP or any party with that kind of a name. I know the Members take that as rather shocking but the fact of the matter is this, whenever put to the test, socialist governments have failed the test of helping their fellow man and that includes this Government. You may recall two years ago this House had the opportunity of amending The Mental Health Act. Mr. Speaker, they altered The Mental Health Act so that any person outside of Saskatchewan in desperate need would get no benefit from the estate of people who died in our mental hospitals, whereas those who were relatives of those living within the province would get it whether they were in need or not.

Now the Hon. Minister of Health at the time thought that this was a great advance forward, and I spoke at the time pointing out that it was not. What he was doing was caring not at all about the question of need, he cared only about where that man cast his ballot. And if a person lived in Saskatchewan then the Province of Saskatchewan would make no charge against the estate of the deceased person who was mentally infirm, and had spent years in a mental hospital.

On the other hand if the relatives lived outside Saskatchewan's borders, no matter how needy they might be, they were in fact . . .

Mr. Meakes: — On a Point of Order, I believe the Hon. Member's remarks are in no way connected with this Resolution, he is surely not attacking the Resolution that is before us.

Mr. MacLeod: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the Government

for being touchy upon this point, because obviously their actions in the past in this House leave them a good deal to be ashamed of.

Mr. Speaker, I do support the Motion and I think the Member who presented the Motion is probably exactly the right one to present it on behalf of the Members opposite in this House, having regard to his recent speech he made in this House. I am not surprised that he is the one to present this to us, although no doubt about it other Members in the House on both sides will support him.

I prefer this kind of approach to international aid, Mr. Speaker, aid by governments and voluntary aid through agencies rather than individual help from here to an individual somewhere else. We have advertisements in the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, where people in Canada are invited to raise a Korean child or a child somewhere else in the world. These are laudable and give us a great sense of well-being. If somebody does, in fact, raise a Korean child, he rightly, I think, can take some measure of pride in having done something good. But there is no question in my mind that this is very nearly useless when you consider the entire size of the problem.

The net birth rate in the world today is such that if you take a particular point, four new babies could march past, that is, if they marched at the same rate as the people march in the Canadian army four people abreast, could march past that point forever. That is the indication of the annual increase in birth rate. Every second that goes by, approximately three children (net increase) are brought into the world. That is, net over those older people who have died.

Mr. Speaker, I like this motion because I think it is the kind of thing that indicates our concern for our fellow man a around the world.

The other parts of the world tend to kill their people off by starvation. I notice in Canada we kill 34,000 per annum by abortion. I am not sure that we are doing much better than people in other parts of the world who give some opportunity to life, albeit a miserable one.

I believe that any effort by our Government to help other nations help themselves is to be lauded and we should support it and increase it. I am disappointed that we have not increased our foreign aid to the extent that we had hoped. I recognize that some parts of the world are under the yoke of governments which do not deserve to call themselves government. We recognize this, and I was informed by a friend of mine who served in India, that equipment sent overseas from Canadian factories, paid for by Canadian money by Members of the House and outside, sent over there was left to rot because the officials in the area did not want to admit that they were obliged to get free help from other parts of the world. We have heard a number of stories where grain was shipped to Pakistan some years ago, it was left to rot on the docks because it was marked as being foreign aid grain from Canada, and the officials of the neighborhood were not prepared to admit that they had to get free help from a richer country. They were not prepared to admit that someone else was better off. So I recognize the difficulties that we face, but I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can increase our foreign aid. I hope we can increase it to the

point where we might even get to the stage where the United States is today where other people vilify them for their good works. If we give enough undoubtedly that is the point to which we will reach.

Of course, it is always a shock to me that a nation which was victorious in the last war, which if history had been a guide they would have taken to themselves the spoils of the victor, but instead took to themselves the good Samaritan role and saved virtually half the world from starvation. They received for their pains the resentment not only of the people they saved but in many cases, friends of theirs or people who ought to have been friends. Let's hope that we can give as much per capita as the most industrialized nation in the world, because we, in fact, are as close to being the top industrialized nation in the world as there is. Sure, we have Japan and the United States and Germany which have a high degree of industrialization but what we lack in industrialization we made up in the quality of our people and in the quality of our land. There is no question about it that no nation in the world should be able to give foreign aid and assistance to developing nations beyond that of Canada on a per capita basis.

I want to thank the Member for the material which he sent around. It is obvious that he has given considerable amount of attention to this particular motion. It is nice to see this kind of material submitted to Members of the House on these motions and I appreciate it and it saves us from some of our own research work.

With the reservation, Mr. Speaker, that I have not felt in the past that governments, socialist governments, have lived up to the high words that they have spoken, with that reservation I support the motion. I hope this is an indication that in future their actions will go beyond their words and if so they will receive support from this Member of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, it is with deep concern that I give my wholehearted sponsorship to this Resolution. When we consider the magnitude of the starvation of not only animals but of thousands of our fellow men currently experienced across the central portion of Africa, we must examine our conscience.

Are we doing our fair share? As a have-not province in the Dominion of Canada, we look upon the richer provinces to equalize the opportunities to a fulfilling life. But when we consider the status of Saskatchewan in the world context, we indeed are a rich people and a rich province. I want to examine the facts leading to a country finding itself as an underdeveloped country. And I quote some ideas as documented in articles distributed by Oxfam, the Oxford community for Famine Relief.

Yes, nature causes famines which bring our attention to the immediate suffering, but other causes have placed these countries in a position where they no longer can cope with nature's failure. And I quote from an Oxfam publication.

What is an underdeveloped country? Underdevelopment is not due to the survival of archaic institutions and the

existence of capital shortage in regions that have remained isolated from the stream of world history. It was and still is generated by the same process that generated economic development, the development of capitalism itself. Region after region in South America were converted into export economies and incorporated into the structure of the world capitalist system. Each of these regions experienced what may have appeared as economic development during the period of its respective golden age. But it was a satellite development which was neither self-generating nor self-perpetuating. As the market declined, foreign and domestic economic interest in them waned and they were left to develop the underdevelopment they live in today.

It is argued that in the capitalist system, metropolises — e.g. London, Lisbon, Madrid, New York, tend to develop and satellites to underdevelop. A second hypothesis is that satellites experience their greatest economic development if and when the ties with the metropolis are weakest. It is during times when foreign investment is reduced due to wars, etc. at home that the greatest autonomous industrialization and development takes place. Under this thesis, the poverty of particularly backward areas is not seen to be due to feudalism but to the particularly close ties to the metropolis in the past. Regions of ultra underdevelopment like the sugar exporting West Indies, mining districts in Brazil, highland Peru, Bolivia, the Mexican silver mining areas, Bengal in India, once provided the lifeblood of mercantile and industrial development to the metropolis. Their degeneration arises from either their resource exhaustion, or alternative or synthetic sources of supply. Thus their poverty is a direct result of past exploitation.

In order to modernize underdeveloped countries, foreign aid, loans and foreign investment especially are thought to be necessary. However, it is well known that aid plus investments, though large, are usually exceeded by the flow of money in the opposite direction in the form as a whole, in the 1970s, unless aid is increased drastically, interest payment of past loans will not be covered by present loans.

Foreign investment is usually included in aid sums accounting. Such investment is usually so lucrative for the 'donor' country that attempts by the recipient country to control foreign investment are usually swiftly dealt with. In order to protect foreign investments, the US for example, often finds itself supporting totalitarian governments if not actually putting them into power. Political upheavals in countries such as Brazil and Chile must be looked at in the light of foreign investors and the opportunities the government gives to them.

The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned the failure of socialist nations to contribute to world relief and after reading these articles in the Oxfam publication, I would point out that possibly the reason some of these socialist nations haven't contributed, possibly their fair share, is that these countries haven't been the nations that have exploited the underdeveloped countries and put them in that position.

March 19, 1974

I should also like to point out, although I don't like to open the lid on the garbage can, that in 1968 under the Liberal Provincial Government, Saskatchewan contributed \$2,500 to Nigeria and Biafran relief. In 1971, under the New Democratic Government, which is a socialist government, we contributed \$100,000 to the Bangladesh.

It is not enough just to give food or money. If we look at Ethiopia we find a nation of 24 million people who are cared for by a mere 40 Ethiopian doctors. This country has a population similar to that of Canada and can you imagine the suffering and hardship that our population would go through if we were only cared for by 40 doctors?

If it were not for the medical aid and the medical personnel sent by the churches and missionary groups, can you imagine how much more serious the suffering would be in a country such as that?

We as citizens of a great food producing province must feel despair when we view documentaries of the famines in Ethiopia and west central Africa. We must examine our contributions to world relief.

On an official basis we have given approximately \$100,000 to Nigeria and Bangladesh and also give yearly about \$4,000 to CUSO. But most of the aid we give is given by private individuals through voluntary agencies. The figure raised through these channels approaches \$750,000 per year.

True enough, Saskatchewan contributes to the national economy of Canada which in turn contributed about \$638 million in 1972. But this is only .5 per cent of our gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, 75 per cent of this aid is tied to purchase of supplies of Canadian goods and services. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is thus a net benefactor from these programs. As much as the federal aid is in the form of grain purchased from Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan farmer really benefits, and I think the Saskatchewan farmer has a conscience and wishes us to do more as a provincial government.

Oxfam has established, as has the Federal Government, that voluntary agencies have greater flexibility, greater innovative capacity and dedication and can therefore function more effectively in distributing and generating foreign aid. And it is for these reasons that we have introduced this Resolution which would match \$1 by the province for every \$1 raised by the voluntary groups concerned with world relief. The Federal Government will then match the \$2 coming out of Saskatchewan with \$2 from the Canadian International Development Agency. Thus \$1 can grow to \$4 and at least \$3.80 should reach the needy out of every \$4 that we raise here in Canada. Three dollars and eighty cents can reach those people if it is handled by the voluntary groups. The efficiencies of these groups is far superior to that of the Government's when it comes to international relief.

I was impressed with a short film which I viewed before the feature 'Alien Thunder' some weeks ago. This short feature was sponsored and produced by the Canadian International Development Agency and depicted an average irate taxpayer disturbed by his dollars going abroad. After the film I felt that

education of our own people must play a key role in a program of international relief and rehabilitation. And I think that this Resolution clearly states the idea that Saskatchewan must adopt if we are truly concerned about the needs of our less fortunate.

We must bring our assistance up to at least 1 per cent of our gross national product in Canada if we are to be sincere. And I would encourage all the Members of this House to forget politics, unite and support this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I rise too, to support this Motion, moved by the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris). I do it partly because many Members of this House will know that in 1971 I went around the world. I attended a meeting in Malaysia and from there I went to Hong Kong and from Hong Kong to India and the impressions that I got from my stay in India is burnt in my brain and I like to sometimes use the term that no human being on the North American continent, in fact, has any conception of how many people there are in India.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm out of order speaking of what I saw there. I remember a conversation with a person I had become very friendly with while I was there. He said with pride, this was right during the time there were 8.5 million refugees in India, in saying, for the first time — this is in September, 1971 — “We can say in India that we are self-sufficient.” And then he stopped and looked at me and said, “not as self-sufficient as you people would consider, but for the first time we are producing enough food to keep the people of India alive.” And then he went on and talked about Bangladesh and he prophesied, “If we have to feed them and unless the United Nations does something about the 8.5 million people that are in India that we are feeding, it means that 8.5 million of our people must go hungry.” He then made the statement if something doesn't happen within three months, “We will be forced to go into Bangladesh and straighten the mess up.”

I'm not taking sides on that, what happened, but I'm repeating the words of a man who foresaw what was going to happen.

I think I saw the poverty of India, and nobody can conceive who hasn't been there, how many human beings there are. I think the best word I have used many times, is that it is an human anthill. I drove 125 miles by car to Agra to see the Taj Mahal and I can truthfully say that in that 125 miles either way, practically without exception there was a mass of humanity walking on either side of the road.

I agree with the mover and the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Hanson) that we have to examine our conscience and we have to examine it very carefully. I think if we look at ourselves in the mirror we have reason to be feeling very guilty, very guilty that we in Canada are only investing — I think the figure he used was .5 per cent of our gross national product into international aid.

The other reason I rise, Mr. Speaker, was because of the film that many of the Members of the Legislature saw the other day on Ethiopia. If that didn't stir the heart strings and

stir guilt within ourselves, then we're not worth much, not worth very much.

I like the idea of matching grants, I think this is a very good idea.

Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't prepared to speak today, but I had to, I felt I had to stand to solicit the support of all the Members of the House and I'm sure they will all support it. But too that we dig into our pockets and do that; do it on a personal basis, on a provincial basis and hopefully on a federal basis. So I give my wholehearted support, Mr. Speaker, to this Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Motion as moved by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris).

I do so, Mr. Speaker, hoping that this is one of the Resolutions that we as politicians can join together as privileged individuals and realize our responsibility for those who are less fortunate.

The Member for Arm River outlined I think very succinctly to this House the points that we should like to get across to the people of Saskatchewan, when he spoke to this Motion.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, the Motion simply asks the Province of Saskatchewan to do its bit in recognizing that there are many, many people in the world who are less fortunate than we are, and that in some sense we are as aiding or helping along the situation that makes them or puts them into these dire conditions.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to speak to the federal panel on population in Saskatoon. You can't speak about population unless you speak also about the economic conditions that are prevalent in that country. At that meeting, was an individual whom I greatly admire, the Rev. Bob Ogle. Father Ogle spent seven years in northern Brazil. One of the panelists asked Father Ogle what he thought of foreign aid and the foreign aid policy of Canada and other developed nations. I think it's worthwhile listening to an individual who was born in this province in Rosetown, spent seven years in northern Brazil and gave the following definition or comparison of foreign aid, not only by Canada, but by other developed nations. He said to the panelist, "Let me make the following comparison."

If you understand what it means to a 19 year old boy who goes out to buy a secondhand car for the first time and doesn't have the finances to purchase that car and goes to a finance company to borrow that money. After making about 15 payments on the car, the car almost worn out, has hardly paid the interest that has accumulated on that car and has no way of making the final payment; then the finance company comes along and repossesses it. If you understand that situation, then you understand Canada's foreign aid policy towards underdeveloped countries.

He went on to say that unless we, as developed nations really try to give aid to underdeveloped countries without any strings attached at all, without worrying as to what we will get out of it, then he said that he would much rather not see any aid given at all.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is not so much concerned with the money, the \$1 million is not that much, it is a lot for this province, I agree. But it is not that much when you consider all the people who need the money. It will hardly make a scratch on the surface. That is not the point. The point of this motion is that we would like this Government to look at the situation as it exists in Saskatchewan, and attempt to re-educate the people. I think we need to re-educate not only the adults in Saskatchewan, but also our young people, as to the limits that must be placed on the use of our natural resources. They are limited and we have a responsibility, not only to future generations as far as the natural resources are concerned, but also that every time we waste or overuse or overindulge that someone else in other parts of the world is suffering because of it.

There are many causes for poverty or for shortages. Some of these, Mr. Speaker, are natural and we have no control over them. Why was there a drought in Africa and consequently millions of people starved? We don't know. Why floods in other parts of the world, destroying crops and many people starve? We don't know. We have no control over these. Mr. Speaker, we do have control over our gluttony. We have control over our selfishness. And everytime we ask for more, it means less for someone else, surely there must be a twinge somewhere in our conscience when we have to say, enough is enough so that others may have more.

When we, Mr. Speaker, in the western world worry about the price of bacon and worry about the menu, many, many people in the third world don't worry what is on the menu, they simply worry whether there will be a meal at all. I think that it is in this kind of atmosphere that the Member for Arm River and myself as the seconder, moved this Resolution.

We would hope that we can avoid politics in this particular Resolution. I think it is too serious a question to get involved in the pettiness of politics.

I should like, at this time to say to the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) that he has different sources of information than I have. But I read from the Prairie Messenger, where Mr. McNamara, who is the head of the World Bank, complained that there was little likelihood that in the first half of the decade aid would exceed .37 per cent of the gross national product. Mr. McNamara was talking about the United States. He said that if the United States continued to allocate the amount of funds to foreign aid that by 1975 they would drop to .24 per cent of the gross national product. Canada now is giving .5 per cent. I am not saying by this that we should be proud of what we give because I think it is so little of what we have. We have so much. But I simply want to point out to the Members that I hope that we do not go the way advocated by the Member opposite, the direction that the United States is going. Because if we did we would have to reduce our foreign aid, and that, I think, would be really disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more that I would like to say on this Resolution and therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2 — Inflation

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E. C. Whelan (Regina North West):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for taking steps to ease the harmful effects of inflation particularly for those on modest incomes, by increasing the minimum wage, abolishing medical and hospital premiums, increasing social assistance allowances and other measures, and further urges the Federal Government to take the appropriate steps to control the cost of living by such measures as: (a) developing policies and programs to increase food production and ensure stability in the agricultural sector; (b) establishing a permanent Prices Review Board empowered to set selective price controls; (c) implementing and enforcing effective controls to curb monopoly power.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to Resolution No. 2, I should like, first of all, to congratulate my colleague the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) for the very able presentation he made last day on this subject. In his remarks he has commended this Government for the action they have taken in an attempt to hold down living costs in this province and well he should. When it became evident that living costs, particularly food costs, were escalating at an usually high rate, this Government acted quickly to do what was in its power as a provincial government to try and cushion the increase, particularly for those people on the lower end of the income scale; the unskilled worker, the recipients of welfare, and the handicapped.

Actions such as the removal of the Medical Care premium were regarded by some, whose incomes were secure, as unnecessary since that premium was already low for the kind of services it provided. However, for those people in the low income bracket from \$4,000 to \$6,000 per year or less, whose incomes were being seriously depleted by the steep increases in the living costs, it was a real relief to know that now they did not have to worry about that quarterly payment.

The increase in minimum wage to \$2 on December 1st, was also a welcome raise to those unskilled workers who were often only partially employed. It was rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, to hear those friends of the international corporations on the benches opposite, whose hearts bled so profusely a few weeks ago when we clipped the wings of their friends in the oil industry. Why we were only allowing them to take over \$130 million in profits out of this province! Yet these are the same stalwarts of free enterprise who so bitterly attacked the minimum wage increase just a few weeks ago. It's tricks for the poor, Mr. Speaker, and treats for the rich. This wage hike

to the people who so desperately needed it was called a war on business, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that this action was well received by most responsible citizens.

My colleague spoke at some length on matters relating to the cost of living and I do not wish to plough old ground. I should like to speak to you about living and operating costs as it affects the farmer in rural Saskatchewan.

We all recognize, of course, that farm income has increased very substantially in the past two years. The sudden shortage of cereal grains and livestock products in many of the developing countries has served to strengthen the world market and farmers at last are getting a fair price for their product. But, Mr. Speaker, I would caution those who think that all farmers are now rolling in money and spending their winters in California, because many of them were in extremely serious financial position after the years of LIFT and low quotas and low prices. Many are even now struggling to recoup their back taxes and overdue payments. Costs of farm inputs are rising very rapidly and many farmers are wondering if \$5 wheat is really too much. Let me give you a few instances.

A recent check on land prices indicates that the price of farm land has risen from 15 to 25 per cent. The cost of steel buildings has risen almost 40 per cent. Just a year ago I purchased a 40 x 70 foot steel shed for \$3,200, this year only 12 months later that identical building is being offered at bargain prices of \$4,600, an increase of almost 50 per cent.

Baler twine, an essential for livestock producers has jumped from \$8.25 per bale to \$17 per bale in one year and we understand the price is going to go up \$25 for next season, an increase of 300 per cent. Farm tractors and equipment have increased by as much as 20 per cent on some models. Fence posts another essential of livestock men, have gone up from \$50 per hundred to around \$75 per hundred for the small three by six size, an increase of 50 per cent. Costs of some feed supplements rose from around \$160 per ton to well over \$330 per ton. All protein concentrates, although not as high now as earlier this year, are still well over double last year's prices. These are only a few of the very rapidly increasing costs farmers are now facing. The list could go on and on to include fertilizers, repair parts, building repair costs and a host of others.

The big question in the minds of all farm producers is: will the present satisfactory prices for cereals and oil seeds continue or will we be faced with yet another round of world surpluses and disastrous low prices? One thing that agriculture producers have learnt is that prices for their inputs once raised seldom come down. The same worry faces the farmer today as he was faced with all through the years, that is price instability. We have over the years built into our farm programs many protective devices to reduce the variable in physical production. Improved technology, better machines, better management training, crop insurance schemes and many other devices in the production end have helped to reduce the risk to some extent. The major obstacle to a stable and viable agricultural industry has been the uncertainty of markets and prices. These are areas which for the most part come under federal jurisdiction and require constant consultation between all jurisdictions from farm organizations to provincial and federal governments.

The Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, in this Session have been attempting to lay the blame for the lack of a stabilization program at the feet of this Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they refer to the Otto Lang proposal of 1972, which guaranteed the farmers nothing but continued poverty, we would gladly have accepted that responsibility. Proposals made at that time were rejected not only by this Government but by every major farm organization in western Canada as inadequate and ineffective.

The provincial governments and farm organizations at that time put forward alternative proposals which would have incorporated the best part of the original stabilization plan which had many good features and would have added that one very important and essential ingredient, the provision that prices be guaranteed at a level at least at the cost of production. Without such a guarantee any stabilization program becomes virtually ineffective.

The Leader of the Opposition made a great play recently about the value of the two-price system of wheat. He tried, but he did not succeed in convincing us that when the world market price for wheat is around \$5.60 a bushel that we were somehow being protected by a floor price of \$3.25. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, wheat farmers are subsidizing the consumer on the difference between \$5.60 and \$5 a bushel or 60 cents per bushel on some 60 million bushels of wheat consumed in Canada. A subsidy of around \$36 million annually. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that western farmers are opposed to making this contribution to Canadian bread consumers provided that the guaranteed floor price of \$3.25 is subject to cost of production increases as they occur. However, no such commitment was made by the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, Mr. Lang. He arbitrarily announced the seven-year two-price program. There was no vote, Mr. Speaker, no consultation. All he said, "There it is, like it or not."

In the content of this Resolution we urge the Federal Government to develop policies to increase food production and ensure stability in the agriculture sector.

Mr. Speaker, most farmers are energetic and ambitious and want to produce to their maximum capacity. However, the lack of any mechanism to guarantee them a reasonable return on their labor is a constant deterrent to them. This past year has been a typical example. The price of feed grains has been very satisfactory. As a result the cost of feeding hogs and cattle has risen accordingly. Other input costs such as protein supplements rose sharply and drove their costs even higher. The imbalance of feed costs and returns has been such that producers are taking severe losses in many areas of livestock production. Only timely and positive action on the part of the Government has prevented a massive reduction in hog numbers. Because this Government has guaranteed hog producers a price related to cost of production, most of our hog producers have stayed in business. As the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley so ably documented during the Budget Debate, Saskatchewan hog production and slaughterings have continued high, compared to severe cut-backs in the Province of Alberta where no stabilization program has been made available for producers.

I believe this is a fair indication that given some reasonable assurance of price stability, farmers will produce the volumes required.

Steer prices continued to be depressed to the extent that feedlot operators are not filling their lots and much of our livestock is going out as calves or unfinished. Hopefully not too many of our livestock producers have reduced their breeding herds up to this point. A continuation of the imbalance between feed costs and finished beef for an extended period will certainly lead to that end result. Last Friday the Federal Minister of Agriculture announced a seven cent subsidy on certain grades of finished beef. This belated action on the part of the Federal Government although it will help some of the feedlot operators is once again an indication of the one-shot emergency type of program which we have come to expect from that Government. The subsidy is not related to any cost of production criteria. It does not guarantee to maintain the price if markets drop still further; nor does it compensate for variations of price over a period of time, nor does it purport to be a long term policy which producers can rely on. Without some more comprehensive program of stabilization related to cost of production, it is very doubtful that many producers will be encouraged to remain in this industry. It is highly unlikely that producers who have already reduced their herds will have enough confidence to restock under such a one-shot ad hoc proposal.

Also notable in the announcement, Mr. Speaker, was any lack of support for the other basic livestock products such as hogs and poultry which are being equally hard hit by high grain and concentrate prices and low markets. Surely the Federal Government cannot continue to disregard the need for long term stabilization of all these products. The impact on the multi-million dollar livestock industry at this time is fantastic. Not only are producers faced with negative returns of mammoth proportions but because of the higher prices of grain now being received these livestock men are looking at the alternative of disposing of those herds and returning to more lucrative grain farming which could also be short-lived. Such a reversal of farm production away from livestock would be nothing less than tragic at a time when we are attempting to build up our secondary industry in this province through the processing and meat packing business, both through losses of total production and a loss of jobs. And yet it is inevitable if major marketing policies are not developed in the very near future to prevent it. A major swing away from livestock production in this country could well be upon us in the months ahead. If this occurs consumers of meat products can expect a sharp and continuing increase in the cost of beef over the counter as supplies become less available. Because almost 75 per cent of the food trade is concentrated in the hands of three large food chains there is little doubt that they will take every advantage of any short-supply situation.

What is urgently required is a federal-provincial grain and livestock stabilization plan which will guarantee to producers at least cost of production in those years when returns are below normal. It is essential that such a plan be integrated to ensure that severe imbalances do not occur in any one segment of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a number of pages to go yet and I would beg to call it 5:30.

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

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, when I was so rudely interrupted by the clock at 5:30 I was just saying that what is urgently required is a federal-provincial grain and livestock stabilization plan which will guarantee the producers at least the cost of production in those years when returns are below normal. I said today that it was essential that such a plan be integrated to ensure that severe imbalances do not occur in one segment of the industry. During the past twelve months we have seen some of the wildest gyrations of price in our agricultural industry ever recorded in history. Grain prices have risen from below cost of production to the highest on record. Beef prices have ranged from highs of 55 to 60 cents per pound live weight to the present depressed price of 46 cents, well below the cost of production. In fact, the Member for Wilkie today reported that the prices were as low as 41 cents.

Hogs have followed the same unstable pattern. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, who can expect new farm operators to commit the thousands of dollars necessary to establish a livestock enterprise when some of our long-term feedlot operations have their backs to the wall because of lack of any mechanism to guarantee them at least the cost of production.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be a better way to even out earnings of agricultural producers than the cruel and inefficient law of supply and demand which brings unrealistic rewards in times of short supply and can destroy an industry through inadequate prices whenever there is an oversupply of as little as five per cent.

Not only do these wild gyrations hurt the food producer but it alienates and angers consumers as well. A housewife will go shopping one week and pay 90 cents per pound for a roast, next week she returns and finds it priced at \$1.25, only to find a third week that is at the opposite end of the scale again. This continues fluctuation and uncertainty leads to frustration and anger which invariably leads to demands for higher wages because of uncertainties in the cost of living. These severe fluctuations also set the stage for food chains to make substantial rip-offs at the expense of consumers because of the confusion over prices.

In order to bring some semblance of order back into the food industry a number of things must happen. There must be some form of international grains agreement which will stabilize wheat and feed grain prices on the international level within specified minimums and maximums. There must be a comprehensive federal grain stabilization program in Canada which will help to remove the extreme price variations in wheat and feed grain prices with guaranteed minimum prices at least equal to cost of production. There must be a stabilization program for livestock which must be integrated with the grains policy to guarantee at least cost of production to Canada's livestock industry.

With these kinds of programs in place, agricultural producers will provide the necessary amounts of food needed to provide our consumers with their needs at fairly consistent prices. So they too, can look forward to greater stability in their costs of living.

In the Throne Speech from Ottawa recently we heard promises that such stabilization programs are once again being considered

by the Federal Government. I sincerely hope that this is true and that action will be forthcoming quickly. We will be looking forward with interest at any new proposals and can assure you that if they are realistic and meaningful that Members of the New Democratic Party will support them with vigor. However, I would caution farmers and farm organizations to look at any new proposals critically. Too often in the past, Mr. Speaker, we have been offered what appeared to be an attractive package on the surface, only to find in the fine print it threatened and undermined the orderly marketing process which we have so painstakingly attempted to build over the years.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the consumers of food become just as confused as the producer when extreme fluctuations of price are constantly taking place. When the price of bread rises from 27 cents to 39 cents per loaf in one year, as it did this last year, he is led to believe that the producer is ripping him off in spite of the fact that out of the 12-cent increase only about two or three cents can be attributed to the increase in the price of flour. At the same time huge profits being taken by bakery chains go unnoticed. The same applies to many other foods and household necessities. For this reason we believe that it is necessary to establish immediately a permanent prices review board with powers to set selective price controls. Such a board could also act as an effective watchdog over those corporations and industries which attempt to take unconscionable profits whenever the opportunity arises. If these organizations were required to justify their prices on the grounds of cost increases, only then should they be allowed. We say selective controls, Mr. Speaker, because much of our trade in this country polices itself through competitive pricing and leaves little opportunity for excessive profiteering. Only in those instances when excesses appear should the board become operative to protect the consumers of the nation. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that in our haste to find ways and means to curb inflation, we have overlooked one of the most effective weapons at the disposal of the consumers of this country. I refer of course to the Consumer Co-operative movement. Many criticisms have been levelled at the co-ops charging that they have not always been effective and have become too oriented to the ways of big business. Some of these charges may have some validity. However, I would point out that without sufficient size, their impact on prices can only be minimal. If consumer co-ops could receive the support of even 25 per cent of the purchasing public, they could act as a real force in setting forth price patterns. Because we have co-ops in the production, wholesaling and merchandising field, it should be possible with popular support to reduce many of the costs now plaguing the consumer. One thing should be clearly pointed out, the co-op movement is there for only one purpose, to supply service to its customers at the lowest possible cost and to act in their best interest both as producers and consumers. All profits are the property of its members and are returned to them in a year-end direct dividends or what is often more important in better services to their customers. Every dollar earned is returned to the local member in one way or another. All savings are retained in the community instead of going out in dividends to eastern and foreign corporations.

The real strength however, is in the power that can be exerted at the manufacturing and wholesale levels. By getting into these fields, such as petroleum, fertilizers, farm machinery, lumber mills and food processing, a great deal of influence could

be exerted on stabilizing prices at reasonable levels. With added support of a much larger element of our consuming public the strength of the co-op movement could increase rapidly to the benefit of all. It might indeed become the most effective weapon against profiteering and inflation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say that this Government has acted quickly and decisively to do what is within its power to cushion the effects of inflation on those most in need of help. We have gone beyond the routine measures in implementing a guaranteed price for hog producers in an attempt to stabilize production and guarantee supplies. We call on the Federal Government to be equally courageous in coming forward with national policies to stabilize agricultural production at prices which will be realistic to producers. If they will guarantee stability we will guarantee supply. Failure to recognize their responsibility will inevitably lead to another round of short supply and increased price to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. B. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in support of this Resolution and in support of some of the comments that were made by some of my colleagues. The question that I want to raise first, Mr. Speaker, is what are the effects of inflation?

May I say at the outset that the hard cold hardships and anxiety caused by rapidly rising prices are borne in the main by the low income groups. Families whose income is \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year or less and we have many of them in Canada, they spend 90 per cent or more of their entire earnings to buy their needs. The basic needs of food, shelter and clothing. When the prices of these necessities go up, it has a severe effect on their budget. The person whose income is \$25,000 per year or more spends much less as a percentage of his income on the basic necessities of food, shelter and clothing. Therefore, in the short term he is the one that can best sustain the effects of rapidly rising prices. But it is the little guy who is hurt. It is the little guy, Mr. Speaker, that I am really concerned about.

How do these problems of rising prices develop? Firstly, the problems lie in the fact that not all prices go up together. Usually the prices of goods and services rise and then there is an attempt to move wages and incomes up after. To the extent that wages and incomes lag behind the price increases there is hardship on the wage earner. To the extent that wages and income do not move up proportionately to prices of goods and services there is hardship. And then there are the people of relatively fixed incomes and I am thinking here mainly of the people receiving senior citizen pensions or who have other private pension plans. These people are hit hard. Their incomes are very low to begin with and most of it is required for the basic needs. When prices go up without a commensurate increase in income they are in real trouble and many of these people across Canada are in real trouble right now.

What are some of the effects of inflation? Well, in these circumstances people tend to spend more and save less. They do this because they know that their dollar will command fewer and

fewer goods and services in the market place, to the extent that less saving takes place, there is less capital available for new investment or for replacement of stock. However, to some large extent this may not be applicable because profits of most corporations are so high that much investment can be derived from merely plowing back retained earnings into the business. In fact this latter example is exactly what has happened with many American business firms and these firms have grown and expanded in Canada, not from large inputs of capital from the United States as the Member's opposite of conventional wisdom would have us believe, but rather their capital is derived through the process of using Canadian labor to exploit Canadian resources and the profits go back to expand their holdings in Canada.

When there is rapid inflation money tends to lose its function as a medium of exchange. To the extent that purchasing power of money is decreased rapidly then to that extent people prefer to hold other assets. And this is one of the reasons for the rapid rise in the price of gold recently.

Another effect of rapidly rising prices is the dislocation of wealth. People that own investments or people who own real estate tend to benefit from inflation because the value of their stocks or real property rise as the price increases. On the other hand people who do not own a home are the real losers, they find if they don't own a home that the rent goes up but their income might not be going up proportionately. And this is exactly what is happening right now to many people and it is a real hardship to them. Rampant inflation inflicts much hardship on large segments of the population, and it is a number one problem in Canada at this time. It inflicts hardship on people that do not deserve such treatment; people on low incomes, older people and retired people. Rather than contentment and relaxation these people see their costs continuously rising and their own income remaining relatively the same causing fear and anxiety. But our corporate, enterprising economy continues on irrespective of the hardships left in its wake.

Let's look for a moment then, Mr. Speaker, at the causes of inflation and there are a variety of them as given to you by the economists, by the financier or by the businessman, but they are generally very vague and very misleading. There is a demand pull theory, where demand exceeds supply and pulls the prices up. There is a cost-push theory, costs rise and push up the prices of goods. There is the oversupply and undersupply theory and one can get as many answers or theories, depending upon whom you talk to. Most of these are designed to take someone off the hook. But what are the real causes of inflation, Mr. Speaker? What are the real causes that force the prices of goods, clothing, shelter to rise? Let me talk about some of these.

My remarks in the main will refer here to the retail industry but much of what I say about the retail industry could apply to other sectors such as banking, finance, insurance and other service industries. High prices, Mr. Speaker, are caused by a number of factors and let me list some of these and then I will elaborate. Firstly, there is the exorbitant monopoly profits. Take the food industry for example. It is dominated at the production and distribution levels by a handful of conglomerates. In the automobile industry the same situation applies. And one could look at the major appliance industry or the farm

machinery industry, all dominated by a handful of fat-cat firms and all earning monopoly profits. So one of the reasons for inflation, Mr. Speaker, is the exorbitant monopoly profits.

But there are other reasons, there is the overcapacity situation, particularly applicable to the retail sector. There is the problem of an ever increasing number of products on the market. There are all the merchandizing practices, including advertising and expensive packaging, glamorous stores and offices. There is a ludicrous situation in the auto industry of changing models every year, costing the consumers billions of dollars in retooling costs and there are other reasons. But let me look at some of these areas.

What happens to food prices from the time the product leaves the farm until it reaches the dinner plate. The 1969 US Anti-Trust Committee offers a partial explanation which also applies to Canada. Evidence presented to the committee shows that \$200 billion out of a total of \$780 billion spent by American consumers purchased absolutely nothing of real value. Fully 25 per cent of the consumers' food bill is accredited to deceptive packaging, misleading advertising, promotional gimmicks, short-weighting and monopoly profits. A year earlier the Royal Commission on Consumer Problems and Inflation on the Prairies showed that a family of four living on the Prairies in 1967 the cost of monopoly and waste exceeded \$100 per year. By 1973 the sum would be closer to \$200 and here is part of the breakdown. Excess profit — \$9.40; excess capacity — \$51.88; advertising cost — \$14.80; luxury stores — \$38.32; a cost per family per year in 1967 of \$114.80.

The Prairie Provinces Cost Study Commission Report, 1968, discovered that the operating profit as a percentage of net worth for supermarket chains across Canada for an average five-year period, 1960-64 was 16 per cent. In the cities of Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton it was 28.1 per cent. For the same period it was 13.8 per cent in United States for stores, indicating a far greater degree of profiteering among supermarkets in Canada than in the United States.

The Financial Post of February 17, 1973, reported that in Canada the large independent and corporate chains together represent only 18 per cent of the total food store numbers but their share of the total food dollar is a disproportionate 77 per cent. One particular ruse of the conglomerate to camouflage their super profits is to relate profit to the sales dollar. And you have frequently heard statistics of the profit margin in the retail industry only being one or two per cent of sales and I say this is very misleading because to me, Mr. Speaker, the only reasonable and intelligent profit ratio is the one related to investment. What matters most is price. There is a law against businesses meeting together to fix prices. It undoubtedly still happens more often than detected and the price that is fixed upon is the price that a single monopolist would charge. But the price fixing of this kind is passé. It is possible to get the same effect without formal or even informal agreements. In short there are ways to fix prices and avoid price competition without breaking the law. For example, Safeway is regarded as the price leader in all prairie cities. It usually sets the pricing pattern and is followed by the other chains and filters down into the small stores. This price leadership works like this: a prominent company takes the lead in announcing a particular price change, other firms recognize the announcement not as

an aggressive move but as an invitation for them to follow suit. Usually they will do so. If rival firms do not respond appropriately the price leader will alter his plans. Such informal collusion is perfectly legal and is an inevitable consequence of an industry structure dominated by a few powerful corporations. The absence of price competition leads to huge super profits which are earned year in and year out.

Over the past decade operating profits as a percentage of net worth has been in the range of 15 to 20 per cent for incorporated grocery stores, 15 to 20 per cent of investment. On the prairies where concentration of ownership is higher than in the rest of Canada, profits have ranged from 25 to 30 per cent of net worth. Economic power in the market place refers to the degree of concentration of industry. The extent to which a small number of firms supply a large share of industry output then wherever concentration is, high price competition is always absent and monopoly profits are the order of the day. A major reason, Mr. Speaker, for high prices are monopoly profits.

The chartered banks and finance companies are a notorious cartel charging interest rates that approach usury and afford profits that will have doubled between 1967 and 1973 and that now total about \$1 billion a year. Their annual reports indicate that there was an average increase of 23.2 per cent in the province in the year 1972. At one time there was a ceiling on the interest rates which banks could charge. During the 1960s that ceiling was removed. The case was made that this would permit banks to compete with other financial institutions for deposit funds and for borrowers. Nobody ever bothered to check that the same people owned the finance companies and the trust companies also owned the banks. The result of lifting the ceiling was predictable. Profit rates at the banks jumped a notch and they have been rising ever since.

I want to turn for a moment to the problem of too many products on the market. A few years back Mr. R. G. Meaks of Loblaw's Groceteria Company, testified before the special government committee that Loblaw stores carried 450 items in 1919. In 1928 they carried 900 items. In 1952 they carried 4,000 items. In 1968 they carried between 6,000 and 8,000 items and by 1970 he predicted they would be carrying upwards of 12,000 items. Managing this monstrous inventory is one of the industry's worst problems and new products keep coming. The net increase of births over deaths is several hundred a year and except for the packaging each one is a near duplicate of some already on the market. If the number of brands and varieties were cut down by two-thirds consumers in most instances would not lose any real choice. Since few of these sell at a decent rate of more than a can a week, stock movement, the key to profitable retailing, remains static at about 12.5 per cent a year.

Let's look at the situation of excess capacity. In a study for the Prairie Economics Council an economist found that there are about twice as many stores or twice as much floor space as can be justified on the grounds of efficiency. The average degree of excess capacity defined as existing when sales are not large enough to carry the firm to the point where its cost per unit of sales are a minimum is 44.4 per cent, ranging from a minimum of 32 per cent in some stores to 66.2 per cent in other stores. What is this excess capacity costing the consumer? Calculations show that an average excess capacity is costing the consumer 3.6 cents on the food dollar and for a family it could

cost as much as \$40 to \$100 per year. The question emerges why do the supermarkets build up this excess capacity if it adds too much to their costs? If a store has a location which is good enough to allow it to operate to capacity its profits would be so high as to invite in competition. To forestall such competitive entry the operators say it is in their own interest to expand their own store size or build a second store in their vicinity. The extra costs are small compared to the potential loss of profits to the rival store. In any event the store loss is very little, since the extra cost is passed on to the consumer at a higher price.

Turning to advertising. Advertising is the essential tool of the supermarket. One cent of the food dollar is used by the supermarket chains for advertising. This figure includes newspapers, radios, television, advertising flyers and other media of advertising. It does not include other sale promotion techniques, such as air condition, piped music, wide aisles, express checkouts, parking lots and so on. Nor does it include the fees paid out to advertising agencies. In the five prairie cities advertising is noticeably greater than it is in the rest of Canada, taking up 1.64 cents of the food dollar. Every cent of the sales promotion effort is added to the consumer's bill. Excess advertising, Mr. Speaker, is another reason for high prices. And built into the price of the product is not only the advertising expenditure of the supermarket but also the advertising expenditure of the manufacturers which is, on the whole, more expensive. This was revealed by the Special Government Committee of the House of Commons in late 1966 which discovered that among food and soap manufacturers advertising costs vary from 3 to 43 per cent of the sales dollar. Together with the advertising of the supermarket it is a very heavy burden for the consumer to pay. If we also added the extra cost of excess packaging we would have one important explanation as to why food prices are rising for the consumer, yet staying the same or falling for the farmer.

Costly deceptive packaging and its proliferation and endless multitudes of shapes and sizes adds immeasurable amounts to consumer costs. The total cost of packaging paid by the consumer is estimated at one-third more than all money spent on public schools each year. The 8,000 most common items in a supermarket are packaged in 2,650 different sizes. Billing the consumer for these staggering costs, much of it waste, adds inflation to injury.

As the food price inquiry ground to a halt last April one issue always seemed to get squelched every time it was raised. It involved the nasty question of kickbacks, or as they are more euphemistically known, volume rebates, promotional allowances, listing allowances and so on. Manufacturers are paying substantial fees and a wide range of discounts to get their products handled and displayed by supermarket chains. These are in addition to the normal trade discounts and rebates based on sales volume referred to earlier. Various industry sources estimate that when taken as a whole these kickbacks come to three per cent of the total value of supermarket chain sales. Manufacturers say they build the cost of these promotions into the end price of their products. As with everything else the consumer ends up by paying the shot.

There is a real silence and fear surrounding these practices. Supermarket officials won't talk about it. The president of

of one of the leading food manufacturers left this message with his secretary in reply to a call by the reporter of the Globe and Mail, who was seeking details of the company's experience in allowances and deals. "There is nothing I can tell you," he said. It is common knowledge in the supermarket industry that this company was stubborn several years ago and refused to pay them various allowances. The exclusion of many of his products forced the company to pay the rate to get back onto the shelves. The cost involved depends on the store display space required and the size of the chain. It is understood that for one chain the end of the aisle display in stores for one week and a reference in the weekly newspaper advertising costs almost \$10,000. Anonymous Toronto executive said he bought several minor promotions for more than \$5,000 each from one major chain. He said bluntly that the products would not have been in the store unless the promotions had been purchased. I, Mr. Speaker, challenge the Federal Government to investigate this whole area of kickbacks. Whenever prices go up the villain is usually the wage earner and the primary producer. The sham of this argument has already been exposed for housing, labor costs only comprise seven per cent of the total cost and for automobiles where the total direct labor cost of a new car is equal to the price of its four tires. but we cannot pick up a newspaper these days without this propaganda being used to explain the high cost of food. Actually labor costs to the food industry are largely unavailable because of the refusal of the food companies to reveal the necessary information.

But there are at least a few cases of what is going on in the industry. A moment of truth occurred when J. M. Schneider reported to his shareholders on the phenomenal 83.17 per cent rise of net profits in 1972, while sales rose only 44.75 per cent. I quote:

Increased profits reflect increased and improved productivity. Plant efficiencies and cost control have accounted for an 18-cent per hundredweight decrease in costs for the same period last year. Such achievement is significant, especially considering the 8 per cent negotiated increase in hourly rates effective last June. We commend our employees for their efforts.

An even sharper indication of food price increases have little or nothing to do with wage levels as given by comparing wage levels and food prices in Ontario and in the Maritimes. Skilled meat cutters get \$192 a week in Ontario and \$152 in New Brunswick. In one large Nova Scotia chain they get only \$105 a week. Despite the wide gap in wages paid for similar work, the price of meat is almost exactly the same in both regions.

Royal Commissions on food prices come and go, but appearing before the Price Spread Commission back in 1935, J. S. McLean then President of Canada Packers, revealed the lasting truth. When asked what pricing policy his company followed he said that it bought as cheap as it could and sold it as high as they could. Canada Packers, for one, has done very well by this formula. Fortune Magazine ranks it as one of the 70 largest companies outside the United States and the fifth largest Canadian business. On the 39 weeks preceding February 15, 1973, the Financial Post reports that its profits were up 46 per cent.

The general relationship between wage levels and prices was put straight by George Saunders Research Director of the Federal Government's Task Force on Labour Relations in a speech

to the professional institute of the Public Service of Alberta. Describing the study he said:

The analysis, therefore, strongly suggests that collective bargaining is not an independent or primary factor in initiating the recent period of rising prices. Wages in the unionized sector are strongly determined by the operation of the market forces. Collective bargaining follows economic activity rather than leading it.

Note was made of the tendency for large wage increases, negotiated in union sectors to lag behind changes in other economic variables.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking at length about the monopoly profits and other costs that go into the final consumer bill. Let's just look at one of these large monopoly situations and let's just look how big these monopolies really are.

The food giants control a large portion of the market. They have a high sales volume, they have a high profit rate and buy and sell to their own subsidiaries. They are vertically integrated. This means that they can have close control of the inputs into their commodities as well as the final markets. Profit is accumulated within the extended corporations all the way down the line. The food giants are obviously efficient at making money.

One of the laws of capitalism is that profit must not be wasted. It must be carefully reinvested, for the more it invests the bigger the company grows, and the bigger it grows the more profits it makes. One rational way for a company to reinvest profits is to gain control over related businesses. The food giants have learned this very well. They build new retail outlets, acquire food processing and packaging plants, get into shipping and transportation, buy up or more likely control farm operations perhaps expand into farm equipment, fertilizers and chemicals. The result of this kind of growth as we have seen is the tentacle-like conglomerates.

Let's look at one of those conglomerates. George Weston Limited is a holding company in a pyramid of holding companies and operating companies. Above George Weston stands Wittington Investments and W. Garfield Weston and family. With a few exceptions most of the Weston companies were put together by a series of financial acquisitions stretching back nearly five decades. Incorporated in 1928 the company today has a total annual sales figure of \$3 billion via 150 active companies, 1,850 supermarkets, 1,500 franchises 250 warehouses and 80 plants. It has controlling interests in various other aspects of business in Canada or United States, Great Britain, South Africa, Germany and France.

On the Prairies, George Weston Limited is represented primarily by Loblaw Groceries and Westfair Foods. Though other subsidiaries operate in the same area. These other subsidiaries run five chains, namely, Loblaws, OK Economy, Shoppers, Econo-Mart and Mini Marts. They do business under five voluntary group names: Shop Rite, Red and White, Tom Boy, Lucky Dollar and Union and United Purity and operate a number of wholesale companies, namely: Western Grocers, Dominion Fruit and G. McLean, which do business under a score of names including Brown Fruit, Plunkett and Savage and so on.

In addition, Weston operates bakeries, food manufacturing plants, a drugstore chain and controls several independent food stores. In British Columbia, Weston's retail outlets also include Supervalu, Maverick, High-low Wholesalers, Kelly Douglas and Company Limited and W. H. Malcom Limited. There are many subsidiaries that supply a wide variety of goods such as, chocolate under the brand names of Neilson and Willard, tea and coffee, Dickson; matches and paper under the name of E. B. Eddy; seafoods, ice cream cones, bakery goods and so on.

The manufacturing division of Weston's packages and distributes over 500 food products under various different brand names and services 450 accounts. Loblaw's Groceteria Limited, the other main Weston subsidiary is itself a holding company as well as an operating company. George Weston Limited began to acquire Loblaw's in 1947 when it purchased a large block of Loblaw's stock. However, it did not obtain control of the company until 1956. Since then Loblaw, too, has continued to acquire more companies, Kelly Douglas and Company of Vancouver and so on. By far its largest operations are in the United States, through its subsidiaries, Loblaw Incorporated and the National Tea Company. On the Prairies its main business is conducted through its chain of yellow fronted stores, its OK Economy chain and a Shop Rite voluntary group.

At the retail level Loblaw's is Canada Safeway's principal chain store competitor. Aside from food processing, wholesaling and retailing, Weston interests include food and housekeeping, catering at camps and industrial sites, such as the Mica Dam project. Packaging materials are supplied by another subsidiary Sommerville Industries Limited, whose companies are amongst Canada's largest manufacturers of folding cartons, display materials, toys, games and automobile parts.

Other agricultural business arms include dairy, farming, refrigerator transport, meat packing, restaurant supplies, fish and fish packaging, cold storage and retail drugstores. Such a vast empire is furnished with financial direction to holdings such as Perron Investments Limited.

It becomes pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that with conglomerates like this around, that there is very little competition left in the food industry and there are, in fact, monopoly profits being made in this industry.

I, therefore, urge upon the Federal Government to consider this Resolution to control the prices of goods to the consumer in this country. However, I do so with not too much enthusiasm, because I recognize that a government with Mr. Sharp who is a millionaire, Mr. Trudeau who is a millionaire and Mr. Richardson who is a millionaire, really don't understand the problems of the common man.

I will be supporting the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is a little surprising to hear from the Member opposite when he talks about millionaires and not talk about some of the socialist millionaires in Canada like Tommy Douglas and David Lewis. What do they know about the common man, Mr. Speaker? They have made some money from sharp

investment, some very wealthy clients and some that have now left the country, unfortunately or fortunately as the Hon. Member says, . . . Oh, what was his name? He did fairly well under the Socialist banner. I don't know how he managed to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before this House sets out in the beginning the things that the NDP Government opposite has done to fight inflation and it is a pretty sorry record indeed.

First of all, it talks about increasing the minimum wage and yet the Province of Ontario, the Department of Labour has done a study which indicates that it takes exactly one year or approximately one year, for the differential to reassert itself. In other words, if the minimum wage is increased 50 cents an hour the people above the minimum wage will have their salaries raised 50 cents an hour within a year. In other words the minimum wage doesn't help anybody.

It is a very interesting study. It is surprising that the Members opposite seem to forget that when they talk about the minimum wage it is a self-defeating thing and there are studies to prove it. And yet that is one cornerstone in the NDP fight against inflation. They talk about abolishing the premiums and then we have the Premier's words the other day, "It is only \$72." He must have said it seven or eight times that it is only \$72. It is only \$72 that we are doing for the people. He made a big thing about it one year ago when he took it off for the old age pensioners, now we find out "It is only \$72" that he is giving, to quote the Premier of the Government opposite. It is very surprising that that is all that the Government opposite can do.

They talk about raising social assistance allowances — 29 per cent one year, 52,000 people on social assistance in the Province of Saskatchewan. Possibly that may be the only group that you have helped to fight inflation in the Province of Saskatchewan, those on social welfare. Nobody else has been helped by the Government opposite. And then we find out that the supposedly little helpers of the little man have greedily taken away the family allowance for those on social assistance. That is the NDP record on fighting inflation in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Resolution sets that out.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was a little disappointed to hear the Premier lose his cool again, the other night when he got into a diatribe against the Economic Council of Canada, as I prefaced in my remarks, that it is a very responsible organization. The Premier said that the Economic Council of Canada is against raising old age pensions, whereas his party is in favor of doing something for the old age pensioners. He had his chance in the Budget and he failed to do one solitary thing for the old age pensioners in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in fact . . .

An Hon. Member: — He raised income taxes!

Mr. Lane: — Oh, he raised the income tax, I'm sorry! I suppose that is a help to the old age pensioners. Not one solitary program in that Budget to help the old age pensioner and yet it just shows the surprising ignorance on the part of the Premier and the Government opposite because the Economic Council of Canada says just the opposite. It says that it feels that family allowances are least likely to interfere with the workings

of the labor market and increases in family allowance and for old age pensions are not inflationary. As a matter of fact they say they are long overdue. That's what the Economic Council of Canada says.

It is too bad the Government opposite didn't read that. I am surprised that the new Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) and the Premier, Mr. Blakeney, all seem to have forgotten what the Economic Council of Canada has said. The Economic Council of Canada has made some constructive proposals for fighting inflation, but every constructive proposal made by any responsible body for fighting inflation has been ignored and I say, deliberately and purposely, by the Government opposite. I say that the Government is deliberately making whatever moves that it possibly can to maintain an inflationary psychology in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Messer: — How can you say that!

Mr. Lane: — I just said it, and I just proved it and your record is dismal. So far, all that you have done to keep down high prices in the Province of Saskatchewan is subsidize beer. That is your sole record.

When we talk about selective wage and price controls, we get selective price controls. You bet we get selective price controls! We selectively go out and help the one product that the Government opposite says the people really need, something that really has to have help, the first priority of the Government is to help the beer drinkers of the Province of Saskatchewan, and that is what the Government has done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — We talk about bread. We asked the Government to absorb the proposed increases in the price of bread and they have refused to do so and they can do so. Poultry, meat, fish any other products, they can absorb the prices and yet they have refused to do so. They hold up proudly the fact that we were prepared to keep down the price of beer in the Province of Saskatchewan, but the Opposition made such a noise that they had to back off. Make no mistake that we are proud to bring that stupid proposal to the attention of the public and it was the public who spoke and it was the public who forced the Government opposite to back off.

We talked about clothing. We hear about all of the things for which prices have gone up which the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park just raised. He talked about clothing, and not one proposal in the Budget or from the Government opposite to do anything about the high cost of children's clothing. Very surprising that the Government did not take off the sales tax for children's clothing. That is something the Government opposite can do and it is something else that the Government has refused to do.

We talked . . .

Mr. Messer: — Means test!

Mr. Lane: — You are in favor of the means test. We have already seen that. You have a means test on the Day Care Centres. A surprising about face by the Government opposite.

Let's take a look. We talked about gouging the middle man. We have heard that allegation floating around the Chamber tonight and this afternoon, about the big bad middle man getting the farmer. In Saskatchewan we have marketing boards, we have co-op livestock yards, we have a government controlled meat packing plant and we have co-op retailers. Are you saying that in the Province of Saskatchewan the co-operatives and the Government of Saskatchewan are doing the gouging of the farmers? Because that is what you are saying, that is what is happening if there is gouging in the Province of Saskatchewan. You are at fault right from the basic producer right up to the retailer.

Mr. Cowley: — You are . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — He is getting a little excited, Mr. Speaker. They say that truth always hurts and it is certainly hurting the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — But every aspect is influenced or controlled in the Province of Saskatchewan by the Government opposite and if there is any gouging in the Province of Saskatchewan you are as much at fault as anyone else is, and you have the power to act and you have failed to act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, when a very common sense proposal like a government inventory of basic farm supplies doesn't even get a hearing from the Government. We know that there are supplies in the province where it is a distribution problem and not a supply problem. We know that there are adequate supplies of certain farm products and yet the Government refuses to do anything about it and refuses to help the farmer maintain or reduce his cost of production. We have asked for a cost of farm production price review board to monitor these prices, to take away the inflationary psychology and keep the prices down and let the farmers know where there are unconscionable transactions. You yell and scream about it and make all sorts of allegations. And you can do something about it, you can call public attention to unconscionable price increases, if there are any, and yet you refuse to do it. You are failing, you are failing in the fight against inflation. Because there are things that the Government opposite can do.

The attempt by the Government to blame one particular level of government, when the problem is international — it is national, it is provincial and it is municipal — I say is irresponsible politics and it is an irresponsible motion that is before this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, they make certain suggestions. It is very interesting to note that the suggestions made in this Resolution are in fact not accepted by David Lewis. The NDP leader in Ottawa has not made one concrete proposal to fight inflation in the Dominion of Canada, not one, and yet here an NDP Government in Saskatchewan is making certain policies and certain proposals which are not accepted by the national New Democratic Party. They want such appropriate steps to control the cost of living by developing policies and programs to increase food production and yet their interference in the agricultural sector in Saskatchewan is creating instability in the Province of Saskatchewan, not stability.

They avoid the Outlook Dam, they get out of that because that's going to increase food production and a deliberate approach to create inflation, they refuse to act in that regard.

They have created havoc by their interferences in a government controlled Land Bank. When government interference right through the whole Land Bank Commission has been proven in this House, you say that that gives stability to the farm people. Certainly it does not! It's just government interference and unfortunately government control of the Land Bank Commission.

The Government is involved in a Feed Grains Commission, a Hog Marketing Commission — people are going out of hogs in Saskatchewan because of that Government's actions in the Province of Saskatchewan. And that is not creating stability! Then you're going to try and tag somebody else with lack of action; look in your own House first because you are at fault. You created instability in agriculture and yet you call for someone else to correct your problem.

You wanted to establish a Prices Review Board empowered to set selective price controls. The only price control you've acted on is beer, I've already proved that to the satisfaction of the Members of the House and it's an embarrassment to the Government opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Surprising, very, very surprising that that becomes the basic commodity in the Province of Saskatchewan. We've asked for a Prices Review Board from you people and yet you refuse to do anything to monitor the cost of farm production.

The Government is going to implement and enforce the effective controls to curb monopoly power and we heard an awful lot of allegations about monopoly power and the rich and what they are doing to this, that, and the other people. We know the Government opposite would love to set up a monopoly called Saskoil, which surely is not curbing monopolistic powers.

They buy into Intercontinental Packers and out goes Burns, thus setting up a monopoly in the Province of Saskatchewan. The NDP is on record as wanting a monopoly of the railroads in Canada to eliminate any competition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Surprising. That just shows

how much business acumen the Members opposite have when they want to take over a losing proposition like the Canadian Pacific Railroad, but that's typical of the NDP thought. They move to control and take total control, monopolistic control of the forest industry in Saskatchewan. They want to nationalize potash, they want to nationalize the fertilizer industry according to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). How is that curbing monopolistic practices? If monopolistic practices are creating and are a cause of inflation, again you are as guilty as anyone else is, who is involved in a monopolistic practice.

It's a surprising thing, Mr. Speaker, 40 per cent of our gross national product goes through the public sector. The day that a government of any stripe, in Canada can avoid taking blame or attempt to avoid taking blame for inflation, is no longer valid because too much of our gross national product goes through the public sector. You can't hide that. Those days are over. Governments are responsible for inflation and no type of motion or proposal before this House can mask that. We will have further to say and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 5 — Construction of Additional Facilities for Grain Handling

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Comer (Nipawin):

That this Assembly urges that the Federal Government take immediate steps to provide for: (a) construction of additional facilities for grain handling; (b) the dredging of Churchill Harbour to a depth of 40 feet; (c) the provision of bulk loading facilities for sulphur, potash and ores; and (d) immediate construction of sheds and cranes for the import and export of general cargo, in particular containers.

and the amendment thereto proposed by Mr. Grant:

That the words "commends the Prime Minister of Canada for indicating willingness to upgrade the Port of Churchill and" be added after the word 'Assembly' in the first line and the words "and further, that the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Manitoba be urged to lend every possible assistance to the development of Churchill as a first class Port, "be added after the word 'containers' in the last line.

Mr. G. B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, when this subject last came before the House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — . . . and the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) spoke on it, I indicated that I believed that most of us would agree basically with what he expressed, in so far as the future of the Port of Churchill was concerned.

My acquaintance with Churchill dates back to almost 25 years ago when I made my first trip to the Port of Churchill and the most recent trip would indicate that little or nothing has been done to enhance the facilities at that port in the intervening 25 years.

However, during the 25 years there has certainly been a lot of talk by Liberal Governments, by Conservative Governments, and by NDP Governments about the pros and cons of Churchill and what should be done to improve that port to move western Canadian grain particularly.

I think it was the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) who said that the Liberals do a lot of talking and they don't get much action but, I think this is a case where all governments, federal, provincial and all parties have done a lot of talking without too much action.

Looking back, I don't think it's necessary to go back too far because if one went back to the origin of the Port of Churchill back in the mid '20s there is a great volume of material on the port. But I think the conference that took place in 1972 is indicative of the frustration that most people have in western Canada on governmental attitudes toward this port.

At that time there was a Hudson Bay Route Association meeting in Weyburn, attended by some 100 people and that seems to be the occasion each year when there is the most interest in the Port of Churchill, when that association has its annual meeting. But at that meeting the President, Mr. Richford was very critical of what was not happening, pointing out that the port was being used by vessels of up to 45,000 tons when actually the port harbour and its facilities were built for ships of 2,000 to 4,000 tons. Actually it seems to me that if that's the accommodation they have, that they were built to accommodate Henry Hudson's ship and not Peter Dalglish's ships.

He pointed out also that this is a type of work, that is the improvement of the port and the facilities and the roadbed, that would be a good make-work program in a depressed area and probably far more beneficial to the country than many of the other make-work programs that we encounter.

At that meeting the Hon. Mr. Lang was speaking and the content of his remarks seemed to be that until the demand for the use of the facilities of the Port of Churchill increased that it was difficult to justify the expenditure that would be required to update this port.

One wonders whether it's not the old story of which came first, the chicken or the egg, because the users of the port are critical of the facilities and the lack of proper equipment and the lack of depth in the harbour and yet Mr. Lang says until the port proves itself by handling a bigger volume of grain, that the future didn't look too good as far as federal money was concerned.

Well, at that same meeting in Weyburn, no this is a later meeting held in Churchill, when the Premiers of the three Prairie Provinces, I believe, attended a gathering up there, and Mr. Taylor of the National Harbours Board was speaking, indicating that some \$16 million was being recommended by way of expenditures to deepen the harbour, repair the wharf and certain

other things. Mr. Dalglish of the Dalglish Shipping Lines, who is probably one of the biggest boosters of the Port of Churchill that we have in the world, not just in Canada, but in the world, because Peter Dalglish has been coming in there for about 25 years with his ships. He felt that \$16 million was just a drop in the bucket and that it was most inadequate.

At that same time the Premiers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba were very critical of the facilities and when Mr. Taylor who is the Chairman of the National Harbours Board was asked to comment on this criticism, he agreed with it. He said, I understand them completely, I have nothing but credit for the Premiers. So apparently, Mr. Taylor, of that august body, the National Harbours Board agrees that the facilities are most inadequate.

The Hon. Otto Lang indicated that, in 1973, I believe it was, that all the facilities of ports would be used, including Churchill, but yet in 1972 that year set a record of some 26 million bushels. That was the highest volume that had ever been moved through and yet the Chairman of the Harbours Board felt that the figure should be in excess of 30 million and Peter Dalglish, if he is an authority — I think his opinion is worth considering — felt that the figure should be nearer to 40 million.

Mr. Dalglish at that time was also very critical of the short season and suggested that it could easily be extended by a relatively small expenditure and by a small increase in insurance and I don't believe anything has been done in that regard either.

When Mr. Schreyer and Mr. Blakeney were in Churchill, it's interesting to note that Mr. Schreyer picked up a booklet on the harbour or on the facilities at the harbour, and the booklet mentioned that there were three cranes; a 10-ton crane, a 15-ton and a 30-ton crane. But no one saw the cranes, so this seems odd indeed that the booklet would describe these pieces of equipment that are most essential for a harbour and Mr. Schreyer enquired where they were, but no one seemed to be able to answer him. Mr. Schreyer thought that the port was in a little poorer shape when he visited it last time which was three years prior to that date.

I doubt whether either premier has been back since 1972, because I have a feeling that not only is the Federal Government not that anxious to improve the facilities at Churchill, but I have a feeling that the provinces are not pulling their weight as well.

On July 28th in a report out of Churchill, Mr. Blakeney was very critical of the port and suggested that if Ottawa didn't do something the provinces would have to take the lead. Well, about that time the Member for Lumsden, Mr. Lane, suggested that the province should give this greater priority than they had been giving it. And I think this is true. I don't think Manitoba particularly has been as vocal as to the merits of the Port of Churchill for Saskatchewan even.

At these conventions of the Hudson Bay Route Association, if it wasn't for the delegates from Saskatchewan, I don't know just what kind of business they would conduct, because Manitoba certainly has been mum in the past.

Well, this article written by the Leader-Post reporter Mr. Harrison, said that the course of the Port of Churchill's future, subject of two days of investigation by prairie business and government leaders this week, must show tangible evidence of change in the next few months or the prairie premiers will begin thinking of more direct action. Mr. Schreyer said, rest assured that having gone to the trouble of organizing this meeting, we will not let it rest. He suggested that Premiers Blakeney of Saskatchewan and Lougheed of Alberta and himself might take their complaints to Ottawa personally. At least there would be a more formal presentation than has been made in the past. That was in 1972.

About a year ago in 1973 in a Leader-Post editorial, I think the meat of this thing was struck when one member attending the 1973 Hudson Bay Route Association said, what is needed is, "One guy to say this is what is to be done and get on with the job."

If Mr. Schreyer's promise to take up the cudgel if something more tangible failed to happen in the next few months as a result of the conference, made one thing clear in the eyes of the reporter, that the leadership vacuum was about to be filled by the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Premiers. They felt with moral support from Premier Lougheed of Alberta, in the fall of 1973, and with indications that the Federal Harbours Board itself was about to urge some improvements at the port, it appears possible to declare the Churchill Conference a resounding success. It may, however, take a few more years to really prove that.

Well, I think from the words spoken by the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) and what I've quoted from some of these articles and the fact that this port has been in existence now for about 50 years — I think it was 1922 or thereabouts that it was built — I don't think that too much is going to happen quickly. There definitely seems to be a foot dragging on the part of Ottawa. There is less than total enthusiasm on the part of Manitoba and I suspect that even on the part of Saskatchewan, there is less than total enthusiasm.

I think it's high time that the Federal Government made up its mind on the port, whether they are going to have a port or whether they are not going to have a port and get on with the job.

I believe at the Calgary Conference there was an indication that Ottawa looked favorably on the expenditure of a sizable amount of money on the port. This at least is an encouraging sign. I always feel that it's advisable to butter up the person to whom we're looking forward to come forth with the money necessary to improve the port.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the Resolution that I believe will improve the intent of the Resolution and I hope would get the endorsement of all the Members of the House, because while it butters up the Prime Minister a bit, it also places some responsibility on our two provinces to make a greater effort to promote the Port of Churchill than has been evident in the past. I so move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't miss this opportunity to say a word or two on this very important Resolution.

I am rather disappointed the Member for Whitmore Park would move an amendment of that kind. I haven't had a chance to see it except a few rough notes that I scribbled, but I really don't see the purpose of the value of it. To commend the Prime Minister for his actions on Churchill certainly is not what I would recommend to this House.

Certainly, if there are any recommendations to be made, it should be to those who have fought so consistently over the last several decades to try to get the kind of a port that we want.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the records of this House are rather clear in so far as the stand of Saskatchewan on the importance of the Port of Churchill, these are very clear. The story of the Bay Route goes back nearly 400 years ago. It was the gift of the lands watered by rivers into Hudson Bay, by Charles II which gave Britain's claim to this part of North America which meant that these western lands became a part of Canada, rather than of the United States. This in turn made possible the high industrial and development growth of Ontario.

The fight of western Canada for the fullest development and use of the Hudson's Bay Route has gone on since approximately 1870. For over 50 years governments and farm organizations and the original On-to-the-Bay Association and its successor, the Hudson Bay Route Association have fought this battle. They have often encountered great discouragement because of the failure of people in positions of power to visualize the potentialities of the Bay Route and to secure the realization, and of hidden but very powerful opposition and apathy of our own people. We must be aware that the Hudson's Bay Route saves about 1,200 miles from Edmonton to the United Kingdom and Europe and that it eliminates the movement down the Great Lakes and seaway with the extra handling.

These savings have been estimated as from 10 to 15 cents a bushel or over on grain. I have been advised that the Russians who took most of the Churchill grain this season made a saving of several dollars a ton. And as the Wheat Board usually shares these savings, one could assume that the producer also secured more earnings.

Incidentally the Wheat Board target for Churchill was reduced from its usual 25 million bushels to 21 million for 1973 owing to the railway strike which caused the diversion of one vessel and the failure of a late cargo to move because of the extremely high ocean freight rate quotations. Only around 19 million bushels were moved. Unfortunately other sales were turned down because of the uncertainties of the strike. All vessels got away without undue delays and rail shipments to Churchill were the first to get back to normal when the strike ended. The 19 million bushels included roughly 9 million bushels of barley. In addition several thousand tons of pellets made from the elevator system screenings by a Calgary firm were shipped. Alberta is interested in the possibility of moving coarse grains, alfalfa and alfalfa pellets, mustard seed and oils. Surprisingly, interested inquiries are coming from the European Economic Community.

A few pre-fabricated buildings were shipped from Calgary to the North through Churchill this year. And the resumption of resupply through Churchill in 1974 and on a large scale hopefully in 1975 offer interesting possibilities to Alberta businessmen to share in the growing resupply for the Hudson's Bay Keewatin and some eastern Arctic areas.

Oil companies based in Alberta are doing more exploration work in the Bay. One very large drilling rig is to go in quite early in July of this year. Newspaper reports say that arrangements are almost complete for an Alberta firm to ship 100,000 tons of sulphur to Churchill for shipment overseas in 1974. Tonnages like this add strength to requests for an immediate start on long overdue rehabilitation and expansion work to the port facilities.

Economists and accountants can and have produced reports as to the future of Churchill as an overseas trading port which on the one hand if acted upon could lead to the decline, stagnation or even phasing out of our own sea port. On the other hand, vision, drive, traffic solicitation the year round and a provision of facilities at the port could produce a traffic pattern of great value to the West.

I should like here, to discount an argument often quoted to belittle the prospect of Churchill development and that is because most of the vessels come in empty. Ocean rates will continue high and prospects dim. I find myself in agreement with Mr. Rathy, a member of the Harbour Board for the Pacific who when visiting Churchill recently, took pains to deal with a question on that point. Mr. Rathy pointed out that most bulk vessels travel empty one way. It is the quick turn about which is of importance, most are built for specific cargoes and more and more the packaging traffic is being handled by the container lines operating on regular schedules. Of the 40 million tons of Vancouver traffic last year, only two million tons were incoming cargo, which meant that most vessels arrived in ballast. Vancouver, however, continues to grow and why not Churchill? Especially if we develop some container facilities.

Of late years the tardiness of the National Harbours Board in doing even necessary maintenance and improvement at Churchill the increasing importance attached by governments to reports by economists and to cost recovery techniques made some people wonder as to whether Churchill was to be phased out or operated at the lowest possible level.

The Hudson's Bay Route Association with the backing of western governments and many western organizations has increasingly asked the Federal Government to declare its intention as to the future of Churchill, and whether our port is to be maintained, Mr. Speaker, and developed as a national port or not.

Although Churchill did not get the publicity which Prince Rupert received at the Calgary Western Economic Opportunities Conference, the Prime Minister did state that Churchill would be maintained with the essential work spread out over six or seven years. This encouraging, yet discouraging statement was rejected by Premier Schreyer of Manitoba who received the support of Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan as being unacceptable as it completely failed to meet the needs or potentialities of our western seaport. I find myself in conflict, Mr. Speaker, with the Resolution when we have the western Premiers on record

as speeding up developments and our Prime Minister wanting to phase it out for the next six or seven years.

Replying to the presentation of the four western Premiers for an immediate start on an extensive program of rehabilitation and expansion on Churchill, the Hon. Jean Marchand said that he had accepted a program suggested by the National Harbours Board that would cost \$12.5 million. This would include deepening berths and channels to 35 feet, widening of the turning basin, rehabilitation of the 44 year old cribs which even National Harbour Board reports confirm as dangerous. I would say because of neglect in raising of the north end of the grain loading gallery it should also be lengthened and the provision, Mr. Speaker, of a new tug.

There was no mention of a new berth which will be made necessary by the appearance of resupply and bulk cargoes and a tidal barrier. Much of the flow of the Churchill River is being diverted into the Nelson and the reduced flow combined with a tidal barrier could lengthen the season for ordinary vessels until mid November, very close to when the seaway closes. However, one method of financing the works which has been suggested to the Minister of Transport, is to secure a commitment from the Canada Grains Commission that it will authorize an increase in the Churchill elevator charges by 20 per cent with corresponding increases in port charges, so that the costs would be borne to quote, "by the chief beneficiary, the grain producer," before the Harbours Board would agree to undertake the works.

Again we see an attempt to saddle the western grain producer with unnecessary costs and unnecessary delays. This seems very much in line with the policy which saw 1973 increases in Churchill elevator overtime rates from 140 to 290 when that service is requested which drew protests from shipping agencies and the Shipping Federation of Canada. This suggestion seems selective and punitive against Churchill which one fears could thus be quoted out of the grain handling market.

To what extent is this cost recovery policy being practised in other Canadian ports? An interesting check would find that one could list many, many non-productive and wasteful government expenditures running into even millions of dollars to which cost recovery is certainly not to be applied. Out of a national harbour budget of \$23 million, it is disgraceful that there is such a fuss over spending 2 or 3 or even \$4 million a year at Churchill. Surely the taxpayer of Canada, the beneficiary of our high tariffs can provide this national asset for Canadians, without the grain producer having to foot the bill. It is once again we, who must pay or else, Mr. Speaker.

There are several other aspects of this whole development at Churchill. With the recent grain handling picture and the railroads performance in it, I think that we ought to again spend more time looking at the potentialities of Churchill and its use.

I therefore request leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 155

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) for Return No. 155 showing:

Under the Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act: (a) the monthly collections during 1973; (b) the number of estates that were involved; (c) the number of beneficiaries that were involved; (d) the number of estates that were valued between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (e) the number of estates that were valued between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000; (f) the number of estates that were valued over \$1,000,000.

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

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

(a) The quarterly collections during 1973 under the Saskatchewan Succession Duty Act; (b) the number of estates from which some amount of duties were received; (c) the number of estates that were assessed for Succession Duty purposes during the period from April 1, 1973 to September 30, 1973, that were: (i) of a value between \$50,000 and \$200,000; (ii) of a value between \$200,000 and \$500,000; (iii) of a value between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000; (iv) of a value in excess of \$1,000,000.

Hon. J. E. Brockelbank (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate briefly, because of the series of events that prevented the Minister of Finance from responding to an inquiry which was placed by a Member in the debate because the Minister of Finance had moved the amendment.

The Member when speaking in the debate had questioned why the number of beneficiaries was left out of the amendment offered by the Minister of Finance. Upon inquiring into this particular matter, I was able to discover that the Federal Government does not supply information on a beneficiary basis, only on an estate basis. Therefore, this information is not available and consequently the Minister of Finance when presenting the amendment left it out of the amendment. I think the information will be supplied in an adequate the sufficient form in the amendment proposed by the Minister of Finance and I would therefore support that amendment.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 7 — Stabilization Plans for Farm Commodities

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Larson (Pelly):

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to establish permanent stabilization plans for all farm commodities based on cost of production, and in particular, to immediately join with the Saskatchewan Government in its temporary Hog Price Stabilization plan to convert it to a permanent long term plan in order to guarantee fair returns to all hog producers.

Mr. I. W. Carlson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on this Resolution last day, I indicated that I would have more to say about the matter of stabilization.

I want to comment on some of the statements made by the Member for Moosomin. When I read his transcript it really didn't have much to say. He criticized the Hog Marketing Commission and said that it was unpopular. He criticized the guaranteed floor price payments and tried to say that they were a political move to try to gain support for the Commission. Mr. Speaker, that is pure nonsense and the Members opposite should know it. The farmers know that the floor price is a sincere effort by the Provincial Government to keep the hog industry alive. We all realize that it is a short term plan. No provincial government could justify maintaining a program such as this for a long period of time as it ends up being nothing more than a consumer subsidy to people outside of our own province.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite know full well that the livestock industry must have government programs that will help to maintain them in business. Under present costs of production and prices, almost every sector of the livestock business is in trouble. The floor prices on hogs have helped them, they now need a long term and permanent stabilization program.

Beef producers are in the worst situation that I can remember. This is not something that has developed in the last few weeks either as some of the Members opposite would have us believe. Although it is quite possible that the opposition didn't realize there was a crisis developing. I don't believe they have many cattle producers on that side of the House. Probably the closest thing there is to a beef producer is the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who has a few cattle in a custom feedlot. He probably was the first one to realize that there was a serious problem and probably it didn't dawn on him until he got the bill for the feed for the cattle in the feedlot.

For Liberals, money talks and it talks loudest when it is coming out of their own pockets.

Mr. Speaker, the poultry producers are faced with similar production cost increases. They at least have orderly marketing and production controls available to them which does help somewhat. The turkey producers have now formed a Canadian Turkey Marketing Agency which works together with the various provincial marketing boards. However, they are still unable to cope with United States turkeys being dumped on the Canadian market. They too, need some government help.

In his closing remarks the Member for Moosomin made a request of the Provincial Government, I want to quote him, Mr. Speaker. He said:

So we call this time on the Provincial Government to be constructive, to forget politics and to accept their responsibility to the farm people of this province. We hope that this time the NDP will co-operate with the Federal Government and accept the stabilization plan which will be of great benefit to our farmers in future years.

Let's take note of this suggestion. He says we should be constructive, co-operate with the Federal Government and accept their proposals. That certainly sounds like Liberal consultation. Constructive, but don't say anything. Be co-operative but don't do anything. Then sit back and accept blindly whatever the Federal Liberal Government proposes. I, for one, and I am sure this Government is not prepared to sit back and totally accept an unreasonable proposal.

We have seen too many useless Liberal programs that have proven to be disastrous originating out of Ottawa. For example, 'Operation LIFT', and the abortive feed grains proposal.

I would seriously make some constructive proposals. Before making these suggestions, let's review the present program administered through the Federal Agriculture Stabilization Act. This Act sets a minimum stabilization level on certain named commodities. These commodities are cattle, hogs, sheep, milk, eggs and wheat oats and barley that are produced outside the designated Canadian Wheat Board area. The minimum support level is 80 per cent of the average price prevailing in the preceding 10 years throughout all of Canada. A higher rate may be established. Commodities other than those listed may be named and in fact nearly every commodity has received assistance at some time or another.

My objections to this program are, first, that the 80 per cent of the last ten-year average is unrealistic. Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent is too low a percentage and the 10 years is much too long a period of time. The Canadian average price doesn't reflect regional variations.

Secondly, the price depression must be over a period of one calendar year before payments can be made. That does little to protect the farmer who sells an entire year's production over a short period of time at depressed prices, if the year's average is not low. This may be acceptable for dairy producers who sell literally every day or every week of the year, but it is totally unacceptable for beef producers who may be forced to sell all their year's production in one month. Anybody who knows anything about the livestock industry realizes that once a steer is ready for market it cannot be kept in cold storage to wait for the market to improve.

Thirdly, the Act does not specify the quantity of produce that may qualify for the stabilization payment. The last payment that was made was for hogs and was restricted to 200 head or \$1,000 per producer.

Fourthly, a historical price level bears no real relationship to current production costs. Therefore, the best the present Act can provide is stabilized gross income with no guarantee that this will result in a positive net income position.

There are several obvious places to start to make improvements in the stabilization program. The average price must be raised much higher than the 80 per cent and the 10-year period

should be reduced to two or three years at the most. The floor price should be calculated as a percentage of production cost and not on historical prices, which are not relevant.

The third recommendation that I want to make is that the list of the commodities should be expanded to include a much larger range of commodities. There are a few other factors that must be taken into account when discussing commodity stabilization.

Stabilization of prices does not eliminate the necessity of orderly marketing of various commodities. Stabilization of prices will probably create the necessity for production controls to prevent surplus production when the disincentive of low prices is removed.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the time is right now to convince the Federal Government to implement a realistic stabilization program. They have indicated a willingness to act. It is our duty to see that the program is of real value to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I will certainly be supporting the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief but a few glaring facts must be brought to light.

Mr. Larson, the Member for Pelly, has introduced a very important Resolution for this Assembly's consideration. I suggest that this Resolution is serious in that hog producers are facing the highest costs of inputs in history. The cost of feed, Mr. Speaker, is having a serious effect on hog producers in Saskatchewan.

You will recall that back in October 1973, our Government with a very aggressive Minister and the Department of Agriculture, became concerned with the dilemma of livestock producers. Not only showing concern by paying lip service, our Minister of Agriculture introduced a Hog Price Stabilization Plan, which in the first quarter paid subsidies of up to 57 cents per pound, bases index 100. That program, Mr. Speaker, showed our Government's concern to a tune of \$1.1 million, a direct subsidy to the hog industry in Saskatchewan. And that subsidy will cost even more in the next quarter. That is performance, Mr. Speaker!

I think it would be a good exercise for Members of this House to know what it costs presently to produce a hog. A thorough production costs analysis has been made by the Department of Agriculture. They assume an operation of some 60 sows and also built into their cost, some assumptions. The assumptions they make are in terms of a management level. They have three examples and they list them, above average management, average management and below average management. They break the costs down into two areas, variable costs and fixed costs, to show the high costs of inputs, or high costs of feeds in

particular. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to give a run down of these costs.

Feeding grain at 5 cents a pound; pre-starter at 13 cents a pound; starter at 9 cents a pound; supplement at 13 cents a pound; sow supplement and other rations at 15 cents a pound. We find that we have a total feeding cost to the above efficient operator of \$46.90 per animal; we have an average operator at \$52.45 and a cost to the poor operator of \$61.80. Adding to that list of feed input is feed processing, utilities and machinery use, buildings and facilities repair, vet and medicine, marketing costs, interest on variable costs and a death allowance for several animals. We find that we have a total variable cost at that end of \$55.15 for the efficient operator and as high as \$72.25 for the not so efficient operator.

Fixed costs are another portion, but a very small portion, with grain taking a bigger share of the cost of operating. Fixed costs list out at some \$10.30 for an efficient operator and \$11.30 for an average operator, \$10.85 for a not so efficient operator, adding to that a labor allowance. We find the total cost to raise one animal, with an efficient operator with good management is \$75.45; with the average operator approximately \$83 and with a not so average operator \$93.10. On a break even price of 160 pounds they find that 47.2 cents is breakeven for an efficient operator; an average operator would be 51.9 and a not so average operator 58.2 cents.

On the other side of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, we find that the prices for animals as of this morning were running around 42.60 cents per pound (call it 43 cents) and we would find that the income to a producer for an animal under the present prices would be \$68.80. However, Mr. Speaker, under the stabilization program guaranteeing the producer 57 cents a pound, bases index 100, the operator would have \$91.20 for that same animal. That, Mr. Speaker, is a subsidy to the hog industry of \$22.40 bases index 100.

Mr. Speaker, those are 22 good reasons why hog producers like hog stabilization; those are 22 good reasons why hog producers like hog marketing commissions and those are 22 good reasons why hog producers will want the New Democratic Government back in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, these figures, I think, clearly show to Members the situation producers are in, in Saskatchewan. This Government has acted with a temporary program that has seen, and will see, huge and necessary subsidies to our producers. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic to see Members opposite parading around the province, constantly needling the Hog Marketing Commission, our stabilization plan, but what has to be the real classic case of hypocrisy would be the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). Yes, you probably know the Member for Morse, I understand, is a hog producer.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse is consistent with his party position in condemning all stabilization plans and in particular, the Hog Marketing Commission and the Provincial Hog Prices Stabilization Plan.

March 19, 1974

I suggest that he be fair to his constituents and my advice would be that you can't have your cake and eat it too. Let us hear the Member for Morse stand up in this House and throughout the province and commend the Government on its stabilization plan and the Hog Marketing Commission, because it is hard for taxpayers to understand how a Member can keep face, while his mouth rattles on when he is stooped over the public pot and digging in with both hands, to pull out his share of the present \$22 stabilization payment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — If the Member opposite and Members of the Liberal Party do not believe in stabilization let us see those Members, in particular the hog producer from Morse, return his stabilization cheque back to the Provincial Treasury.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, a simple calculation, for example, on the Member for Morse's operation would be if he had a productive year of approximately 60 sows and just assuming that he produced 900 animals annually and if he was able to sell approximately 200 hogs per quarter and let's say that the prices stay constant as they are right now, an average of \$15 per animal in this quarter, Mr. Wiebe would be eligible for a payment from the stabilization plan of \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Party and Mr. Wiebe are against such a plan and the Hog Marketing Commission, I ask them and I urge them, to pack up and head for that great Canadian tax haven, Alberta, and there Mr. Wiebe would not be subject to a \$3,000 free gratis cheque from any stabilization plan. If Liberals support our program, let them tonight, stand up, including Mr. Wiebe, one after another, and voice their support not only here but in the Press and in the province for the hog marketing stabilization plan and for the Hog Marketing Commission.

Mr. Speaker, while this Assembly has asked that the Federal Government provide a stabilization plan, let there be no delusion that if that plan were to be similar in any way to their old stabilization plan it would not be acceptable to the producers of Saskatchewan.

The program I refer to, Mr. Speaker, was one in which the Federal Government attempted to stabilize prices based on average 10-year prices, of which they took 80 per cent and made up the difference up to that figure of 80 per cent. That is what the Federal Government calls stabilization, I think no. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's plans make payouts only on partial production of the producers in Saskatchewan and that portion, Mr. Speaker, was at the discretion of the board.

Mr. Speaker, that program was a joke. It only made payouts to Saskatchewan producers, I understand, in the years of 1961, 1965 and 1971. That simply is no plan. Unless the new federal plan is identical or similar to the present provincial plan, it will not be worth the paper it is written on.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine that some comment is required in regard to this debate.

I understand there are a number of NDP Members across the way who are taking advantage of the stabilization plan on hogs and they are going into hogs themselves. I understand that the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) as well has gone into the hog business. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, what his stabilization payment was for the first 3-month period. I wonder what category he puts himself in whether it is the efficient, the average or the inefficient category?

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, seeing that he was quoting figures as to how much my return would be in regard to the stabilization plan, that for the 3-month period, because we have an efficient operation and we do market high grade hogs, my stabilization payment amounted to \$2.83 per hog.

One begins to wonder the reasons for this motion on the Order Paper. I had an opportunity to talk to some of the Members opposite and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) shortly after he announced the stabilization plan for the hog industry. As we know because of the Hog Marketing Commission and the dictatorial attitude of the Members opposite, in that they are not allowing the hog producers themselves to have any voice in the Commission, they have found it necessary possibly to throw some kind of hope into hog production in Saskatchewan in order not to lose all of the hog producers.

On this occasion, while talking to them, the price was somewhere around \$56, about \$1 under the subsidy. I asked them why they come out with a subsidy? They said our projections are that it is not going to cost us much money. Predictions are that hogs are going to be up to \$60 in January, they will be up to \$80 in March, so really it is a political move. We don't think that it is going to be costing the taxpayers that much money. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, they realized that their projections were wrong and it would cost them a lot of money. It is going to cost the taxpayers of this province close to \$6.5 million in the next three-month period. So what are they doing? Again, they are trying to get themselves out of a hot box and they are crying to Ottawa to come along and bail them out of this mess which they got themselves into and they want the Federal Government to take over the subsidy program.

Mr. Engel: — Are you against that?

Mr. Wiebe: — The Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch wants to know if I am against it or not. I imagine that seeing that he is strictly a grain farmer that by next summer he will be in the hog business as well. Certainly we are not against the stabilization plan. I don't see why in the world we should be and I don't think that anybody should be opposed to it. I think the same stabilization plan should be offered for the beef industry in Canada today. I disagree with the present stabilization program which the Federal Government has implemented, I don't think it is going to do anything to help the cattle industry in Saskatchewan. But, I must point out as well for the Members opposite, that a hog marketing commission or a cattle marketing commission is not required to put in a stabilization program.

They have sat idly by and not said one word; they wouldn't allow us to debate the crisis in this House; they wouldn't allow a feed subsidy, which by the way, Alberta is giving and which the Provincial Government did in this province about six years ago. They wish to do nothing in terms of cattle. They are quite content to sit back and allow the feedlot operator, the cow-calf operator, to slowly go out of business in this province. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that here this Government on that side of the House is talking about helping out the little guy, the small guy, just like they are helping them out on the income tax return. How are they helping him?

The people who are suffering in the cattle industry today are not the established cow-calf operator, not the big rancher, not the big feedlot operator. The person who is being hurt today in cattle is the fellow whom this Government opposite has enticed into going into cattle, to diversify his operations through FarmStart and other programs. A number of these fellows are new to cattle, they don't have the experience, they don't have their feed reserve built up, these are the ones who are being hurt. And these are the fellows that you people are hurting by sitting back with your mouths closed, you are not doing anything to help them. And you talk about stabilization! You're darn right we need stabilization in this province. You can rest assured that it is not going to be you fellows that are going to give it to them, it is going to be the Federal Government in Ottawa that is going to stabilize this industry.

If the livestock producers have to wait for you people opposite to do any stabilization for the livestock industry in this province we are not going to have any cattle left to stabilize.

I have much more to say on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 8 — Feed Grains Policy

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Carlson (Yorkton):

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to immediately restore the pricing authority of the Canadian Wheat Board as it relates to domestic marketing of feed grains and quickly develop a feed grains policy that ensures fair and equitable prices within the Province and across Canada, under a system that leaves all of the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board intact.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to review some of the remarks already made and at the end add what I think would be a reasonable policy as far as feed grain is concerned in Canada.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate, for the Members opposite, the fact that the beef industry has been locating in western Canada for the last few years and if we're looking towards the East as being the great beneficiary of cheap feed grain, well this doesn't prove correct as far as statistics are concerned. And I wish to read to the House, statistics which have been provided to me by the Department of Agriculture,

the Canada Department of Agriculture, for last year, 1973. For the 12 months of that year Alberta slaughtered approximately 100,000 head of cattle per month; Ontario slaughtered about 80,000 head; Saskatchewan about 11,000 head; Quebec about 11,000; Maritimes 3,000 and British Columbia 3,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think, what is also significant is, of the cattle eligible for slaughter that originated in the four western provinces, only about 7.6 per cent of these cattle were shipped live weight to eastern Canada for slaughter. So in actual fact we were slaughtering all of the beef that was raised here in the West and was in condition for processing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this has great significance as far as any feeds grains policy for our country is concerned. I think if we take a look at a feed grains situation as exists today, we will find that out of every ten bushels of feed grain, approximately seven are used where they are grown, in that particular area, two of those bushels will be exported and one out of the ten or approximately 10 per cent will be shipped to the eastern provinces.

The result of this of course, Mr. Speaker, is that given our present transportation system it's extremely important that a large quantity of the feed grain continues to be used in the area where it is grown, simply because we do not, as of current conditions, have a transportation system that can move the tremendous quantities of feed grain to either export or to other domestic markets. So it's extremely important that we maintain a healthy livestock industry in the western areas, from the point of view of the grain producer, as well as for other very valid economic reasons.

Now, if we take a look at the suggested policy that has been put out, Mr. Speaker, we would find that the National Farmers Union, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, to a lesser extent, and the NDP Governments of Saskatchewan and Manitoba have been the most vocal. We would find that in favor have been the Palliser Wheat Growers, the Stock Growers Association, the United Grain Growers' delegates at their convention were unanimous and more recently the Alberta Government has come out in favor, Mr. Speaker, of wishing to put the current suggested Federal Government policy into operation as soon as possible.

It's interesting to note that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture refused to take a position, apparently finding the whole subject somewhat too controversial, in a recent meeting held here in the West.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some suggestions as to what I think would be a valid feed grains policy and should receive consideration.

First of all, I think that it's most important that we have a storage policy that would indicate that the Government of Canada is willing to pay some of the storage costs to maintain necessary feed grains supplies. Now, I think that this can be done in two different ways. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is that I think prior to the beginning of every crop year, at least prior to seeding, prior to the production part of the year, that the Federal Government should announce a price for feed grain that they would be willing to stand behind for the whole year. Here I suggest that the Federal Government would be this

time of the year announce a guaranteed price per bushel on barley, that would be carried through for the whole year. In other words, a farmer before he begins his planting intentions this spring, would know what he could expect for his whole crop once it is seeded and for want of a better example, the Government could announce at this time of the year \$2.50 for a bushel of barley and stand behind that announcement as having the intentions of either taking in on quota that quantity of grain or, Mr. Speaker, that if they are unable to take it into the system that they would be willing to pay the farmer to store the rest of that crop on his farm. This would mean that the farmer would receive the \$2.50 that he is unable to deliver to the elevator system and the Federal Government would pay him the \$2.50 and they would pay him some storage on retention of that amount of grain for the period of time until he is able to deliver it to the system.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this should be applied to the year in which the grain is being produced. Now, I would suggest that next year, after this year has passed, the Federal Government will end up having a guaranteed price, farmers will have received payment on everything they have produced and again next year come spring, prior to planting intentions, the Federal Government would announce another guaranteed price. And I think this would have the two advantages. It should bring forth sufficient production of feed grain to maintain a viable livestock industry and at the same time the amount of grain not taken into the system could be kept on the farm and the farmer paid to store it.

I think secondly, that the Wheat Board should retain control over the transportation of all grain and as I suggested before that a quota system should be applied to the feed grain system. I think in respect to the Wheat Board retaining control over all transportation, that the Federal Government has already suggested it.

Mr. Speaker, I think with the guaranteed price system an announcement prior to planting intentions and an indication that the production would all be bought, that we would have little reason to have surplus grain unloaded on the market at a cheap price. I think this is what may concern most grain producers. I think for the livestock industry that the announced price for a full year ahead of time would be a price which they would be able to lay their plans on when buying cattle for fattening when going into general livestock production, hogs, cattle and poultry.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have just attempted to outline two or three of the points that I think should be involved in a feed grains policy. I feel that with the guaranteed price there needs to be little worry of cheap grain flowing to eastern Canada because of bargaining which some people have voiced concern over. I think there should be little worry of bargaining taking place because there would be no particular reason why you should sell at a low price or at least lower than the guaranteed price.

So, with those suggestions, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this issue can receive a rational debate. I think that it's received a great deal of political discussion up to this point and unfortunately I think for both livestock producers and feed grain producers, their best interests are being lost in a political blast that's been flowing across the papers in the country for about the last six months.

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I had not really intended on taking part in this debate and I know that a lot of debates take place in this House with similar opening remarks, but I couldn't help but take exception to the closing words of the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) when he asked that rational debate take place rather than political debate in regard to the pricing authority of the Canadian Wheat Board and the other ramblings and generalities that he referred to in relation to a feed grains policy in the orderly marketing system.

Mr. Speaker, if there has been an attempt to encourage and promote and develop rational debate it certainly would have to have emanated from the Government of Saskatchewan in regard to the present orderly marketing system that is under debate at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Member for Morse to know that some time ago, long before we got into the complexities and the inner mechanics of the proposed feed grains proposal and the orderly marketing system which the Hon. Otto Lang would have us subject our primary producers to in western Canada, especially in the prairie basin, that I proposed to him a long term feed grains proposal which would allow for equitable feed grain pricing across Canada. And at that time we were given every assurance that the Federal Government would consider and would in fact implement discussions and negotiations, not only with provincial governments, Saskatchewan in particular, because it is the largest supplier of grains in Canada today, but also with the farm organizations before there was ever any decision made in regard to an interim feed grain proposal, or for that matter a long term feed grain proposal.

Obviously, those kinds of assurances that he gave me, those many months ago did not really mean very much to him.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that my Government's present views on the present so-called interim Feed Grains Policy of the Federal Government are indeed very well known. I have spoken on them many times over the past months with reference to the obvious defects of the present arrangement which have been pointed out, not only by the Members of this Legislative Assembly but also the farm organizations of the prairie basin in western Canada, such as: Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers Union and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and more recently the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

A greatly improved permanent policy at least according to the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board is going to be announced August 1974. The Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board assures us that there will be ample opportunity to discuss the permanent policy before it takes final form, but at the same time he announces that the private grain trade will be allowed full access, full access to western feed grains outside of the authority and the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

This in itself is enough to condemn the new plan and who knows what other shortcomings it may have.

Let me just review some of the worst features of the present policy to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the kinds of things that

can come out of Ottawa, not in a crisis situation with limited time, but at least after two full years of intensive study and preparation.

1. It is admitted in all quarters that the Wheat Board following Mr. Lang's directives has been selling barley in the domestic market at anywhere up to a dollar a bushel below the export price, since Mr. Lang's policy was announced.

2. We have at least three markets for feed grains operating after a fashion, in western Canada at this time. Especially, and at least in the prairie basin the Wheat Board Pool and the Agricultural Products Board and the very unsatisfactory off quota trade direct from farmers to mills and feedlots.

3. The Wheat Board's legitimate operations are being hampered because it must allow the Agricultural Products Board's stocks to take up space in elevators, it must fill the gap in western requirements caused by the uncertainty created by the present state of confusion and it must bear the stigma of lower final returns for the Pool to grain because of it being ordered to be sold at prices lower than in the domestic market.

Mr. Steuart: — That's a lie and you know it!

Mr. Messer: — Well, I hope the Leader of the Opposition will have something to say about this, if he thinks that that fact is not true. Because if there is one reason for the proposed interim Feed Grains Policy and the proposed long term policy which is to be announced and implemented, August 1, 1974, it is to provide cheaper feed grains for eastern Canada than is available for western livestock producers in western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The present policy is supposed to result in equalized prices across Canada. What is in effect happening, Mr. Speaker? The Thunder Bay price for barley for domestic use is based on monitored off board quota prices plus 28 cents. This is a reasonable spread, but western livestock producers get only an insignificant portion of their requirements on this basis. Those who grow their own feed must do so in competition with their grain growing neighbors who can bid for land and other resources purely on the export returns for grain. And even those who buy their feed are having to get a good part of their requirements back from the Wheat Board, not at 28 cents below Thunder Bay but at 10 cents or 11 cents below the Lakehead price.

What happens to feed freight assistance is another thorny question which I cannot go into here at this time. But the combination of freight policies and feed grain pricing policies is threatening to set back the western livestock industry by at least 20 years.

The benefits of the Wheat Board method of marketing have been amply demonstrated in recent months. Compare the record of the Wheat Board with the performance of the Grain Exchange in the United States in the past six months. Even as recently as November 1st, 1973, Chicago wheat futures were as much as \$1.50 below the Wheat Board selling price and members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange were carrying on a campaign of innuendos to the effect that the Wheat Board was quoting artificially high

prices to save face, but would not be able to sell any wheat at those prices.

Today, the Chicago prices are almost up to the Wheat Board quotations. The large American grain companies and the speculators have apparently decided that the Wheat Board was right all along.

We must not lose, Mr. Speaker, we must not weaken in the slightest sense this great institution. There never was the least need for the Agricultural Products Board entering the grain product market than there was when Otto Lang instituted it to do so.

The Wheat Board is in a much better position to carry out deliberate quantity guarantees than any other agency. Let us have clear cut policies in this situation and do away with the present confusion. Let us have one pooled price to all grain producers in the prairie basin. Let us have meaningful, meaningful, Mr. Speaker, rationalization of grain prices across Canada and this includes the abolition of the feed freight assistance and all of those things that can be done better by the Canadian Wheat Board than by the private grain trade.

With guaranteed delivery opportunities there's no need for concern about low off quota prices in the West if competition from corn provides cheap grain in the East, the same then, must apply surely to the West. Any losses to the grain producer can be made up through an income stabilization scheme or some other device, an income stabilization scheme which has been advocated and promoted and advanced by the prairie basin and especially the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan for some years now. There is no need at all for new agencies or major disruption of past practices to achieve the national objectives for the grain and the livestock industries in Canada today.

It is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I fully support the motion and ask other Members both Opposition and Government to also do likewise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I must echo the words of the Minister that I didn't plan tonight in entering this debate but it is interesting to listen to the words of the Minister of Agriculture. Apparently he is still trying to ride two horses, he would like to get a high price, he said, for the producer and he still wants cheap grain for the cattle and he can't really figure out how he is going to do that. He did start up a Saskatchewan Feed Grains Commission last fall which he immediately hid, nobody heard of it for six months and I am sure the Minister wishes he hadn't heard of it either because everybody wondered what became of it. It was supposed to protect the farmer from these low prices that they were going to get under the new policy and of course this just didn't happen at all.

I think it has become fairly obvious now that one of the biggest problems facing the feed grains situation is transportation. It is not a matter of how much we can get in eastern Canada or we can get overseas, it is how much feed grain we can actually get there, that we can transport there. We have to keep in mind that when we are talking about feed grain and

subsidizing these terrible people down east who are feeding cattle that we are talking about one bushel in ten of the feed grains. This is something that we have to keep very much in mind. From every ten bushels of feed grain that is produced in the Prairies, in western Canada, two bushels are exported seven bushels are used right here on the farms on the Prairies, one bushel is fed in other places in Canada. So when we are talking about this grain supposedly being sold cheaply or not going to be sold to the Wheat Board, we are talking about 10 per cent of the feed grains. This is really what we are talking about. How that is going to destroy the Wheat Board I have no idea, I can't really understand how anybody could suggest that that type of thing would in any way destroy the Wheat Board.

I have here a clipping from the Free Press Weekly, November 17, 1973 and it says here that "Uskiw predicts the Collapse of the Wheat Board." And it goes on to say:

Manitoba Agriculture Minister Sam Uskiw predicted last week that the Canadian Wheat Board would collapse within a year under the weight of the Federal Government's new feed grain marketing policy.

Now I don't know how closely associated Mr. Uskiw is with the Minister of Agriculture here, I don't know whether he agrees with this proposal or not. But those of us who do believe in the Wheat Board I am telling you are watching very closely because we have until November 17, 1974, which is the balance of this year to see if Mr. Uskiw is going to be wrong, that the Wheat Board is not going to collapse in November 1974. In fact I think it will be carrying on perhaps stronger than ever. I just wanted to indicate that the small amount of grain, if it is removed from the control of the Wheat Board, the feed grain, will be sold in other parts of Canada and it is not going to affect very seriously the operations of the Wheat Board.

I wish to indicate also that we have had some strange Press releases and suggestions over the past six months from various governments and organizations regarding the operation of the Agricultural Products Board. I am sure many of us saw in the Press that the Farmers Union and the NDP were suggesting that the APB was going to buy grain cheaply in western Canada and sell it cheaply to farmers elsewhere in Canada. This was their suggestion all last fall and the Minister himself sent a letter out to all of the farmers in the province at the taxpayers' expense, suggesting this. And, of course, this just didn't happen. The APB doesn't sell grain to anybody any place in Canada. The only people even under this interim policy that sell any grain is the Canadian Wheat Board and it certainly hasn't had any detrimental effects on the price that we are getting for our grain.

Just one further comment, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about feed grain I think it is very important that we should know the position of the Minister on feed grain. I would refer you once again to the Outlook paper of the 20th September 1973, where we see the call for tender and I am not going to embarrass the Minister by reading it completely, but I think everyone knows the gist of it. The Department of Agriculture Lands Branch, are advertising for feed grain for the Matador Community Pasture and they are trying, apparently from this ad to get barley and oats as cheaply as possible: 2,000 bushels of No. 1

feed oats, 1,000 bushels of No. 1 feed barley delivered to Matador Community Pasture. They are trying to get farmers to bid against each other to see whom they can get it from at the lowest price. Now this is the actual policy of the NDP Government's Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. If they get one small farmer bidding against the other, hopefully they can buy some cheap feed grain. So when we are talking about feed grain it is important that we take a look at this, Mr. Speaker. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other comments that Members would like to make on this subject and in view of this at this time I would like to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 9 — Policies and Operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca):

That this Assembly urges the Saskatchewan Government to immediately convene an independent or judicial commission to inquire into all aspects of the policies and operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I rise just for a couple of minutes to speak on this proposed Resolution No. 9. I rise to oppose it. I believe that this Resolution was placed on the Order Paper purely for political reasons. I personally want to compliment the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) — and I wish he were in his seat — to compliment him for two things. First, for taking the personal abuse that he has taken in the last year and taken it in a manner in which nobody can really say that he has acted like anything but a gentleman. Secondly, to compliment him on the progress that has been made in the North in the last 12 months.

Whenever a change, Mr. Speaker, is made it is a part of human nature that we resist change. I remember going back over 10 years ago when discussion was going on about changes in the North, then I believe after there was a change in the Government in 1964, the Liberal Government conducted a study on what should be done in northern Saskatchewan and that study suggested change. Only my hon. friends didn't have quite the courage to carry out that study which suggested change.

Mr. Steuart: — What study was that?

Mr. Meakes: — I understand you people had a study made on what to do with northern Saskatchewan. The study said there should be a Department of the North. We knew that whenever a basic change was made that we could be sure there was going to be some resistance. But I want to say that this Government and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has assisted the natives in organizing and I am proud of that, even though they turn around and criticize the Government as they have done. And I think that is part of the process of them learning the democratic process, finding out for themselves what they really do want.

I noticed in the paper the other day, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the Metis Association says there is going to be turmoil and I believe he used the word riots in the North. Then I heard yesterday on the news that David Ahenakiw denied this. He says there will be no trouble in the North, that the native people in the North will work with the Government, whatever government is to conduct change.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is not that far away from an election. You know it is only a year or so and I prophesy at that point that whatever happens that neither one of those northern seats will be in the hands of our Members across the way but they will be seated to your right with this Government. So I oppose.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, you know it is amazing how the Members opposite can win those northern seats down here in Regina. They don't do too well when they get up North. We only lost one of them once and that was by mistake and we quickly corrected that when we elected the fearless Member for the North, Mr. Allan Guy in 1960 and have re-elected him ever since. It is only with great personal sacrifice that I have convinced him to come out of the North to make room for a member of the native population, something that the Members opposite can't understand. Really the irony of the NDP Government about the North is that they might have won that by-election, that unnecessary by-election in Athabasca had they not produced a kangaroo court and pushed aside Mr. Jones, the native candidate, who would have won their nomination. Of course, they couldn't stand the thought of having a native representative and so they held a kangaroo court and they pushed him out. It was one of many reasons along with the travelling circus, (the visit of the Cabinet) and a few other things that not only ensured Allan Guy's re-election but tripled his majority . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . from 12 to 36. Seriously, the Members opposite should join in and agree to insist that a judicial inquiry take place in northern Saskatchewan. The idea of one, huge, dictatorial, monolithic department in northern Saskatchewan was doomed from the beginning but the Government insisted arrogantly and bull-headedly that they would move ahead and impose this type of rule on the people who live in that part of the province.

Now why should the people who happen to live in northern Saskatchewan be forced to deal with just one department? Why should they be treated any differently in their relationship with the Government than the people who live in Regina or Saskatoon or anywhere else in this province. As a matter of fact they are the last people in this province who should be treated that way. The white population are up there because they are of an adventurous character. They have gone into what is still the frontier part of our province and our country. The native people themselves and especially the northern native people don't like this type of government. I am always amazed that it has never entered the heads of the NDP and the old CCF why they consistently lost those northern seats. Why, when many

times they would almost sweep the entire province and the Liberals would be reduced to 15, five or 14 Members, we still held the northern seats. The answer was very simple. It doesn't matter how many times you tell them, because they don't want to learn. The northern people don't want to be pushed around by anybody. So as soon as this Government returned to office what did they do, they put them back under Mr. Bowerman, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Where was he before? He was a very powerful man in the old Department of Natural Resources. The very type of individual who pushed them around before.

I can remember bringing up in this House a case where under Mr. Bowerman's direction in the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Natural Resources, he used to take fishermen to court, take away their nets, take away their boats, fine them and reduce them to living on welfare. Why? Because when they fished in those northern lakes they dared to sell their catch to someone other than the co-op. That is the way they used to work that. They had a meeting with the fishermen of each lake and they would have a vote, supposedly a democratic vote and they used to issue instructions to the Government employees that when they attended these meetings they shouldn't wear their DNR uniforms and they should vote right along with the fishermen. Whatever the majority at that meeting voted — it wasn't necessarily the majority of the fishermen — that was the company to whom they had to sell the catch out of that particular lake. And most of the time it was the co-op and they would stamp each licence that they gave to the fishermen where they had to sell their fish. If they didn't sell to the co-op and sometimes it was Wade Fisheries and sometimes it was someone else in the fishery business up there but not very often, they were breaking the law. What would happen? People would move out on the lake and they would offer to buy the fish and they would give them a fair price or what they thought was a fair price and they would sell it to them. They didn't know about stamps and about having meetings or anything else. So they would end up being hauled into court and many of them were fined and denied the opportunity of making a living at something they had been doing for generations.

Mr. Michayluk: — Is that still going on?

Mr. Steuart: — No, it's not still going on because we put a stop to it when we were the Government. But it will go on because the same man who was doing that, Mr. Bowerman, was put in charge of the Department. Then whom did they put under Mr. Bowerman? Well they put Mr. Wilf Churchman. Where did he get his training? Under the old DNR. Now I think Wilf Churchman is a fine fellow but I think it was a terrible mistake to put him back as a deputy minister of the DNS because he had been the very man operating as the Deputy Minister of the DNR who had turned the native people against the DNR and against the CCF back in the '50s and the '60s, causing them to be defeated election after election. Talk about never learning! They had to go and find him, he wasn't there. At least they had Mr. Bowerman and the Premier had to do something with him so he said we will make him Minister of the NDS, but they went looking for this other fellow and they gathered the same old gang around them, and put them in charge.

Now what has happened since then? Well they have flooded the North with dozens and dozens of experts from all over this

country to again tell the people that live up there exactly how they should live. Only instead of having to appeal to the Department of Welfare that they used to have or the DNR or the Department of Mineral Resources they put them in one department with one man at the top. One man who is literally the czar of the North. So if you are a northerner and if you happen to fall out with the local kingpin in the DNS, God help you. Just go and talk to them, let the Premier go up there and sit down and talk to these people, they'll tell him this. If you fall out with the kingpin of the DNS, God help you if you live in La Ronge or any of these areas in northern Saskatchewan.

It used to be that maybe if you had a little quarrel with the local welfare office you could appeal to someone else. Maybe the Department of Education. You had, as we have all over the rest of this province, several departments to deal with and you were not at the mercy of one department and in most cases, one man. So they have had great hard feelings up there. There have been sit-ins, talk of uprising, there has been protest, even the civil servants, people who philosophically are aligned with the NDP, who are very strong members of the socialist party have been forced publicly to denounce what they are doing. So what did that great New Democratic Party give them for their pains, for their standing up and speaking out for the native people in northern Saskatchewan? They fired them and they sent memos out and told everybody else, if you dare speak out you will be fired. They put a blanket of fear across the people of northern Saskatchewan. And it is there and make no mistake about it.

Mr. Bowerman got up and he criticized the Liberals and he castigated the Liberals and some other people. We know whom he was talking about. He was talking about the Metis Society and Jim Sinclair. He said these people are the cause of all our troubles. If they just wouldn't play politics — and I have never been really convinced that Jim Sinclair is of the same political persuasion as we are — the last time I checked he was a supporter of the NDP and he has changed now, I think. I don't think that even he can stomach the NDP any more and their ranks in northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — To blame Jim Sinclair and the Metis or to blame Allan Guy of the Liberal Party for what is happening up North is patent nonsense. You just have to read the paper, you just have to go up North, you just have to see what is happening and open your eyes and your ears and you will find out that it is the people of northern Saskatchewan themselves who are saying things like: the money is being misspent, the money is being mishandled, we are being pushed around, we don't receive justice, people don't listen to us. It is those people up there that are demanding some kind of an independent inquiry.

We sent people up there and, of course, they didn't get very far because the people who worked for the Government, and that is most of the people of northern Saskatchewan outside of the native population, the people in business, were afraid to talk to our Members. Why shouldn't they be afraid? If they were seen talking to our Members they would probably be fired.

Our Members went into the office of the DNS in Buffalo Narrows and the fellow wouldn't even admit that it was snowing outside. He wouldn't admit anything. They asked him, "Is the lumber mill open still?" He said, "What lumber mill?" Here it was within a couple of blocks, you could see it outside the window. "What rates do you pay?" He was a welfare officer too and he said, "I don't know what rates we pay." "How many people are on welfare?" "I don't know how many people are on welfare." You could see that obviously he was frightened within an inch of his life to say a word as soon as he found out that they were Liberal MLAs.

So, of course, we couldn't find anything out, because the NDP had turned the handle and they had threatened silently and even publicly that if anybody talked to anybody from the Liberal Party or the Press, you know what will happen to you. You will be fired! So we know what has happened.

If there is nothing to hide, if you are all so proud of the Department of the North, if you are all so proud of the job that the Minister is doing, then have an inquiry. Bring out the facts and put them in front of the public and we will be the first ones to say, sorry we were wrong. We will agree that you have done a good job and support you. If all that is happening up there, as the Premier said, it is just a little growing pains. It is just democracy in action. If that is true then have an inquiry of independent people, fair-minded people and there are lots of them in this province. You go out and find them and we will sit down and we will agree if they are fair-minded people. Go to the judiciary of this province and ask them to hold such an inquiry. If nothing is wrong it will come out fine. But if there is something wrong then dig it out, root it out and get rid of it, because the lives of those people and the future of that part of Saskatchewan is too important to play the kind of cheap politics the NDP are playing right now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Minister gets up in this House and he talks about development. There is no development taking place in northern Saskatchewan! Literally none! Most of the things that this world is short of are in great supply up there: Uranium, metals, there is a possibility of oil in some parts of that northern part of the province. And yet what is happening outside of Gulf Minerals and Motka, two industries that came in because of our program when we were the Government? There is absolutely nothing going on up there except Government payroll and welfare and there is lots of that.

When the hotel in Uranium City can add a \$100,000 or \$200,000 addition, and when another hotel can start up in La Ronge, when the only industry up there, the mine, closed up and fishing has almost ground to a standstill — that is a boom town up there, La Ronge is a boom town today, Why? On government spending, welfare, civil servants, building homes for civil servants. I say what is going on in northern Saskatchewan appears to be a disgrace. We are not talking about some small little area, we are talking about relatively few people and we are talking about a people that depend on government, because of the isolated area, because of the lack of roads and the lack of normal communications they depend on government. And so the Government can put them under its thumb. The Government can push them

March 19, 1974

around; the Government can dictate to them and that is exactly what your people are doing. And if you are not doing it, then you tell us why all the unrest is going on up there. You tell us why there are headlines in the papers in Prince Albert, in Saskatoon and in Regina, week after week and month after month, talking about the unrest, the unhappiness, the frustrations of what? The people who live up there, not the Liberal Party, the people that have chosen to live up there and have made their lives up there, natives of that part of the province.

So if you have nothing to hide and nothing to fear, have the inquiry. And to give them an opportunity to think this over, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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