

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**42nd Day**

**Tuesday, April 2, 1974.**

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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Hockey — Two Provincial Championships for Rosetown**

**Mr. G. F. Loken** (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have two provincial hockey championships to announce for the town of Rosetown.

The Rosetown Midget Elks team won the Midget B championship last Friday in Biggar in a two-game total score series by a score of 10 to 6. Both these teams are sponsored by the respective Elks Lodges.

The Rosetown Redwings won the Intermediate AA provincial championship by defeating the Lloydminster Border Kings in the best of five game series with three straight wins. The Rosetown Redwings have won the Intermediate AA provincial championship five consecutive times. They now advance to the western semi-finals against the Warroad Lakers starting April 5th in Rosetown.

I know the Assembly will join with me in congratulating the Midgets and the Redwings. The Redwings are advancing along the playoff trail and I know this Assembly wishes them every success.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Brian Coulter**

**Mr. D. G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the Orders of the Day I want to direct a question to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that, according to the Globe and Mail of March 27th, Mr. Brian Coulter, Special Assistant to the Saskatchewan Premier, Allan Blakeney, is co-ordinating Mr. Akerman's campaign, that is the campaign for the NDP in the Nova Scotia election that is taking place today. The report further states that there are at least three or maybe four others from Saskatchewan. Now my question is, has this gentleman, a \$12,000 a year employee of the Premier's office, been given leave of absence without pay and who are the other three or four paid employees, civil servants of the Government of Saskatchewan, who are down there assisting the NDP in Nova Scotia at this time?

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker. I saw the report in the Globe and Mail. To deal with the first question, Mr. Coulter is on leave of absence without pay.

With respect to the second question I am not aware of whether or not other employees of the Government of Saskatchewan are in Nova Scotia. I must say that I read the report and it didn't suggest that employees of the Government of Saskatchewan were there but simply people from the Province of Saskatchewan. I am not aware of any other person from the Government although I don't know for sure whether other people are on leave of absence. Mr. Coulter is.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Now a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How long is the Premier going to keep up this farce of needing a half a million dollars a year worth of assistants, special assistants and assistants to the assistants, like Mr. Coulter and other people sprinkled throughout the Civil Service who are on the payroll of the people of Saskatchewan eight, nine, ten or eleven months a year and are sent out to fight elections in British Columbia when they come, fight elections and in Nova Scotia. I can understand the Premier having some little feeling about Nova Scotia having come from there, but I think that it is a disgrace that the people of this province put up with having people on the payroll for eleven months or ten months so they can be there as a ready pool to send out to fight elections for the NDP wherever they happen and whenever they happen in this country. I want to know if the Premier is prepared to tell the people of this province that he is going to put a stop to this practice. I think it is a disgrace and should be stopped immediately.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all appreciated that statement from the Leader of the Opposition. May I say that Mr. Coulter is in my opinion a highly competent employee and he is on leave of absence. He is when he is serving here highly competent, when he is on leave of absence without pay he is costing the citizens of this province nothing and I think we are fortunate to have his services for the period that he is serving with us.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. K. R. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us if Mr. Brian Coulter was also the same Brian Coulter who was on leave of absence for the Lakeview by-election and also the same Brian Coulter who was in British Columbia at the time of the British Columbia election and if he plans to give him leave of absence for the upcoming elections in other provinces?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am sorry I can't answer all those questions without some notice. I really am not fully acquainted with Mr. Coulter's comings and goings without notice.

**Mr. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Doesn't he work for you?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I simply am not aware of each time an employee of the Government of Saskatchewan, even an employee of the sundry agencies of which I have responsibility, are on leave of absence.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the Premier . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I freely offer to get the evidence or the information — evidence all right — if you'll put a question on the Order Paper as this clearly is a proper question for the Order Paper, I would be happy to get the information.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier, if he is undertaking to get information, if he would also for our help and assistance give us a list of the entire reservoir of political servants that are readily available for NDP elections around the country, across Saskatchewan, that he has tucked away in the various departments of Government including Barret Halderman, I understand, in Finance and so on. Would he give me that list?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm afraid I can't. I could have started on a list which had Gary Lane, Jack Herrington and Jack Nichol and Gordon Tanner and an impressive number under a previous regime. As a matter of fact I think I have that list in hand. But if you want to ask a question which you now pose verbally, if you wish to put it on the Order Paper I would be happy to attempt to answer it for you.

### **Nationalization of Uranium Industry**

**Mr. A. R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Resources. He was reported in the news last night as saying that now that the Government and he as Minister has settled the oil industry they are going to turn their attention to the uranium industry. Poor uranium industry is all I can say. But I should like to ask the Minister, does that mean that you plan to introduce a bill similar to Bill 42 and maybe call it Bill 43 — to nationalize Gulf Minerals and AMOK Ltd. and to chase all the uranium exploration companies out of the province?

**Hon. E. L. Cowley** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I don't know how the Member got all of that out of the statement that I made yesterday. I gather the Member had a dream last night and he's bringing it into the House. I think all I can say to the Member is, no, it doesn't mean that, but Government policy will be announced in due course.

**Mr. Guy:** — A supplementary question. Can the Minister tell us whether he is considering the nationalization of uranium companies in Saskatchewan and also is he going to interfere in the uranium industry with the same results that occurred in the oil industry?

**Mr. Cowley:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, as the Member opposite may know, if the only producer of uranium at this particular time in Saskatchewan, although there are a couple of other companies involved. I am not sure whether it is within the power of this Government or not to nationalize a Federal Crown Corporation.

April 2, 1974

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cowley:** — But at the Member's request we will take it under consideration.

### **Housing Conditions of Welfare Recipients**

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Before the Orders of the Day I have a question to direct to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Social Services either under its own auspices or by hiring somebody else has conducted a study of the housing conditions that welfare recipients are living under in Saskatoon, Regina and Melfort and other centres. I further understand that the result of the study indicates that in many cases, in fact the majority, the recipients of welfare were living in substandard housing. My question is, Mr. Minister, was such a study made and if so when are you planning on releasing the results of it?

**Hon. A. Taylor** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, the Member appears to have some partial information and some misinformation. The partial information is that the study covered most of the province and not just the three or four centres that were mentioned. The misinformation, at least I assume it's that, he reads a number of things into the study and as far as I am aware the results have not yet been compiled. So we don't know what the study says. As far as the release of the study this will be decided, of course, at a later date, but I am still waiting for the results to be tabulated and compiled.

**Mr. Malone:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell me when the study was taken and by whom it was taken and if the results of the study will be released?

**Mr. Taylor:** — The study was conducted by clients of the Department of Social Services engaged under the Employment Support Program last year. The final work was completed, that is the survey work, I believe about two months ago, maybe just a month ago, and handed over to the research branch to compile the statistics. We're not yet sure when it will be released, I haven't even seen it.

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **Resolution No. 18 – National Transportation Policy**

Mr. D. H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough) moved, seconded by Mr. Gross (Gravelbourg):

That this Assembly commends the Premier and the Attorney General for the stance they have taken for Saskatchewan regarding transportation development, and wholeheartedly agrees with the Hon. Jean Marchand when he says that Canada's transportation system is a mess and with his good intentions for reform; we urge the Government of Saskatchewan to adopt a transportation policy which will set an example for the Government of Canada in its search

for national transportation policy designed to serve all Canada rather than be based without regard to its negative effects on some regions of Canada, and which will provide: (a) for a transportation system based on the complementary use of the various transport modes with each mode doing the job it can do best, (b) minimized investment in duplicate facilities to ensure lowest operational costs, (c) service and price levels set in relation to economic development objectives and service requirements of people, (d) for the minimization of energy consumption in the task of transporting goods and people, (e) for socialization of the Canadian rail transportation system either through public ownership or by comprehensive regulation of the rail system as if it were a single public utility, and (f) the leadership that the Government of Canada so badly needs to get this country back on the 'right track'.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my objective in introducing this topic to the House was to propose the principle for a national transportation policy for all of Canada in resolution form which would be acceptable to both sides of the House. But after the Resolution appeared on the Blues the Opposition seems to have taken some issue with the word 'socialization' in the sixteenth line. I used the word 'socialization' because I thought it was a descriptive word but the Opposition seems to feel that it has some political overtones to it. So in order to appease the Opposition and hoping to win the favor of the Opposition on this Resolution I would beg leave of the House to be able to change the word 'socialization' to 'social utilization'. I would also beg leave of the House to add a phrase which was left out in typing and that is in the ninth line (as it appears in the Votes and Proceedings) after the word 'base' and before the word 'without', I should like to add the words 'on the principle of competition', so that it reads, "based on the principle of competition without regard . . .". Is that agreeable to the House?

Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would ask that the Member withdraw the Resolution and substitute the amended one. Proceed.

**Mr. Lange:** — The drafting of such a resolution as you can well imagine, was not easy. In fact, it has taken several weeks of concerted thought and research to formulate in a few sentences a resolution which alludes to all of the important variables surrounding the issue of transportation. But I feel that I have, after much contemplation, compiled a resolution so comprehensive that it shouldn't require a long explanatory speech.

I think that this Resolution on transportation if accepted by the House should be presented to the Federal Government as a bipartisan expression of the importance of transportation to the people of Saskatchewan. We should realize from past experience that the issue of transportation in this province transcends political ideology because of its importance to our people.

The history of Saskatchewan is a function of the development of transportation. Conservative Governments, Liberal

April 2, 1974

Governments, and CCF-NDP Governments in the provincial history of Saskatchewan have consistently harped about disparities within Canada caused by transportation injustices.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly review the state of Canada's transportation policy. Quickly, I would have to say, that there is no satisfactory transportation policy. More specifically let me review the last decade of development of transportation in Canada and let me show how both Liberals and New Democrats have put forward the same basic arguments in Saskatchewan regarding transportation.

You will recall that in 1963 the Federal Government passed the Branch Lines Prohibition Act which staved off branch line abandonment until January 1st of next year. Part of this Act was due to the pressures of the New Democratic Party at that time. When Ross Thatcher and the Liberal Government was in power, he consistently pressed the Federal Government for freight rate equity. He was partially responsible for the institution of the Prairie Economic Council which eventually led to the joint Federal-Provincial Committee on Western Transportation. Ross Thatcher and his Government pressured the Federal Government for a transportation policy which would provide for meaningful development in Saskatchewan. My own Party, then in Opposition, provided support in resolution after resolution. In 1967, Ross Thatcher sincerely attempted to present the western perspective in the drafting of The National Transportation Act and as a result of his and his Government's efforts during 1967 and 1968 the Canadian Transport Commission put forth to set out procedures on rail costing. And as a result of his efforts no hearings on branch line abandonment have been heard in the last several years.

Members who were involved in those deliberations are presently sitting in the House, including the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who as Minister of Municipal Affairs put forward some progressive changes under the Municipal Road Assistance Authority, trying to help alleviate future rail line abandonment.

In 1971, this Government proposed the New Deal for People. The New Deal is a development package for Saskatchewan and its people. It promotes agricultural stability, secondary industrial processing of primary products and rural urban development. But this Government is aware, the Opposition is aware, the Press is aware, that some programs in this development package will not reach fruition without the development of the transportation sector.

We cannot have agricultural stability until we have competitive freight rates for agricultural produce. We cannot have secondary industrial processing of primary products until we have competitive freight rates with other parts of Canada. And we cannot have rural-urban development until we have a transportation system capable of handling people and handling them using cheap energy.

In order to ensure the implementation of the New Deal for People, Premier Blakeney and the Attorney General, the Minister responsible for transportation, have appealed to the Federal Government for assistance to the province in all modes of transportation. They have clearly made out a case at a number of federal-provincial conferences and negotiations. They posed our

Case to all of Canada at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in July, and again in January at the National Energy Conference. Just last week, the Premier very directly tied the transportation fund to the oil pricing agreement. As a result of the Premier's and the Attorney General's efforts at WEOC, the joint federal-provincial committee on Western Transportation has been discussing policy. At WEOC the Prime Minister recognized the transportation problems facing the West and urged western Canada to attempt a solution using the old National Transportation Act legislation based upon the principle of competition.

But three weeks ago, the Hon. Jean Marchand, Federal Minister of Transport, admitted in Vancouver that there is no sense in going to the Canadian Transport Commission for a solution. Moreover he rejected the principle of competition in the National Transportation Act and asked for policy input from the provinces in drafting a national transportation policy. For the first time in the history of Canada, a federal Transport Minister apparently wishes to discuss a transportation policy based on the principle of co-operation and has asked for provincial contributions.

In my opinion the gravity of the transportation issue and the unprecedented culmination of political circumstances which allows for this opportunity, demand that we express a unanimous gesture of co-operation. The need for sensible changes in transportation is one issue upon which both sides of this House can agree. Transportation has been the common denominator of both major Saskatchewan political parties.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has publicly supported the Premier in his stance on transportation. He has publicly supported the Premier's stance on transportation taken at WEOC. Mr. Steuart has publicly supported on national television the Premier's stance taken on transportation at the National Energy Conference. And only last week, he again reiterated to this House the importance of transportation to the development of Saskatchewan and he alluded to the mismanagement inherent in the CN and the CP railway networks.

When we consider all of the factors involved in the transportation issue a solution to problems of transportation will not be easy. Fundamental changes in the rail mode, for instance, will affect trucking; yet we need trucking for specific services. What impact could this have on industry in western Canada?

Since the issue is complicated, this House can deal in concepts only. It is for this reason that I have put forward this Resolution on transportation policy.

We are all quite aware of how the Canadian Pacific Railway was designed to be a tool of national development, but became, at the same time a tool for western exploitation. We are also aware of the formation of the Canadian National Railroad out of the unregulated chaos of the private railroad industry.

An over-construction of rail lines which were not economical necessitated a federal government amalgamation of these lines into a national public railroad company. Both of these railways are heavily subsidized by the public and neither are providing satisfactory freight or passenger service. Because these railroads have not provided adequate service, freight is being

April 2, 1974

increasingly carried by truck, while passengers choose private cars and airplanes. trucks, cars and air are the modes which are most wasteful of energy. Rail and water transportation are the most energy efficient modes and yet they are being used the least.

After several decades of chaotic, unregulated, investment in transportation facilities, we now have expensive highways running alongside expensive railways, beneath expensive air routes, all often competing to carry many of the same commodities; all requiring tremendous quantities of energy and all subsidized by the people of Saskatchewan. In spite of this increased investment, Saskatchewan is faced with station closures, deteriorating rail service, lack of airline facilities and service, and the uncertain prospect of more energy intensive trucks and cars congesting the roadways at added expense to the people.

Saskatchewan presently has \$350 million invested in Canadian Pacific and Canadian National railways lines. It has a further \$1,050 million invested in roads. Despite the fact that we have \$1.4 billion invested in transportation facilities, and this year are spending a gigantic \$104 million more on road construction, freight, passenger and grain delivery service in the province is deteriorating rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, why is this happening? The answer lies in the fact that Canada does not have a national transportation policy which emphasizes service. As a matter of fact, Canada does not have a national transportation policy.

The Hon. Jean Marchand has observed that never in the history of Canada has a comprehensive transportation policy been discussed in the House of Commons. Never in 100 years of Canadian history, Mr. Speaker, has the issue of transportation policy been debated in the Parliament of Canada.

Emphasis in the past has always been on the provision of facilities. The National Transportation Act has theorized that by providing proper facilities, competition among the various transportation modes will provide the self regulation needed to ensure proper service to the users of transportation at competitive prices.

But competition among the various modes, rather than driving down the price and increasing the service, has resulted in collusion among the modes, increasing the costs for deteriorating service.

This same unregulated competition among various modes, means over-capitalization in needless facilities and chaotic investment in modes which are wasteful of energy. As a result we have expensive, energy-consuming trucks hauling freight on roads which are expensive to maintain, and which run alongside railroad lines which are energy efficient and not being used.

Since transportation requires a great deal of money to develop, maintain and operate, this form of chaotic waste and inefficiency must be paid for by the public. We must borrow money to build transportation facilities; we must repay that money by raising rates. We cannot afford to subsidize all modes of transport if they are going to compete. Since it is the public who must subsidize transportation, then transportation should obviously be operated as a public utility by government,



a public utility that provides people with service for their money.

Government must make the decision as to which mode will provide the greatest service at the least cost to society. This means a minimization of duplication in facilities, but it does not mean an elimination of any particular mode. It means that we must decide as a Government, which job each mode can do best and put that mode to work. In some places, it's rail; in some, road, in others, air. But in no area should we duplicate facilities for the same job and pay for both facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this province has always taken the position that we want equity in freight rates with other regions of Canada. Only if we can achieve equitable freight rate structures, can we compete in secondary processing of primary products. We want to be able to produce meat, but we want to ship manufactured steel products; we want to grow rapeseed, but we want to export it in the form of rapeseed oil.

Agricultural and industrial development in Saskatchewan can only occur if we have a transportation system which encourages this development. The West is not really geared to a system of grant giving because of our distance from Ottawa. Just give us equitable freight rates and we will develop our own economy, with our own resources.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lange:** — We want industrial development and we want to spread it around the province so that the benefits of industry are available to rural communities. After having located the industry, we should provide a transportation service which meets the needs of the economy and the needs of the people without wasting energy and without the duplication of facilities.

A transportation policy should provide for the use of inter-urban commuter trains for fast efficient passenger and freight service instead of energy intensive trucks and passenger cars. It should provide for but and new forms of urban transit rather than promotion of expressways.

A transportation policy should, of course, provide for the efficient transfer of grain by rail on a year-round basis to avoid over-utilization of the rail system during peak export periods.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that the energy crisis has accomplished is that it has made people aware of the necessity for conservation practices with regard to the consumption of energy.

In Canada, 33 per cent of all of our energy is consumed in transportation; half of this on the roads through energy inefficient cars and trucks. This Government has said that it wishes to conserve energy for future generations of Saskatchewan citizens. If that is the case, then we must decide whether we want to put our fuel into cars and trucks for transport, or into tractors for agriculture. If we are going to put our fuel into tractors for agriculture, then we must use transportation modes which consume less fossil fuel, or alternate forms of energy.

April 2, 1974

Mr. Speaker, let me review. I have stated that a national transportation policy must relate service, price and facility. I have said that it must avoid unnecessary capital investment in facilities. It must not duplicate facilities in the same region or for the same service requirement. Perhaps most important, a national transportation policy must not promote chaotic waste of resources, particularly energy.

Fulfillment of these criteria requires organization, organization of many factors over which only governments have responsibility and control.

Fulfillment of these criteria also demands maximum utilization of the railroad network. Mr. Speaker, rail is the most efficient mode from the standpoint of energy and capacity to haul most commodities. The railroad network exists all across Canada. In fact most communities in Saskatchewan are here because of the railroad. It is a facility in place, which, if rationalized and upgraded, can haul our agricultural products, facilitate industrial development, assist in educational and cultural programs, provide the base for rural-urban community development, provide commuter service between centres and haul freight. All this, perhaps will less energy consumption than all the other transport modes combined. Rail will help to solve many problems which face Saskatchewan in its struggle to develop and it will do it for the least possible cost.

For these reasons, a national transportation policy should designate the railroad as the key mode of the transportation system with all other modes supplementing and complementing the railroad. This will require social utilization for the Canadian railroad system. This can occur either through public ownership or through comprehensive regulation of both the private and public rail carriers by Government in the public interest. Only after this key area of public transportation is organized on a basis which will serve people as a public utility, will we be able to talk confidently about development of other aspects of transportation and the economy.

Transportation has been discussed in this House by successive governments putting forward the same basic argument, equitable freight rates for equitable development. But never before have we had a federal Transport Minister, who appeared to be so receptive to that argument. I would ask that this House take advantage of this opportune moment and develop the principles of this Resolution as our own transportation policy which can be expanded to become a national transportation policy.

Because the issue of transportation has been the common denominator of successive Saskatchewan governments, and because of the timeliness of the recent change in attitude of the Federal Government, I have attempted to draft a Resolution acceptable to both sides of this House; yet a Resolution which provides a different perspective on the issue of transportation. This Resolution changes the emphasis in transportation from a competitive model to a co-operative model. It talks about service to people as a priority and optimizes expenditures on facilities. It provides for a transportation policy which makes economic sense, a transportation policy which makes energy sense, and a transportation policy which makes common sense.

Mr. Steuart, our Government and the Opposition have disagreed on deterrent fees; we have disagreed on how to manage

our forest resources; we have disagreed on how Saskatchewan oil should be controlled; we have even disagreed on occasion upon whether or not a man in this House is telling the truth or not. But the one thing that we have historically, consistently and stalwartly agreed upon is the issue of transportation.

I invite all Members of this House to adopt the principles of this Resolution, thereby endorsing principles which the Hon. Roy Romanow, Provincial Minister of Transport, can present to the Hon. Jean Marchand, the Federal Minister of Transport in Saskatchewan's submission, to a national transportation policy.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lange:** — I would, therefore, move Resolution No. 18 in its amended form.

**Mr. R. Gross** (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lange has done quite an adequate job of explaining the inherent problems in our present rail line and our present transportation program and the lack of a transportation policy. I quite agree with him. I have a great deal to say in this matter and I will have that to say at a later date. I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **Resolution No. 1 — Establishment of Government Financed Child Care Centres**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J. G. Richards (Saskatoon University):

That this Assembly urges government consideration of the establishment of a network of fully government financed child care centres to service all the families in the province, such a program to provide for: (a) universal accessibility at no charge to the user; (b) the control of child care centres by parent groups, co-operatives, community agencies; (c) twenty-four hour operation where need exists; (d) improved and well enforced standards; (e) the implementation of courses to train child care workers.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Rolfes:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore: "commends the Government of Saskatchewan for: (a) providing greatly increased funds for Day Care; (b) devising a program which will make Day Care available to all income groups; (c) establishing criteria which will ensure that each Day Care Centre is parent controlled; (d) providing a program which will be flexible and responsible to the desires of parents; (e) providing for additional grants for those Day Care Centres which offer integrated service to handicapped and non-handicapped children."

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, on this particular Resolution I think I made my thoughts well known the other evening when we were discussing the Departmental Estimates of the Department of Social Services.

However, to recapitulate briefly, I should like to say this. The original Resolution as it stands I am not able to support, Mr. Speaker, as I think it is irresponsible. The estimated cost of a universal system of Day Care Centres, I believe, has been shown to be approximately \$100 million. I think this is far too great a cost to the province at this time. Even if the money was available I would submit there are other social concerns of greater priority than universal Day Care.

Unfortunately as well, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to support the Resolution as amended by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Rolfes), although I do welcome the influx of money that has been put in the system through the Department of Social Services as they are greatly needed. But the reason that I cannot support the Resolution is that the existing system as described by the Minister of Social Services, discriminates against privately operated Day Care Centres. And, further and perhaps most important, is we have had no assurance from that Minister that after the two-year period of further investment is over, that privately operated Day Care Centres will even be allowed to exist. I think that this is completely shocking. I can see no reason why the Government would discriminate against the private operators of these facilities.

Now the excuse given, of course, by the Minister is that they feel that when Government funds are to be expended that, firstly, there should not be a profit motive involved, and secondly, that the parental control was the key factor and the only way you can have parental control was by incorporating these centres either under The Societies Act or making them a co-op.

Firstly, as far as the profit motive is concerned. I don't think that there is a single Day Care Centre in this province where anybody is taking an unjust profit or too great a profit. Probably if they were investigated we would find that the people who are running them can make more money doing other duties, but for one reason or another are restricted in what they can do, and have turned their homes or other places into Day Care Centres.

Secondly, if the rationale behind is that public funds should not be used for anybody to make a profit, to be consistent I would suggest then that the Government then must reduce all payments made to the physicians and surgeons, under MCIC, down to the subsistence level, because all doctors in this province are being paid by public funds. There has been no suggestions that they should not be allowed to make a profit for rendering their duties and I don't think anybody could suggest this reasonably.

I suggest that this is not a reason at all to restrict private Day Care Centres, it is just the enforcement of socialist philosophy on the people of Saskatchewan whether they like it or not.

And for that reason, as well, I cannot support the Resolution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is the suggestion that privately operated Day Care Centres will not be controlled by the parents. I suggest, as well, that this is completely nonsense because the parents have at any time the right to remove their child from the Day Care Centre if they are not happy with the way the child is being treated. If they are not happy with the curriculum, if they are not happy with the sanitary facilities or anything else. As far as I am concerned this is probably the most direct control any parent could have of any Day Care Centre, the right to remove their child when they feel that the child is not getting the proper attention.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I am not able to support either the original Resolution or the Resolution as amended.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Resolution No. 7 – Stabilization Plans for Farm Commodities**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. L. 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.

**Hon J. R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, the word stabilization means many things to many people and I must begin by stating quite clearly what it means to the Government of Saskatchewan.

I want to start by saying what it does not mean. Mr. Speaker, stabilization in the minds, and as it is interpreted by the Government of Saskatchewan does not mean pittance payments to those who have already been forced out of farming or driven to the wall by disastrous prices. It does not mean complicated schemes to stabilize farm incomes or farm prices at those levels which has decimated the farm population of this country for far too many years. It does not mean, Mr. Speaker, a scheme of taking dollars from farmers at good times and giving him back his own money when prices are poor. It does not, Mr. Speaker, mean a system of income transfers where the inefficient, in fact, live off and feed off the efficient.

It does not mean a system where every farmer can produce what he likes, when he likes, in unlimited quantities at exorbitant costs to either provincial or federal treasuries.

No, Mr. Speaker, it means none of these things. To this Government it means a system whereby the efficient and industrious farmer is provided a guarantee, a guarantee of a reasonable return on his investment, his labor and his good management skill, and which will allow the implementation of production schemes which will provide Canadians with an assured supply

April 2, 1974

of food at stable and at reasonable costs; which will allow this country to expand its food exports rapidly and which will achieve all of these at reasonable cost to the taxpayer.

This concept is not an overnight inspiration of this Government. It is the same recommendation which was made to the Federal Government in the provincial submission on agricultural policy in the fall of 1971. And it will come as little surprise to many that it was rejected by the Federal Government and the Canadian Department of Agriculture at that time, just as it was in a similar submission made in the spring of 1972.

Even as late as the Ministers of Agricultural Conference in July of last year, stabilization was still very much heresy, but at last, the howls of the grocery shoppers have been heeded and the idea has achieved an instant and impressive respectability, at least at the Federal Government level.

It is this sudden acceptability and the circumstances which led to it, which gives us cause for some sleepless nights. If the Federal Government was not interested and prices were at rock bottom and suffers an abrupt conversion when they begin to rise, we must ask ourselves, what sort of stabilization are they really interested in? We have already seen one kind which we don't like, which is the creation of a wheat price ceiling in exchange for what has to be regarded by any competent commodity market analysis, as a very unrealistic price floor, unrealistic and unacceptable to prairie grain producers.

I am sure we can all add to a list of things that stabilization does not and should not mean in our minds, and especially in the minds of western farmers. The Federal Government is now very much in favor of more food production in this country and scarcely misses an opportunity to encourage this process.

Mr. Whelan tells the farmers, and I quote:

To produce to beat the band.

But I think, in all fairness, he should be told there is a little more to the game than just that.

It was only about ten years ago that our wheat farmers received the same kind of advice in times of short supplies and high prices. They took the advice and paid a price for which most of them have not forgotten to this day and, indeed, will not forget throughout their lifetime.

I think, Mr. Speaker, all of us will support Mr. Whelan in his quest for a bigger output from Canadian farmers. Canadian farmers have risen to this kind of challenge very successfully in the past and I have no doubt that they will do it again, given the right circumstances. But if the Federal Minister of Agriculture, as he pointed out himself when he addressed the FAO Conference in Rome last fall, the very industriousness and productivity of our farmers must not be used against them by allowing surpluses to develop which will destroy the whole price structure and which surpluses will ultimately be sold at their expense.

For more than two years now this Government has pressed for the implementation of comprehensive and guaranteed price and income stabilization policies as the cornerstone of a new

national agricultural policy. Time has proven us right in asking for these measures which, if implemented in 1971 or 1972, instead of 1974, would likely have headed off the food and farming crisis that we now have in Canada today.

The time has come for the Federal Government to fulfill the promises it made at the National Food Production Conference in September of last year, when it agreed to revamp the entire price stabilization structure. Unfortunately seven months have passed since that undertaking and we are still awaiting a permanent price stabilization policy in even one commodity.

Certain federal politicians have taken great delight in criticizing the hog price stabilization plan introduced in this province. To that kind of political maneuvering I have two things to say, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the plan was implemented following promises of prompt federal action, following the September conference, which itself was convened in a crisis atmosphere. If we made any mistake it was to believe that prompt meant a matter of a few weeks rather than months or even years, as might well turn out to be.

Secondly, those who took great delight in criticizing the provincial policy, have only to look at the shambles caused by the latest piece of ad hoc action called the beef subsidy program. If the Federal Government wants advice on stabilization programs, we will be only too happy to give it, but I say again, Mr. Speaker, that there can now be no excuse for further delay.

The Federal Government should forthwith introduce permanent stabilization schemes and particularly should meet its obligations to those who responded quickly to its offer of prompt action by immediately joining with the Saskatchewan Government in the extension and the development of the temporary hog price stabilization plan, which this Government introduced in the full expectation of rapid fulfillment of the Federal promises made with such flourish seven months ago; from which we have unfortunately seen little or nothing of any use or substance to either this Government or to the producers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Resolution I want to emphasize that our Government has long advocated the establishment of a comprehensive national program to stabilize agricultural income in Canada. With this in mind I should like to outline the proposals which we have made in regard to stabilization of agricultural income and briefly explain why it is necessary for the Government of Saskatchewan to establish an interim price stabilization program for hogs marketed in this province.

The need for programs to reduce fluctuations in income from agriculture is very obvious to all of us. Prices for agricultural products and income from agriculture have always fluctuated widely in the past and always to the detriment of farmers. These wide fluctuations in income have inevitably caused great variations in the production of agricultural commodities. Periods of depressed prices have resulted in massive cuts in production of agricultural products and rising prices in other cases have led to the accumulation of costly surpluses.

April 2, 1974

Moreover, in the past, farmers have been faced with steadily increasing costs of production with absolutely no assurance that prices would increase to cover those ever-increasing production costs. The general result of these conditions have been great instability in the agricultural industry and an inability of producers and governments to effectively plan the development of the agricultural industry, not only in Saskatchewan, not only in the prairie basin, but nationally in Canada as a whole. The Government of Saskatchewan has recognized the need for programs to eliminate these problems and recently presented a proposal for an income stabilization plan to the Federal Government.

Our proposal to the Federal Government was designed to achieve four major things:

1. To reduce the fluctuations in both agricultural prices and the volume of agricultural production.
2. To ensure that farm families receive an income comparable to those in other sectors of the economy.
3. To encourage an increasing production of agricultural products across Canada.
4. To provide a basis for the purposeful planning of future agricultural production and to maintain an equitable balance between returns to various types of agricultural products.

We believe that a program which incorporates all of these purposes is essential to the future development of agriculture in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has established a number of production objectives for agricultural commodities produced in this province, which we feel are necessary to develop a stable and more prosperous agricultural industry. However, it is evident that these production objectives cannot be achieved unless programs are established to reduce the instability in agricultural prices and incomes.

As an example, the Government believes that the marketing of hogs in Saskatchewan should be increased from the present levels to three million annually in the next 10 to 15 years. Another important objective of this Government is to expand our cow herds significantly over the next 10 to 15 years with a greater portion of our beef production finished and slaughtered within the province itself.

Similar objectives are desirable for other commodities such as sheep, dairy and poultry and specialty crops, protein crops. If we are to achieve these objectives it is essential to protect our producers from fluctuating incomes caused by world-wide fluctuations in prices and demand of those very agricultural products.

The proposals which we have made to the Federal Government would provide the necessary framework, the necessary framework for reaching these production objectives. The essential elements of our proposals were to eliminate the wide yearly variations in farm income, and income guarantee related to the cost of



production which would ensure farmers of a fair return for their labor and an annual adjustment for increasing cost of production due to inflation.

We believe that the benefits to an Income Stabilization Program such as this would be very great not only to our producers, but to the province and to Canada as a whole. With this general income stabilization proposal in mind, I should like to explain the reason that we introduced a hog price stabilization program on an interim basis.

The Government of Saskatchewan in the past few years had and has introduced a number of programs to encourage the expansion of hog production in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission and FarmStart are programs which will encourage, and have encouraged, an increase in hog production as it has in other areas of livestock. However, in the fall of last year it became apparent that unstable hog prices would, in the short run at least, endanger our efforts to expand hog production. For this reason it was imperative for the Government to move quickly to ensure producers a return equal to the cost of production.

The general instability in the feed grain marketing areas caused by the new Federal feed grain policy and the rising costs due to general world conditions, led to rapidly rising production costs for hog producers as it did for other livestock producers. During this period of rising costs there was no assurance to producers that meat prices would rise accordingly and returns to them would rise accordingly. Indeed, the Federal Government moved quickly to establish policies which would hold down the price of certain meats in Canada to the detriment of primary producers in Canada.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, hog producers in this province were caught in a severe cost-price squeeze. The Hog Price Stabilization Plan established by our Government, will guarantee individual hog producers in this province, a return at least equal to the cost of production for a nine-month period of time.

The cost of production for the first base period of three months was calculated to be \$52 per 100 weight; a \$5 per hundred weight production incentive was added to the estimated costs of production to guarantee hog producers a total of \$57 per hundred weight. The cost of production estimate is adjusted after each three-month period to reflect changing production costs.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize that this Hog Price Stabilization Program is an interim program only, in hope that a permanent agreement can be reached between Saskatchewan and the Federal Government before the plan expires. I should also like to point out that our interim program was established because of a specific problem in the hog industry. For this reason our Hog Price Stabilization Plan does not contain all of the elements which we believe are essential in a long-term stabilization program at the national level.

It is our sincere hope that agreement can be reached in the future on a stabilization plan which contains all of the elements which are necessary in a comprehensive stabilization program, that would operate under a national framework or umbrella, that would, in fact, allow each region of production to use to its optimum its natural advantages.

April 2, 1974

Mr. Speaker, having said these few brief words to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, and recalling to them the debate that took place in this Assembly last evening, where I believe it was amply indicated by the speakers to your left, that they agree with stabilization programs that relate not only to base prices, but relate to costs of production, having established that there is general concern and general agreement for those kinds of stabilization programs, I would ask that all Members of the Legislative Assembly support this very worthwhile Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. T. M. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a few brief words to this Resolution and I find that the Resolution is somewhat objectionable, not particularly because it advocates a stabilization plan, but simply because it advocates a stabilization plan for all farm commodities.

I think there is certainly some evidence that not all farm commodities would necessarily want to be under such a plan. I, for one, would certainly want to find out from the various producers of various commodities whether they wish to be in such a stabilization plan. If they did, such a program could certainly be acceptable. But I don't think there is any evidence to prove that at the moment, that every single producer of a particular product that all light producers of various vegetables or of eggs, of turkeys or of beef, necessarily want to be in the stabilization plan.

So, therefore, I would suggest that the Resolution would be much more pertinent if any stabilization plan took into consideration the producers of that particular product, as to whether they wish to have it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the comments of the Minister, because I think that while the idea of a stabilization plan is a good one, I think so many things the NDP do, they identify the problem but don't really come up with much of a practical solution.

First of all he suggests that we need to reduce price fluctuations and have comparable incomes for farmers in agriculture that would be the same as industry. Certainly on the surface these seem like admirable ideas and deserving of support. But I want to deal for a few moments with the problems in agriculture connected with price fluctuations.

For example, much of the price fluctuation in agricultural products comes from the external demand, or world-wide demand. It is not the fault of the farmer, but it is also not the fault of the rest of the people of Canada, that the price fluctuates so widely for so many agricultural products. The fact is that on a world-wide market that so many of our products become an important part of, that the world-wide market fluctuates very widely and extremely widely, as is evident in the grain market of the past year or so. Precisely, how any stabilization plan can take into consideration and produce the exact amount or quantity desired in this type of a market, will be extremely difficult to be able to incorporate in any stabilization plan.

Let's take, for example, the very kind of problems that the prairie provinces are running into in the hog marketing system. They suggested to farmers not long ago to gear up for production of hogs to Japan. The one thing that the Opposition pointed out at the time, that the NDP in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan weren't telling the farmers was at what price the Japanese were willing to buy pork. And much to the chagrin of the farmers in Saskatchewan, they found out that the Japanese were willing to buy pork but not at anything like the kind of price that farmers in this country had to have in order to produce it. And, therefore, while we had a market it was a market at a very low price and a price below the cost of production.

This, Mr. Speaker, is all tied in with the problems of producing for a world-wide market, and a stabilization plan that is oriented to this type of thing, I think will be found to be extremely difficult to put into operation.

Now we come to the type of stabilization plan that the Minister is likely speaking of and I think that it is something that practically all producers should be aware of, and I believe one that most producers are aware of.

What the NDP stabilization plan really means is a very very tightly controlled industry. It means if we have a floor price, such as we have in hogs, which I think was a good idea that the province put into operation, but let us remember that if we are going to set a floor price right across this country that guarantees a fair return to the producer, the taxpayers of Canada will be requesting that we produce only that amount of pork that can be taken into the marketing system. Because if we exceed what is a marketable amount, we are going to pile up great pork surpluses like we had many years ago when pork was being given away at various railway stations around the country.

Therefore, if we want to have a stabilization plan right across Canada, I think that inevitably it means a very, very tightly controlled industry with production quotas and allocations to the various provinces. This is precisely what has happened in the milk industry. It is what is happening in the turkey industry, the egg production industry and so on down the line. I think we should make no mistake about what the Minister of Agriculture is really talking about when he talks about price stabilization.

He means a system of severe quotas; he means a system of quota allocation to the provinces; he means a system of a tightly controlled industry.

Now if the people in the hog marketing business want that type of industry, I am all for it. It will be their choice. If the people in the other agricultural production industries want that type of an industry, well fine, I think that we can have that type of production system in Canada, but I don't think that the NDP Government opposite should be able to fool any producer in Canada when we talk about income stabilization; that we can have such a stabilization program without extremely tightly controlled industry and control over all of our producers.

April 2, 1974

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say briefly about some of the other clichés – I call them clichés because the Minister says, ‘we want to reduce price fluctuations’ and, of course, this in itself brings in the world factor of demand for most of our production.

Comparable income, certainly we can agree with that. It is something that I think everyone hopes for and works towards as far as agriculture is concerned. Increased production will depend largely on what the consumers are willing to pay. Again, basically what our problem today is in both pork and beef is the consumers haven’t been willing to buy meat in the supermarkets at a price that was decent as far as the producer was concerned. Meat is piling up all over this country in the supermarkets. Pork has been piling up for two or three months. Beef is now accumulating in freezers, accumulating in the stores and this is pushing down the price. It is obvious that consumers are switching away to other products and so we must keep in mind, no matter how much income that we need as producers, we must keep in mind that this product has to be bought and it has to be produced at a price the consumer is willing to pay.

I think that we have had pretty good evidence in the last two or three months of high consumers’ resistance against the price of beef. I agree, with many spokesmen including Mr. Whelan, when he says that beef is still a good buy. But the fact that it is a good buy and the fact that producers have to have a price substantially higher than it has been, hasn’t changed the fact that when the housewife walked into the store that she maybe walked out with macaroni instead of roast beef. So maybe we haven’t done a very good job of convincing people that the price of beef should be higher as far as the supermarket is concerned.

We have heard the various allegations from the NDP about rip-offs by the corporations and about the middleman, but it would certainly seem from our own evidence here in Saskatchewan, through Intercontinental Packers and the marketing system, that the middleman has not been guilty of huge corporate profits. Certainly Intercontinental Packers apparently haven’t been, according to the best evidence given here and certainly the competition provided by the co-operatives, which is certainly desirable in the retail distribution it would seem that the price of meat has not sky-rocketed particularly because of the middleman.

Most certainly in our province if the corporations of meat packing companies were guilty of huge profits we would have had a great opportunity, simply through Intercontinental Packers, selling meat slightly cheaper than did the rest.

I think the Premier, the other evening, was a little off the track when he said that it was a part of a great multi-group of corporations. Well, certainly Intercontinental Packers would have been able to retain the business of selling meat if they started selling cheaper than anyone else through the store. So I don’t think this has been any problem. I think that it does prove that the middleman probably has not been guilty as far as food costs are concerned. It also indicates that with meat prices going up, over the past two years, that producers will have to keep an eye on what the consumer is willing to pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say that while we certainly support any move towards stabilization that is possible and regret that the NDP were instrumental in sabotaging what was a good grain stabilization program, a good step in the right direction. We do believe that producers must keep in mind, before jumping on the stabilization program idea as implemented and suggested frequently by NDP spokesmen, that this will not come about without a considerable loss of their own freedom of choice, freedom of decision in production and freedom, generally, in their operations. This has happened in other segments of agriculture. If producers themselves in particular products are willing to do this, then certainly we would have no objection. But I do think that before stabilization programs are brought in producers of a product should be consulted and should have an opportunity to indicate that they want to have such a type of program put into operation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, on this particular Resolution may I say I was glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture enter the debate and give us some of his thoughts with respect to the whole question of stabilization plans, income stabilization plans. I was interested in some of the points he made in his remarks, the kind of thing he didn't want to see in a stabilization plan. He made, I believe, one observation that he didn't want to see any income stabilization plan wherein the inefficient operator would sort of live off the efficient operator, or words to that effect and I believe I'm repeating the sense of his argument, truly in that sense. And yet I'm not sure if I understand the regulations that came out with respect to his hog stabilization program that in fact is what happens. That's the one objection I have to that program. I stand to be corrected and perhaps it should be better left to Estimates, but I think his program and the objective behind his hog plan is a good one, if it indeed didn't bonus some inefficient operators as opposed to a more efficient operator. Truly by the method in which he calculates the differential from price received up to the 57 cents.

It's interesting to hear the Minister opposite and other Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, talk about income stabilization for farmers and talk about long term plans for farm income stabilization for all farm commodities. When we recall it was only a few years ago that the same Party, including a lot of the Members opposite, fought so hard against a plan that was introduced by the Federal Government of the day. A plan that if enacted would have put us today, in the forefront in agricultural countries. Because that plan at that time was the foremost of its kind that we've seen presented anywhere in the world up 'til then. It could have been improved upon. We would have been much farther along the road with respect to this whole program than we are today, had that plan gone ahead at that time. We would have had something to go by, some experience rather than be still trying to seek a fair and reasonable solution for this problem of income stabilization for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I think also that the point made by the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is one that I should like to reiterate to Members of the House and to the mover of this Resolution and the Minister, that the producers of the various farm commodities referred to, should most certainly be involved

April 2, 1974

in any decision relating to plans for that particular industry. There is no mention made in the Resolution that that is to be the case. I share the hopes of the Minister opposite with respect to the development of expanded livestock production here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I've been saying similar things for years.

I think we all agree that marketing and distribution of livestock products particularly, as well as other farm products are very much a key to achieving that desire and that particular objective. And I speak here not only of our transportation policies with respect to snow on branch lines in this province, but elsewhere as well. I think we were all rather shocked and dismayed, if you like, at a TV newscast of, I believe last week, where we saw piles of grain, I don't know whether it was Canadian grain or not, sitting on a wharf in Ethiopia and unable, for some reason, to be distributed to the people there who so obviously very sorely needed and could use that grain. It got right to their doorstep and something happened from there. I think this points up the real problem in distribution of the food supplies that we are so capable of producing here in western Canada.

I have an objection to supporting the general theme or the general intent, I think, of the Member who introduced this Resolution. There are many aspects of it that I am not fussy about. What is the cost of production? How is that going to be established? I know that can't be covered in the Resolution but how will the plan be tailored to relate to world demand or domestic demand for our farm products, be they pork or beef as the case may be? The five cent cattle subsidy has been criticized by the Minister, it was again today, criticized by Members opposite. I'm not sure if that's the ideal plan, I doubt if it is, but I think if we, if he wants the plan to support beef at the cost of production, I think we have to look at a few other factors as well as just merely that particular point. The cost of production of beef today, I don't know. I would have to get some statistics from the Minister in his Department and so on, but I would suspect that it's well above 50 cents, it may be 55, 56, 58 cents, I would think somewhere in that area. And in the case of beef and any program that we may come up with in Saskatchewan and certainly in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is one that has to recognize the influence of the great American market to the south of us and their particular policies or programs that may be implemented and any steps that they may take insofar as their industry is concerned, would certainly have a bearing at either a good or a very disastrous bearing on what we may not do here.

The whole question of the way times change so rapidly, I think has to be pretty clearly in evidence in the case of the problems of the beef industry over the last eight, ten months. The consumer resistance picture, which is put by the Member for Cannington very well. It's fine to say that beef is a good buy today in terms of the dollars you spend for many other things, in terms of the food dollar you spent twenty years ago, it's an excellent buy, but obviously that doesn't convince a lot of people and a lot of housewives as they go to shop for beef. This whole question of consumer resistance and the influence on the market in that sense is something that farmers as producers will have to be more aware of, do more thinking about and be more concerned with respect to presenting their case to consumers, either as groups or as a whole.

The other thing that I think certainly is a trend and a pattern in governments, both here and south of the border and any other place in the western world and that's the way governments move and react to public pressure. There is nothing new about that, but I think of the two moves that were made which really shook the stability of the beef industry last fall was number one, the President Nixon freeze on beef prices with the resulting flow then of Canadian beef into the States; and two, the move by the Government here to stop some of that and bring down the price for consumers here in Canada. Let's be quite frank about it, since that time we have seen fluctuations in the beef industry, the like of which we haven't seen in many years before.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, we certainly do need stability. We certainly do need stability, to me it's most regrettable that a major industry of the type of the beef industry today has been subjected to the kind of fluctuations and bounces that have occurred in the last few short months. But how to do it, how to bring it about? Perhaps in isolation here in Saskatchewan and indeed in isolation in Canada, without being very restrictive and very regulatory, I'm not convinced and I certainly have no answers.

On this point, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a number of other points that could be made, there are a number of other points that I'd like to explore and at this point I should like time, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 8 – Feed Grains Policy**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. I. W. 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. E. F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, there's been a good deal of debate already on Feed Grains Policy in this province. Much of the debate is political and I suppose this is only natural, when you get a controversial subject such as Feed Grains Policy, but it certainly is a major issue in Saskatchewan. A number of points have already been made and I will try and be brief, but I think there are several points which should be noted.

First of all, we must remember that feed grain now is a good price. The farmers waited 30 years for a break in the price of the grain that he's produced in this province. He has been behind all of that time. His costs have been rising and the price of his product has not. The rise that we have seen in the past few months for the producer is certainly long overdue and I hope it stays for a good length of time, because the grain producer has waited for this and deserves it. I'm sure

that no one could have imagined twelve months ago that barley would now be trading at \$2.50 approximately, wheat, \$4.50 and oats \$1.50. And the strange part about this is, Mr. Speaker, that both the provincial Department of Agriculture and the federal Department of Agriculture have a great hoard of economists, research people, planners and so on in their departments and not one of these people – and this is the only job they have to do is to look at these things – not one of these people predicted twelve months ago that grain would be at this price. It does make you wonder, Mr. Speaker, as to the value of the people that we have in research planning and development in Departments of Agriculture at all stages of government. So the first point we must note then, Mr. Speaker, is that feed grain is now at a good price for the producer.

Secondly, we should note that the Agriculture Products Board, which was set up last fall as an interim measure in the Feed Grains Policy is going just about exactly what it was supposed to do. It was set up as a buyer of last resort to try and point out to the producer the value of his grain so he wouldn't dispose of it at too cheap a price. It has bought very, very little grain, as this is desirable, this was the intention. We should note also that APB has not sold any grain any place in Canada. A number of farm organizations and the NDP said that the APB would be buying cheap grain in Saskatchewan, selling it elsewhere in Canada, this of course is wrong and it has been proved wrong. They have not sold any grain, any place, the Wheat Board is selling the grain, the APB has bought a limited amount of grain, but the APB is not selling it.

Perhaps the increase in price has been overdone to some extent. I don't know where the balance should be. I do know that in my area and the Carlyle area for example, that people who are feeding cattle are buying barley from the elevator in Carlyle and they are paying the regular Wheat Board price, they are buying many thousands of bushels to feed at a feed lot and this seems rather unusual when grain supposedly is in good demand in the country, a good supply and is changing hands privately.

A third point we should note, Mr. Speaker, is that the feed grain that we produce here, that about 70 per cent of it is used locally, 20 per cent is exported and 10 per cent is sold in eastern Canada. Now these figures have been mentioned before and we should keep them in mind because when we are talking about the changes that may be expected in a Feed Grains Policy, we are talking really about the 10 per cent that's going to be sold elsewhere in Canada. There's no suggestion that there be any change in the 70 per cent, of course, that's used on the prairies. There is no suggestion there be any change in the 20 per cent, the method of marketing the 20 per cent that is exported. We're talking about the other 10 per cent that is bought elsewhere in Canada, mostly in the East, a little bit in British Columbia.

I think we should note also that the suggestions that I have heard will not in any way destroy the Wheat Board marketing system, in fact, it could well strengthen the Wheat Board throughout Canada. The Wheat Board has been under attack in some places for its policies of marketing grain within Canada, it could well be strengthened in this is changed.



We should also note that the Wheat Pools, and I'm thinking of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the United Grain Growers, will probably be in much the best position to handle any feed grain that is used elsewhere in Canada. They have the facilities, the staff, the know-how and these are the people who would probably be handling feed grain if there are any changes in the system.

We should also note that the Canadian Wheat Board, presumably under any changes that are made will still control the transportation, all of the transportation of grain in Canada and I think this is very critical.

Another point we should make is that any new plan, as far as feed grain is concerned, must also take into account a storage plan for farmers, some sort of price guarantee or stabilization, an increase in the initial payment to maximize the initial payment at all time and probably to have more substantial cash advances.

To get back to transportation, we should remember, I believe, that transportation could well be the limiting factor, it could well be the key in the whole feed grains situation. We recall again that 70 per cent of the feed grain is used on the prairies and it's necessary that this market be maintained on the prairies, because we are simply not in a position to get this feed grain to any other markets. We may have a demand in Japan or in eastern Canada or in Europe for barley at a good price, but if we can't get it there, that market is of no value to us. So whatever happens in the feed grains business we must keep the market that we have. We must maintain the market for feed grains that we have on the prairies at the moment.

So this would lead us to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the livestock industry here and I'm thinking of the prairies, must be protected and this leads us of course, to the dilemma that is faced by everyone who is considering the problem. How do we get a good price for the grain producers and still have grain available to feeders at a price that will allow them not only to survive but to make a profit?

I would remind you that this will have to be a national policy, I believe. We do have a Saskatchewan Feed Grains Commission, as you are aware. In my estimation it has no function to perform, it hasn't performed any function up to now and I don't believe that provincial interference is the answer.

Now the federal proposal or the suggestions that we have heard regarding feed grain, we should remember first of all that the Wheat Board is going to control we believe, the transportation of feed grains throughout Canada. I think this is the basic thing to remember in any changes that we are going to have.

Another, very important point is that when we are looking at the feed grains situation, we must look at the whole package. We can't look at changes in isolation. We can't say that this was changed and this is undesirable. We must look at the complete package and I mentioned most of the things that would be included in the package. The farm storage, the increases in cash advances, increases in initial payments, the stabilization plan, guaranteed prices, any changes of this nature must be all looked at as a package and not in isolation. Many organizations,

April 2, 1974

I believe, have stated that they wished some changes in the feed grain handling policy in Canada, but I haven't heard of any of those individuals or organizations who are advocating change, that in any way want to destroy the Wheat Board. We keep hearing this all the time, I haven't really heard any group of individuals, any organization in any way indicate that they do not believe in the operation of the Wheat Board as it is at the moment.

We are not sure at the moment what the Federal package will be. They haven't made public what the complete package will be as far as feed grains are concerned and I want to stress the word package, because I have said this is the key to the whole thing, not what they are going to do about handling or pricing one particular commodity but how the whole feed grains situation is going to be handled. We must then keep an open mind in order to get the best possible deal both for the producers of feed grains and the best possible situation for the users of feed grain on the prairies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as a result of what I have said, it is fairly obvious that the Resolution we are discussing has very little meaning. The authority of the Wheat Board is not in question, it hasn't been questioned by any group that I know of. Most groups believe, as I do, that some changes must be made. I am not specifying what these changes will be, but most people feel that some changes must be made providing, of course, that these changes are improvements.

This Resolution by its very nature seems to oppose any changes for any improvements in our marketing system. It believes in the status quo, whether it is right or wrong. I believe that most farmers in this province would not agree with that. They believe in being flexible enough that if there are some minor changes that need to be made to improve the marketing situation we should be willing to do it.

In looking at the Resolution we had thought of some amendments that we might make to make the Resolution more acceptable but when you really examine it, a Resolution that stubbornly resists any type of improvements in our marketing system is not worthy of amendment and not worthy of support. We will be opposing the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H. Owens (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words that I should like to say on this particular Resolution – Restoration of Pricing Authority to Canadian Wheat Board.

The Federal feed grains policy was, as announced by Otto Lang, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, a modest reform in the method to be used in the pricing of feed grains. Under this guise of modest reform and lots of confrontation the Liberals are endeavoring to reverse 40 years of farm history by replacing the Canadian Wheat Board system of orderly marketing with the open market system. Many farmers have not yet realized that this is a two phase program. We are about half way through the first phase or a little more which will be of small consequence because the high demand for feed grain, the real crunch, the second phase is slated for August 1, 1974.

Just what does this policy do? It does many things that are and will be detrimental to western grain growers, and western livestock producers. It threatens orderly handling and storage of grain by the Wheat Board, threatens the orderly marketing of feed grain in Canada, and could result in a loss of several millions of dollars to prairie producers, by making feed grains available to eastern Canada and private grain traders below world market prices.

By setting up the Agricultural Products Board to purchase feed grains in competition with the Canadian Wheat Board, the policy deals a crippling blow to the Canadian Wheat Board in the form of effectively removing the pricing of domestic feed grains from the control of the Canadian Wheat Board, and the Livestock Feed Board. The Board will be asked to use the off-board or non-board price as the base for the price of feed grains they sell to users in Canada. The off-board on the prairies is controlled by feed mills, larger feeder operations and small users, about five per cent of the feed grains trade. For this crop year the Agricultural Products Board are authorized to buy feed grains on an open quota basis at a price mid-way between the initial elevator price and the expected final Canadian Wheat Board price.

Not only does this federal policy destroy Wheat Board control of pricing of domestic feed grain, it puts the commissioners of the board in an impossible position. They are charged by statute with marketing the grain they manage to the best advantage of the producers. To follow Mr. Lang's directive and market grain at a lower price than they could get, clearly conflicts with this statutory obligation. Further, the Canadian Wheat Board will be charged with the job of working with the Canadian Livestock Board to find out what the non-board price really is.

Further to complicate the storage and movement of all grains, the Canadian Wheat Board will be obliged to buy for Agricultural Products Board on an open quota basis, and have the feed grain in position to fill the Agricultural products Board orders when requested to do so. Why an Agricultural Products Board, when we already have a Canadian Wheat Board that is doing and has been doing a very commendable service? Probably it needs a little updating, but certainly not a whole new deal.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a release from the Leader-Post of March 16. It is headed, "Wheat Pool Appeals to Trudeau, Lang". It reads, I won't read it all but a portion of it:

Prime Minister Trudeau has been asked by the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to take a direct hand in the forming of a federal feed grains policy.

The Pool Board said the policy proposed by his Government will lead to direct intervention by provincial commissions and agencies.

It urged Mr. Trudeau to personally examine the implications of the Government's proposed program. It asked him to give serious consideration to an alternative which would keep the type of marketing structures that are wanted by the vast majority of Canadian producers.

April 2, 1974

A separate letter to Justice Minister Lang said:

The proposed federal policy opts for a non-quota open market for feed grains with prices determined in cash and future markets at the Winnipeg Grain Commodity Exchange.

The non-quota aspect would create glaring inequities in delivery opportunity and inefficiencies in the use of elevator and rail facilities. These conditions would make the federal proposal completely impractical at the producer level.

Referring to federal plans, the Pool Board told Mr. Lang it is not easy to understand how a policy which we are convinced will add inefficiency and confusion in the marketing of domestic feed grains can be promoted as a national policy.

We regret that it appears at this stage that a political solution may be imminent despite the legitimate request of farmers and their organizations.

Why all this confusion? My answer would have to be the pressures from the Winnipeg Grain Commodity Exchange coupled with eastern Canada feeders and processors, to undermine and hopefully destroy the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing system along with the western livestock feeder. I must agree with the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale who was quoted as saying in a news release a few days ago, "Why should our farmers give us the principle of orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board to satisfy central Canada?" I would also add, "to satisfy the Commodity Exchange and other speculators." Exports, quotas and world prices will not always be as high as they are today. Then speculators and profiteers will have a field day at the expense of the farmers, no matter where they live or what they produce.

In some respects the farm scene of 1973 and now 1974 is reminiscent of 1923. Fifty years ago, farm leaders worked hard to set up the wheat pool system because they distrusted, and rightly so, the private grain trade and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. The pools won the West, and the same farmers obtained the Canadian Wheat Board. It was a hard fought battle, an actual life saver for the West, and it has been fully supported ever since by all sane and reasonable people who believe farmers should have a voice in the selling of their produce. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the private trade have been at war with them, that is the pools and the Canadian Wheat Board, continuously, ever since and are and have been supported by our federal governments past and present, Liberal or Conservative. Western farmers of today are just as concerned about the future of farming in Saskatchewan, and the price of farm products, as were their forefathers of times past. Are our memories too short to recall the reception accorded the famous farm stabilization proposal that was for lack of support by the West 'pulled'? We were reminded during the fall sitting by our Members opposite of the fate of that piece of propaganda, continuing in their consistency that what is good for Saskatchewan, we will oppose.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Owens:** — Might I add, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are very vocally blaming the NDP for the withdrawal of this stabilization of poverty Bill. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Liberal Government of the day had a safe majority, the Bill was withdrawn for political expediency for the Liberal Party, not for any reasons expounded by Members opposite.

Another fabulous document also proved the shortsighted policy of our Mr. Lang is, for short, called LIFE (Lower Inventory for Tomorrow), that one almost lifted Otto out. Yes, Mr. Speaker, LIFE left us little in both dollars and wheat. We still vividly recall the remark made by a prominent member of our society, “Why should I sell your wheat?” Never at any time could sane people with sound business principles and concern for their fellowmen, not only in Canada but in the less affluent countries, ever see a surplus of food products. Certainly we had a distribution problem, that could have been overcome with the use of a little common sense and co-operation. No longer do we have an unmanageable surplus, in fact, we are faced with a near shortage, according to a news release from Moncton, New Brunswick; this was some time ago, Mr. Speaker, in December of 1973 and we read in large type, “Feed Grain Shortage Threatening Eastern Canada”. I shall not bother to read it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand how problems, at times, could make it difficult to fulfill commitments on some far away continent, but to have a feed grain shortage facing stock growers in eastern Canada and at the same time to have surpluses in western Canada is inexcusable, unless it is planned. Planned, Mr. Speaker, to further undermine the credibility of the Canadian Wheat Board and further planned to create sympathy for easterners and thereby continue or possibly extend further the freight subsidy for feed grain to central Canada.

Probably sympathy is one of the strategies. When eastern Canada reads reports such as this one in the Star-Phoenix of December 26, 1973, that record cash into prairies is predicted and it states in part, that total prairie grain income will be more than twice anything ever known before 1973, and a few paragraphs later it reads:

World supply and demand situations are pretty well known now for the first half of the year and it is the kind of situation in which Canada can sell virtually all the grain it has to move.

It is a case, Mr. Speaker, where efforts are being made to brainwash western farmers into feeling that because one good year is a fact, and a second good year is a possibility, that they should be prepared and willing to continue subsidizing the eastern interests. I don't believe western farmers or farm organizations have any desire to support such an idea, if I have correctly interpreted news reports attributed to them and letters received from many.

An interesting article appeared in the December 20, 1973 edition of the Western Producer, it is headed, “Wheat Board Supported If”. It is by Dr. Horner, Alberta Minister of Agriculture. This indicates to me that Saskatchewan, as a province is not alone in its opposition to the feed grains policy.

April 2, 1974

Speaking of the feed grains policy Dr. Horner said:

It should contain a provision that feed grains be available to producers on an equal basis, that there be an assured supply and there be a well-known price so that grain producers and livestock producers alike know where they stand.

He also said:

There should be an immediate removal of the feed freight assistance program and the Federal Government should be paying grain producers the difference between export prices and domestic prices.

A Star-Phoenix reporter interviewed a grain marketing specialist at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon recently. May I quote just a few of his remarks as reported in the news report.

1. The new policy may have knuckled under to pressure from eastern Canadian interests.
2. The Federal Government's new feed grains policy in its present form will likely prevent the development of secondary industry in the agricultural sectors of the prairies.
3. I think it is important to western cities that the processing industry be developed here. That is the policy taken by the Government of Saskatchewan and Alberta. But the new policy does not do that.
4. The feed freight subsidy has not been removed and this works to the advantage of livestock production in eastern Canada.
5. The new feed grain program is a confused policy containing many aspects which still have to be worked out.
6. Why do we have to instigate a policy which contains so many loose ends and uncertainties which leads to confusion? I get skeptical when someone says, "Let's wait until next year and we will have all the problems worked out then".
7. The Federal Government should do all it can to ensure that development of the livestock and feed grains industry is not discouraged in an area of natural advantage. It is ridiculous in this country to transport our feeders into Ontario to support development of more industry there.

Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the comments from a grain marketing specialist. Surely it would only be reasonable at least to listen to and study what he has to recommend.

Mr. Speaker, I have been considering the Federal Feed Grains Program as it affects western grain growers versus the eastern livestock feeder with a few other side factors that complicate the situation. Let us not forget that western farmers may not be primarily concerned with the provision to

eastern feeders but will in all probability take a look at the total world grain situation as it appears today.

A reliable source of information informs us that total production of the major grains this year reached an all-time high of around 47.6 billion bushels. This is nearly 11 billion bushels above the level of production in 1964 representing an average increase of close to three per cent in the ten year period. This compares favorably with the world population growth of about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  per cent per year, during this period.

It is important to note where the increase in grain production has occurred. Although production in the major grains increased by nearly 30 per cent in the last ten years, more than half of the total increase occurred in production of feed grains. The more rapid increase in feed production is undoubtedly the result of the rising demand for meat in the industrialized countries. It is readily apparent that feed grain production will have to increase at a much faster rate than the traditional grains as meat consumption continues to go up.

In terms of wheat alone, it is estimated world production will have to increase between 350 and 400 million bushels annually, just to take care of the increase in consumption.

Looking at grain reserves in the major exporting countries, we learn the total wheat carryover dropped from a peak of 2.4 billion bushels in 1970 to approximately 987 million bushels at the end of the last crop year and it is estimated to drop to 737 million bushels by the end of the present crop year, the lowest wheat carryover since World War II, and roughly equals the amount consumed in the world in three weeks' time.

In comparison to a rather confused world grain situation, Canada is in a rather preferred situation. With the Canadian Wheat Board as the marketing agency for the main grain produced in our country, it is in a position to know the quantities that have been committed for export and as a result importing countries are in increasing numbers approaching the Canadian Wheat Board directly to negotiate wheat and barley supplies. As a consequence, direct Canadian Wheat Board sales will account for approximately 85 per cent of our exports of wheat and barley this year. In past years approximately one-half of our sales were handled through commercial companies acting as Wheat Board agents.

In view of these few statistics which show clearly the need for more world requirements of grain for food consumption, with the very strong and promising possibility that, at least for a number of years, the problems of surpluses of any sizable amount unless held by individual operators for personal reasons, will not be a problem. The problem will be the fear of shortages of supplies in various areas of the world.

It is, therefore, beyond my power of comprehension that producers would fail to take advantage of the highest prices available. And, who in the past, has consistently been the only sure and stable source except the Canadian Wheat Board, which has consistently set an acceptable initial price on delivery and made interim and final payments on a fair and equitable basis. Who has stood the test of handling our surpluses and establishing a quota system of orderly marketing that has been acceptable to western producers, producers who realize that their net

returns were too low during some distressed periods?

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board has been a positive marketing system and continues to grow in popularity with both the producers and the purchasers. What then, Mr. Speaker, is the situation faced by the Commodity Grain Exchange and private dealers? Naturally their handlings are below par so they must come up with some formula that will put more grain under their control. The Canadian Wheat Board is accused by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and private agents of having a monopoly, their (Winnipeg Grain Exchange) insistence on competition has resulted in the Agricultural Products Board, a modest reform in our grain handling system for one year, let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, for one year. Next year is a new ball game.

I maintain we are witnessing a foot in the door, a back door approach to discredit and eventually erode our orderly marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board for the open market, free trade, grain exchange style of disposing of our farm grown grains, not only feed grains but all grains. Witness the effort and money spent for the retention of rapeseed for the open market. The farmers are being sold a bill of goods, the present strong prices won't last forever and when they change the producer can be assured of fire sale prices. If the records of past history are any indication, farmers will need the protection of orderly marketing through the Canadian Wheat Board.

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of the federal feed grains policy, I cannot see a need, even an excuse, for the Agricultural Products Board.

I support, Mr. Speaker, orderly marketing by the Canadian Wheat Board of all our grains products including those not presently controlled by it.

I believe the West should be allowed to benefit from its natural advantages in feeding livestock, and from there develop secondary industries to process our livestock products. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want basic supports built into the orderly marketing system, supports based on federal treasury commitments, not off-quota markets.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all the Members of this Legislature to take a serious look at the future of our agriculture economy and the impact that agriculture has on our total Saskatchewan economy. I ask them to take a look over the past history of grain marketing, as it was prior to the Canadian Wheat Board. I ask them to check with the many organizations that represent Saskatchewan farmers for their reactions and recommendations, and lastly, Mr. Speaker, I ask them to vote on this Resolution as I know the people in Saskatchewan will expect them to vote. The people of Saskatchewan cannot afford the federal feed grains policy. As true and genuine representatives of the people of Saskatchewan we have no alternative but to demand that the federal feed grains policy be withdrawn now.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kaeding** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended at the beginning of this debate on this Resolution to become involved since I had taken an active part in the debate in a similar Resolution last year.



However, persistent rumors and news reports which I suspect are being planted by persons close to the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, Mr. Lang, indicate that the Federal Government, under Mr. Lang's direction, is still determined to bull its way ahead with long-term feed grains proposals made last year.

In spite of the sincere pleadings and representations made to them by the Federation of Agriculture, the Wheat Pools, the Western Provincial Governments, to revise these proposals it appears as though the Minister is determined to bull his way ahead, to be stone deaf and stone blind and stone headed.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine those proposals. The overriding thrust is to ensure that the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange would be the centre where the feed grain prices are to be established through the use of the futures market. The plan would supposedly provide a free and open market where buyers and sellers in all parts of Canada would have access to feed grains. Certainly this will be welcome news to James Richardson and his friends on the Exchange. I doubt very much whether it would receive the same warm welcome from western grain producers. Look at these press clippings from yesterday's paper. "Futures Drop in Light Trading." And another, "Grain Futures Tumble Limit." A few days ago I saw one that said, "Futures Soar with Heavy Buying." Yet another one reads, "Prices on Grain Drop Limit as a Result of Profit Taking."

Mr. Speaker, these are not the kind of headlines that bring joy to the hearts of a farmer or can be expected to inspire him with a burning confidence in the future. Imagine the uproar there would be in the well guarded world of big business if one day General Motors cars were traded for \$5,000. Next day, because the market was dull, they would drop to \$4,500 and yet another day the market would be strong and they skyrocketed to \$6,000. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, in that world no one talks of open markets and free competition.

Yet this is what Mr. Lang proposes to the producers and consumers of feed grain in Canada. I say to him that farmers in western Canada will not accept such a proposal easily. I predict that if he does, indeed, attempt to foist such a proposal on western grain farmers, they will rise up against it as they did with his ill-fated stabilization program in 1972.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) tried to allay the fears of farmers by saying that really only about ten per cent of western feed grain would be affected since approximately 70 per cent is consumed on our farms and 20 per cent is needed for export. The Member for Cannington is a so-called economist and he should know better. Today, the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) repeated the argument.

If the price of the ten per cent of open market grain falls drastically the loss of income is just as great on a local farm even if he consumes much of his own product. Does he not realize that in a time of surplus that ten per cent could determine the value of all feed grains if exposed to the open market?

No, Mr. Speaker, farmers of western Canada have worked long and hard to try to get some stability in the grain industry. They have not yet succeeded. However, they will recognize the return to the open speculative market is a retrograde step and will not thank Mr. Lang for moving in that direction.

April 2, 1974

With feed grain moving without restriction and buyers in eastern Canada receiving priority on the delivery of their purchases in the West, the entire quota system and delivery mechanism would be thrown into chaos. With dozens or hundreds of buyers in the market, the Wheat Board would be expected to maintain some kind of order in deliveries and they would not succeed because they would not have full control of the marketing mechanism. As a result the Board would come under even more criticisms and ultimately be destroyed.

If one were to assume, as many would have us believe, that all feedlot operators in eastern Canada would have access to western grain through the free market system on a direct basis, some price competition might arise which could result in some small increase in farm prices. However, it would be both unlikely and impractical for each eastern feeder to deal directly. The result would be that private grain traders would become the intermediaries and would do the bulk of the purchasing, thereby setting up another middleman, who, of course, would expect to reap a profit from all transactions.

How much simpler, Mr. Speaker, if the Government were to take the sensible approach of retaining the Wheat Board as the sole marketing agent for all western grains. We would then have a system which is orderly in terms of deliveries from the producer, in transportation, storage and pricing.

Through negotiations with the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, a stable price could be established which would be equitable to all sectors of the livestock industry. Since the livestock industries of the United States and Canada cannot ever be very far apart, these prices of Canadian feed should be set on the basis reasonably close to the price of United States corn which it replaces in our market. These negotiations would guarantee a continuous supply to all Canadian feeders. They could maintain a price relationship for feed grains in the various parts of Canada which would reflect the costs of transportation, handling and marketing costs. Because the price would be relatively stable both producers and consumers of feed grain would have a clear understanding of their costs and returns.

A properly negotiated price would not distort the competitive positions of grain and livestock producers in Canada and should as a result lead to greater growth and stability in both the grain and livestock industries.

As I indicated in a previous debate, the price of feed grains must bear some relationship to the price of finished carcasses. This could be assured through a properly implemented stabilization program. Because of a stabilization program, producers of feed grain could not always expect to receive the maximum price which might prevail on the open market. Conversely they would be protected from extreme lows through forward purchasing by the Livestock Feed Board from the Wheat Board.

In order to allow the natural advantages of the various regions of Canada to be recognized, it will be necessary to either phase out the feed freight subsidy to central Canada or institute a compensating freight subsidy on dressed meat going east to the central markets.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned not only with the direction taken by the Hon. Otto Lang in regard to the feed grain policy.

Yesterday an announcement was made that 1,000 grain elevators on low volume lines, would be temporarily closed and priority would be given to main lines where a quick turnaround of cars can be accomplished.

As an emergency measure, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have to accept this move in order to get sufficient volumes of grain into terminal positions in time to take advantage of export sales at this time. I do not believe, however, that it was necessary for us to be in this crisis situation, had proper transportation direction been given to the railways before the severe weather we had, created a crisis situation.

I am even more concerned, Mr. Speaker, after hearing a news report this morning, which indicates that railways and elevator companies would receive preferential rates to gather grain at designated points on the prairies, over an extended period. It would appear to me that once we have accepted the principle of preferential rates at certain points, we have effectively sealed the fate of many of our secondary rail lines and subsequently the rural communities adjacent to them.

It looks to me like the thin edge of the wedge. Once traffic patterns have been disrupted it would be increasingly difficult to reverse that trend. I do not quarrel with the idea that some rationalization may have to take place. I also believe that the determination of which lines should be abandoned, should not be decided only by the railway companies, or the elevator companies, but must take into account the total needs of each region. Any move to bring about this kind of rationalization cannot be permitted to be made strictly on the basis of economics.

In all the moves being taken by the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, I detect an underlying motive to implement the recommendations of the Task Force on Agriculture, which has as one of its major projections, the removal of two-thirds of the farms of this country. I think that we should emphatically reject any more in that direction.

Because of the intimate connections between the agricultural industry and the prospective future economic developments in agriculture processing in western Canada, it is important for all residents of this region to be aware of the problems of agriculture and to support agricultural producers in their efforts to retain a stable industry.

The extreme business recession which this province experienced only two or three years ago, should be ample evidence that this is still basically an agricultural province and that prosperous farmers equate a prosperous provincial economy. For this reason all businessmen and private citizens should support farm organizations in their drive for farm income stability.

Mr. Speaker, I would call on all Members of this Legislature to cast aside their biases and support this Resolution, which requests the Federal Government to develop a sane feed grains policy which would maintain the Canadian Wheat Board as the sole marketing agency for all grains and would use the Canadian Livestock Feed board to negotiate a fair price for producers and consumers of feed grain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

April 2, 1974

**Mr. D. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't got much to say except that I am sure the Members on the opposite side would be disappointed if I didn't give the Wheat Board a little touch.

I just took down a few notes and I should like to commend on what the Members opposite said and I want to make them aware of a few things.

The speakers repeatedly said that they wanted all the grain sold and regulated and controlled by the Wheat Board. But the farmers don't agree with you. Recently we had a vote on rape and the farmers voted against the Wheat Board handling rape, despite the fact that the Wheat Pool and the Provincial Government had a very strenuous campaign urging the farmers to vote that the rape come under the control of the Wheat Board.

Surely you wouldn't want to take rape and flax and rye under the Wheat Board if the farmers didn't want it there? We believe in a democratic vote and the Federal Government, under the Minister of the Canadian Wheat Board, provided a vote for the farmers to decide and the farmers made a democratic choice. And they looked at the operation of the Wheat Board and they decided that they would be happier if rape did not come under the control of the Wheat Board.

Now it is very interesting to note – and I would like to tell the farmers, to your right, that they should take a look at the operation of the Wheat Board. In general, I believe, that the majority of the farmers support the marketing of wheat, oats and barley through the Wheat Board, but for the Members opposite to stand up and say that the Wheat Board has never sinned, is wrong. It would be just as sound for me to say that the Liberal Party, when they were the Government that we had never done anything wrong. Maybe we haven't, but I think we did. And you might just as well say, and no one will believe you, not even your own supporters will believe you, that the NDP Government has never done anything wrong. I rather doubt whether you have done anything right.

I want to tell the farmers of Saskatchewan, and I want to tell the farmers on the NDP side, that if you go back only to six or seven months ago, re the pricing of wheat in July 1973, the farmers were urged by the Wheat Board to deliver their grain. And the price of wheat at the Robin Hood Mills on July 31st was \$1.55 per bushel. The farmers were encouraged to deliver and sell their wheat and most of them sold their wheat. And on August 2nd, out of the clear blue sky, the Wheat Board announced an increase in the interim payment of 50 cents a bushel, bringing that wheat to \$2.05 a bushel.

Now the Wheat Board didn't advise the farmers to hang on to that wheat until August 2nd. And you know many, many farmers lost at least \$3 per bushel because of the inaction of the Wheat Board.

**An Hon. Member:** — It was Otto Lang.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Oh, no, it wasn't Otto Lang, it was the Wheat Board. Just take a look at how many farmers got hooked by \$2 and \$3 a bushel and today they are smarting and I want to say to the Members opposite that the reason the farmers didn't vote for

rape to come under the Wheat Board is because of the tremendous financial loss they suffered in two days. The Grain Exchange in the past history, now the Commodity Exchange, as it is known, never has the farmer lost \$3 a bushel in a matter of two days, but it happened under the Wheat Board. And as most farmers know, this is not the policy of the Liberal Party this is my personal opinion, hat I don't think the Wheat Board has been to the benefit of Dave Boldt and the farmer but the majority of the farmers think otherwise and they have a right to do this. But I had a farmer come to me, it was about two or three days before the end of the last crop year and he says to me, "Dave, you know more about wheat than most of the farmers that I know of, would you recommend that I sell my wheat? I have two or three days, (I think it was 48 hours time) to sell my wheat, I have got 6,000 bushels of wheat lying in the elevator at Moose Jaw and I have 24 or 48 hours to sell it, what would you recommend?" And I said to him, "My friend you must be crazy if you sell it now. I've got no confidence in the Wheat Board but when I look at the Thunder Bay price and the Vancouver price, surely the Wheat Board is not going to rob me of that much money that I'm not going to get more in the next crop year than I would now." "Do you think so, Dave?" And I said, "Absolutely." So he kept it and he sold it on August 2nd. The next time when I came to his office, he was all smiles that I had advised him and he said I had made \$6,000 for him in the matter of two or three days and the end result will be a profit of about \$18,000 to him for keeping that wheat, selling it on August 2nd, rather than selling it on July 30th. Why didn't the Wheat Board advise the farmer? They made a mistake or at least if it wasn't a mistake, at least a grave error in judgment and you tell us that the Wheat Board never makes a mistake.

Thousands and thousands of farmers were robbed of millions of dollars. I have a brother-in-law who can't afford to lose that kind of money and he sold in July 7,000 bushels of wheat at \$2 a bushel, he lost \$21,000. He's a small farmer. Now I certainly cannot support this Resolution because I don't believe that the farmers, they have proven, they've had a vote that they don't want the rape, and I don't think that they want the flax and they don't want rye to come under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board.

The Agricultural Products Board has bought so little grain that it doesn't affect the transportation system, it doesn't affect the price and as a matter of fact, feed lots in my area, and there are a good number in my area, are buying barley directly from the Wheat Board out of the elevator at \$2.61, the last price and I am sure that the price has gone up since.

Now the Member who just spoke, I believe he comes from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding). He said a thousand elevators will be closed. I'm not quite sure whether a thousand elevators will be closed. I believe that the Minister said that there would be a thousand elevators affected by the closing of the railroad, not the elevators. I haven't heard that the elevator companies are laying off their men. I am quite sure if they have truck facilities that some of that wheat could be trucked, that the elevators would still remain open. Really I think that they should have done this five or six years ago. This is one of the reasons why the Wheat Board is in trouble today.

We have a delivery system based on 1905 and a world marketing system based on 1975 and those two just don't play

ball. If you want to have a good marketing system I believe that a majority of farmers will agree that some rails must be abandoned. I have one line in my constituency, the Carleton Line. It has trees on the railroad, the railroad hasn't been looked after and the railroad people have told me that two or three times in January and February they tried to open this line. The snowplow got off the rail and they worked on this snowplow for hours and hours, they expected to be back by 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon and they didn't get back until 4:00 o'clock next morning. Anybody knows that a line that is so tough to keep open when it is only a couple of miles away from the mainline from Saskatoon to Prince Albert, they have many opportunities and many places where they can deliver their grain. But if we as politicians say that these small communities must remain open regardless of the cost, well I'm telling you you can put millions and millions of dollars in some of our small communities and in Saskatchewan and they will disappear regardless. The whole farm economy is based on large scale farm operations and only a few days ago on the CBC News, the CBC reporter, I forget what his name is, said on the news, that there are 40 farmers leaving the farm per week in Saskatchewan. You multiply that by 52 times 40 and it amounts to over 2,000 farmers leaving the farms in Saskatchewan during a period of 365 days. That would mean 2,000 farmers less in Saskatchewan every year.

Now FarmStart and all the farm programs and the Wheat Board and the Federal Government and the Provincial Government are not going to change that trend over night. You just look at the farm implement dealers and what are they short of? Are they short of 60 horsepower tractors or 70 horsepower tractors or 80 horsepower tractors? No, they are short of 150, 180, 220 and the other day, just a few days ago I dropped in at a dealer in Saskatoon and he sold a tractor that has over 300 horsepower to a farmer. These are the tractors that are in demand today. Farmers are getting four-wheel drive tractors, they are buying more land, they are increasing their operations and the small farmer is just like a small grocery store in Regina. There is no hope for him surviving and let's stop talking about something that won't exist two or three or four or five years from now. These are the facts of life. The small farmer is gradually disappearing at the rate of 40 per week in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — Is that a good idea?

**Mr. Boldt:** — Is that a good idea? No, it isn't but you won't stop it. No way are you going to stop it. You can pump millions of dollars into an enterprise but regardless of what you do the trend today is for larger farming operations. You are not going to stop it by pumping money into the farms. The farmers that you are helping out with FarmStart, the farmers that are being helped today by the Farm Credit Corporation are not the small farmers. It's farmers like me that don't need it. They'll help me but I don't need it and maybe some of you fellows don't need it. But who are they helping, not the one who really needs it. FarmStart isn't helping it either. I had a phone call here over the weekend from a neighbor of mine whose son has his master's degree in music. He has taught two or three years and has decided to farm. He bought out the dairy and he went to FarmStart and FarmStart said to him, we can't loan you any money, you haven't got assets. He was going to buy the dairy. So the farmer told me the best thing rather than run around he

was just going to finance it himself. So you are not really helping the man that wants to farm. You are helping the man that is already established. Not doing much good there.

All I want to say in closing is that I want to tell the Members opposite that the Wheat Board has made many, many mistakes. I don't believe that the farmers want all the grain to come under the Wheat Board, they have proven it by a vote. If you so blatantly state that you are going to take rape, rye and flax under the Wheat Board, those are not the wishes of the farmer. I think that the mistakes that the Wheat Board has made, maybe perhaps that the Minister has made, the Government has made, was a direct result of the vote that we had here last fall, which indicated that the majority of the farmers that grow rape were not supporting the Wheat Board. In closing I want to say that I cannot support this Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

### **Resolution No. 17 – Problems of Northern Saskatchewan**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East):

That this Assembly commends the Provincial Government for its determined efforts to positively direct the energies of Saskatchewan in resolving the deeply rooted social and economic problems of northern Saskatchewan by having taken the following steps: (a) the establishment of five year northern housing program; (b) the completion of plans for sewer and water in four northern communities; (c) the successful election of northern Saskatchewan's first civic Northern Municipal Council; (d) the provision of economic opportunity for northern people, resulting in increased employment; and (e) the establishment of a single Department of Northern Saskatchewan to implement and monitor the continued transfer to northern people of programs, opportunities and decision making powers not previously offered to them by any former Government.

**Mr. A. R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I have only a few more comments that I should like to make in regard to this Resolution. I made most of my comments the other day. We can't support the Resolution on this side of the House when you commend the Government for what the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has done. I showed the other day that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in its first two years had been an abject failure. It had certainly not lived up to the goals which it established when it was originally set up of trying to draw northern participation into policy making channels. It never solved the problem of an adequate form of northern representation and in two years when there should have been some successes in the various fields in which its endeavors are carried out, we find that it has been short of success, in fact, it has been a determined failure in the field of economic development and in the field of housing development. In another debate one of the Members mentioned that in the early first years of the Liberal Government that we averaged something between 30 and 40 houses a year. That is certainly more than they have been able to manage under a

April 2, 1974

housing program in the first three years. They started a program in the past year of 125 houses and they never got it completed. There are very few of those, if any, that are completed and being lived in at the present time.

The Municipal Council which they established has not worked out. It was full of political interference. Another example was where a Government employee was elected to the Municipal Council just a few weeks ago and there is now court action being taken by some of the northern residents against that particular member. So you can't say that it has been a success.

The transfer to northern people of responsibility for making decisions and running their own affairs of course has not occurred as was promised when the Department was set up.

And the promise that they were going to reduce the welfare rolls was not kept as we find that this year they are budgeting for a greater increase in welfare than they did last year. So in all the major fields of endeavor the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been a failure. In fact, since we started the debate we have had at least two or three other groups coming down from northern Saskatchewan with complaints and with criticism and with condemnation of the activities of the Government. We had a group down here last week who met with both the Government Members and the Members of the Opposition and they are holding meetings throughout the province showing the failures of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

We have a group that was either down here today or on its way down to see Education Minister MacMurchy in regard to the local school board in Ile-a-La-Crosse, which Members opposite have said has been a success. In fact, it's been such a success it has been keeping the children out of school for the last two or three days. So no matter where you look in which field of endeavor that the Department has become involved in, it has been a total failure and we on this side of the House are unable to support the Resolution. In fact, we feel strong enough that the Resolution does not present the true picture that I should like to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern) in amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

expresses its regret at the failure of the Provincial Government through its Department of Northern Saskatchewan to: (a) encourage economic development in northern Saskatchewan; (b) provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of the people; (c) provide a Northern Municipal Council free of political interference; and (d) to transfer to the northern people the programs, opportunities and decision making powers necessary to run their own affairs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. K. Comer** (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Hon. Member for Athabasca speak about the North before, but I have never heard him so quiet and so meek as he was today. He is obviously having second thoughts, second thoughts about his position on



DNS, second thoughts about his running out of the North.

You know I haven't got the text of the amendment with me, I just wrote down briefly some of the areas of concern that he had in his amendment. He talked about the fact that there hadn't been economic development. Since the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been established grants and loans have been made available to northern people, providing approximately 180 jobs in northern Saskatchewan.

He complained about the fact that we hadn't had an adequate housing program and yet last summer in northern Saskatchewan the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was responsible for the building of 99 houses. They finished them. They were built by northern people not by Ad Fab. In five years the Department of Northern Saskatchewan plans to build 600 houses.

He complains about the fact that the Northern Municipal Council for some reason or other, because an employee of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan gets elected isn't independent.

You know from the North, they elected a school teacher who worked for the Government. Did that mean that the Legislature wasn't independent? Of course, not.

**An Hon. Member:** — Be careful how you use that word work. Paid by the Government.

**Mr. Comer:** — Well, yes paid by the Government.

He complained about local control and yet at the same time he admitted that there is a school board in Ile-a-La-Crosse elected, making decisions. I don't know what he wants.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things I should like to say on this amendment. I should like to study it further and I'd like to speak as well on the text of the main Motion. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 15 — Control of Wild Oats on Prairie Grain Farms**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to properly recognize the serious problem of wild oats on prairie grain farms, and to consider methods of control and eradication.

**Hon. J. R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment to this Motion, seconded by Mr. Smishek. The amendment reads:

That all the words after "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following words added:

April 2, 1974

regrets the failure of the Government of Canada to properly recognize the serious problem of wild oats on prairie grain farms and that this Assembly further regrets the Federal Government's failure to take the necessary steps to reduce the price of wild oat control chemicals to a reasonable level and to provide satisfactory financial support for Wild Oat Action Committee programs relating to improvement of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in April, 1973 a wild oat control symposium was held in Saskatoon to discuss the wild oat situation on farms, in not only Saskatchewan, but in western Canada.

**Mr. J. C. McIsaac** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I'm not trying to prevent the Minister from speaking, but technically speaking, the Minister moved the amendment and took his seat, and I think if we are going to adhere to the rules, the Hon. Minister completely missed his opportunity to speak. I thought it was just an amendment, a very frivolous kind of amendment. I understood why he took his seat.

**Mr. Messer**: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Point of Order. I simply wanted to make certain that the amendment was in order before I continued to speak on it. Frankly, the continued . . .

**An Hon. Member**: — Sit down.

**Mr. Messer**: — On a Point of Order. I haven't finished.

**Mr. Speaker**: — Order!

**Mr. Messer**: — I rose on a Point of Order and the Members opposite consistently interrupt you when you are on your feet on a Point of Order with no regard for the decorum of the House whatsoever.

**Some Hon. Members**: — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer**: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to make certain that I, as a Member of this Legislative Assembly and all Members abide by the rules of the House. I was moving an amendment and before debating that amendment, I wanted to have your ruling that it was in order before I spoke to that amendment. That was the only reason, Mr. Speaker, I took my seat.

**Mr. Speaker**: — Order, order! I don't think this Point of Order needs debating. I think the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) is correct that the Minister had spoken and then taken his seat. A Member should complete his speech while he is on his feet. The only way the Minister could continue is if the House gave him unanimous consent, otherwise this Chair cannot.

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — I just wonder, are you saying that the House, on a Point of Order, you are saying now that the House has to give

the Minister unanimous consent?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The rule says he has exercised his right to speak, because he took his seat after moving the amendment. But the House can do what it likes by unanimous consent. The House could give him permission if it wished to.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly will be prepared to give the Minister and I'm sure that the Opposition would want to hear the words of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) in the Province of Saskatchewan and that no one opposite would deny and thereby cut off the freedom of speech for the Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. W. E. Smishek** (Minister of Public Health): — On a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to deal with the Point of Order that was raised. Isn't it the common practice or rather part of the rules that when the Speaker is on his feet that the Member who has been standing up should sit down until the Speaker makes his ruling. I believe, Sir, you were on your feet at the time when the Hon. Minister sat down in order to hear you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, that Point of Order is not well taken because the Speaker was not on his feet until the amendment was sent up by the speaker. Then the Member took his seat. So the Member is out of order in taking his seat, but the House can, by unanimous consent, do what it wishes. Does the Member have consent to proceed with his speech on this amendment?

Permission denied.

**Mr. D. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this Resolution came before the House and it was debated and I made several notes at the time and I want to make a few comments regarding this Resolution.

I find myself, to a degree, somewhat in disagreement with what the Resolution calls for and I believe farmers have a great concern regarding wild oats, as this is one of our worst weeds we have today.

Now, I think most farmers will agree with me that because we are fertilizing our fields, nitrogen fertilizer enhances the growth of wild oats. Yet we very seldom hear this being said by our professors and Ph.D's at the university level. But it is proven that if you spread out nitrogen on a field, that it encourages growth, particularly wild oats and that is one of the reasons why wild oats has just skyrocketed and it has become one of our worst weeds that we have today.

I am also somewhat concerned about the recommendations we get from the university. The university professors tell us that we are not to summer fallow. That summer fallow is a dangerous method of farming. I don't think that the majority of the farmers agree with the professors at the university that tell us not to summer fallow, that it is harmful, that we produce too

April 2, 1974

much nitrogen and it will pollute the water and someday we will pollute all our drinking water. So there are many, many areas of discussion, there are many areas in which the farmer has a great big question mark as to whether he is getting the right information and for that reason I believe that we should have more time to discuss this Resolution and I at this time beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Adjournment negatived on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 13**  
**Messieurs**

Steuart	Grant	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Coupland	McIsaac	Wiebe
Loken	Gardner	Malone
Guy	Weatherald	
Boldt	Lane	

**NAYS — 32**  
**Messieurs**

Meakes	Kwasnica	Gross
Smishek	Engel	Feduniak
Romanow	Cody	Comer
Messer	Robbins	Rolfes
Thibault	Tchorzewski	Lange
Larson	Cowley	Hanson
Baker	Taylor	Oliver
Brockelbank	Matsalla	Feschuk
Pepper	Faris	Kaeding
Byers	Owens	Flasch
Thorson	Mostoway	

**Mr. Boldt:** — I thought, Mr. speaker, for a moment it was an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but this time I won out.

If the Minister of Agriculture would be kind enough to send me a Resolution or maybe it's coming up now. I would like to speak on the amendment.

**Mr. Messer:** — Don't sit down whatever you do.

**Mr. Boldt:** — No, I won't. the Resolution calls for the Provincial Government, or the Resolution says that the Federal Government is supposed to bail out the Saskatchewan Government and this is about all that this Government has to do or has to say are the only responsibilities that they think they have, is to go to Ottawa and tell them to help the farmer.

As I said before, the cause, the real cause that we have today in reference to wild oats in many areas is because we are successfully trying to farm, we are putting more money into raising crops, we are buying more fertilizer, with the result that weeds are enhanced, particularly wild oats. 2-4 D will not kill wild oats, we eradicated practically all the other weeds that we at one time had. So wild oats now has practically a free choice and of course, farmers are troubled.

Another reason why we are in trouble today or have been in trouble in the past, I believe we have good control of wild oats, but it was so costly and \$1.50 wheat, not too many farmers would use the chemicals that will successfully kill wild oats.

I believe that farmers in the Saskatoon area who are close to the university have a real advantage over those that are not. I have over the years been able to use the facilities of the university and I had some real good advice from them.

**Mr. Byers:** — You mean you would take advice from the professors.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Well, they are not lawyers you know, they are doctors. Some of them are pretty good.

So we have been experimenting and I can honestly say that in the last year or two I have tried to combat wild oats and we have been rather successful. Fields that have been polluted with wild oats can be controlled, particularly with Avadex. Avadex is a very good chemical to control wild oats. It can be applied in fall, the granular Avadex can be applied in fall on summer fallow and on stubble, and you can also use the spray type. I have seen fields that were treated, the crop that has been taken off this fall, particularly the barley crop, could be used for seed, absolutely no wild oats. You could see where the drill or the sprayer had missed a couple of inches, and wild oats came up and where it had been covered with spray with Avadex seeded in with the drill, that they had perfect control.

So the argument that there is no control for wild oats doesn't stand up. There is control. Our university people have found the proper chemicals to control it. I think with \$5 and \$6 wheat, \$2.50 barley and \$1.50 for oats that farmers will be using more and more of these chemicals. The result will be that within a couple of years that wild oats will be completely eradicated.

However, I think there is a danger of the advice that we are getting from the university. One of the professors has come out very strongly, suggesting that we should not summer fallow. Well, continuous cropping, at least in my country, certainly deteriorates the land. Weeds have an opportunity to grow, you don't conserve moisture, and if you don't conserve moisture your grain that is seeded doesn't get a good start, you are bound to have weeds and under certain circumstances the chemical sprays that we have today combating wild oats are not effective. They are very, very costly as has been mentioned.

Now, the amendment that has been moved by Mr. Messer calls that all the words after the words "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following words added:

Regrets the failure of the Government of Canada to properly recognize the serious problem of wild oats on prairie grain farms and that this Assembly further regrets the Federal Government's failure to take the necessary steps to reduce the price of wild oat control chemicals to a reasonable level and to provide satisfactory financial support for Wild Oat Action Committee programs relating to the improvement of the problem.

April 2, 1974

I fail to see how the Government can reduce the cost of chemicals when many of the chemicals when many of the chemicals that are produced today come from oil. The Provincial Government has gone to Ottawa, and have raised the price of oil. Alberta has raised the price of oil to eastern Canada, where the manufacturer perhaps is. His costs are going up. I see no way how the price of chemicals is going down. With the cost of labor, with the cost of material, with the cost of transportation, with the farm implements going up. It was estimated last fall that it cost me \$6 an acre to spread Avadex on wild oat infested land. I can see that price go up, maybe double in a couple of years. It is a responsibility of the Provincial Government and the responsibility, to a degree, of the Federal Government to control the price cost increase.

In the last couple of days, I have been informed by various implement dealers that implements have gone up in the last month, in some cases, 11 per cent. I have been informed that some provinces are helping the farmers combat wild oats. Saskatchewan has done absolutely nothing.

I remember that if we go back to the New Deal . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has been told that he has had the floor, he sat down and he should sit down. He should stay there sitting with his mouth closed. When he stands up he can open it up. The sad part about the Minister of Agriculture is that every time he opens his mouth you know he is about to tell an untruth and when he closes it he has told an untruth.

The New Deal for People, in 1971 plainly stated that they would keep the cost of farm machinery and farm operations down. What has happened in the last couple of years?

I remember during the Speech from the Throne in December, the debate then – I pointed out to the House the price increases of farm fuel. Farm costs have gone up. Since December the price of gas and oil, the price of purple gas has gone up another two cents a gallon. What is the Government doing? Absolutely nothing. They just sit there and they cry to Ottawa that they are supposed to implement some kind of a price control. David Lewis sits on the one side and Trudeau is about to put some kind of price control on labor, Lewis is going to kick him out of office. If Trudeau is going to put some kind of price control on products, then maybe the Conservatives are going to kick him out of office. As long as David Lewis doesn't know on what side of the fence he wants to stand, or sit, or vote, there will be no proper action.

As far as I am concerned David Lewis' son can go around in Ontario and talk about elections – I wish there was an election in Canada. I wish there was one tomorrow. For that matter I wish there was one in Saskatchewan so that we knew which Premier is running this province, or this country of ours.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! It is now 5:30 and as Members are aware it is our Parliamentary Association supper this evening. So we will adjourn until we are through downstairs and a few minutes later the bell will ring – five minutes after the bell rings we will resume.

The House recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, after having a fine meal and having tried to belabor the wild oats issue, I should like to make one announcement before I sit down. As we all know David Lewis seeded his wild oats in Nova Scotia and Brian Coulter from the Premier's office seeded Saskatchewan socialist unregistered wild oats in Nova Scotia as well. The socialist Premier Barrett from British Columbia went out swinging for socialism plus many other NDP supporters from across the nation, but the socialistic wild oats just didn't germinate. There wasn't enough nitrogen I suppose.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — The results of the election in Nova Scotia I am sure are very interesting to the Members to your right. The Liberals got 31 seats, an increase of six, they got 47 per cent of the vote. The Conservatives lost some seats, they are holding 12 seats now, about 27 per cent of the vote. The NDP ran a member in every constituency and with all the Premiers and NDP big brass of that area they were able to muster a little better than 16 per cent of the popular vote.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — In closing I would like to say that I cannot support the amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes** (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I have lots of time, Mr. Speaker, I am very patient.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I was urged to join this debate. When I first read the motion, I thought to myself, just why was this motion moved? I am now talking about the original motion by my hon. Friend for Moosomin. Because really already, Mr. Speaker, there had been a lot going on in this province all winter in regard to wild oats. In fact, going back a year ago to April of 1973 there was a wild oats control symposium held in Saskatoon to discuss the wild oats situation on farms in western Canada. The major items of discussion were the reduced yields that wild oats can cause and the concern that customers of Canadian grain may be reluctant to purchase grain containing wild oats. At that time a Wild Oats Action Committee was formed consisting of members of the Canada and Provincial Departments of Agriculture, universities, the grain trade, the chemical trade and other interested parties. This Committee was established to stimulate action in the control of wild oats through the promotion of

April 2, 1974

additional research, investigation of production and marketing problems and the distribution of information on control measures to the farming public.

The Committee was spearheaded by officials of the Federal Department of Agriculture. It embarked on its task with considerable enthusiasm. As I understand it during the early stages of that Committee's work, it was led to believe that the Federal Department of Agriculture was prepared to provide considerable funding in projects and programs which might be undertaken, and geared so that the first step would be to ensure that farmers and the general public were aware of the presently recommended methods of control as well as the problems being encountered in the market place.

With the anticipated financial assistance from the Government of Canada the Committee embarked on extensive educational programs only to find that the anticipated funds were not forthcoming.

In Saskatchewan a local Wild Oats Action Committee consisting of the university, Canada Agriculture Research personnel, chemical suppliers, and the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture found it necessary to embark on the educational program without the anticipated federal assistance.

Eleven wild oats symposiums have been scheduled in Saskatchewan. Those which have been completed were attended by an average of 250 farmers. It was found necessary to turn farmers away at certain points because of lack of facilities. While support of these projects by local federal research personnel has been good, to date the Government of Canada has provided none of the anticipated financial assistance.

That is why I am in complete agreement with the Minister of Agriculture . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . 20 per cent . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I'll start over again. While support of these projects by local federal research personnel has been excellent, to date the Government of Canada has provided none of the anticipated financial assistance. Costs have been borne largely by manufacturers and distributors of herbicides to assist in continuing this very worthwhile program. The Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture will sponsor a major symposium in Saskatoon in early April to add to that which has already been done.

The attendance, the enthusiastic attendance by farmers in this province indicates that they are willing and anxious to tackle the problem of wild oats. The Provincial Government has clearly indicated its interest to assure that available information is provided to farmers with or without the assistance of the Government of Canada.

To make this more effective, however, additional research is necessary to provide more satisfactory answers to the problem. This is clearly the role of the Government of Canada through its own research facilities which they have lots of. I regret that steps to provide this necessary research has not been forthcoming. It is with great pleasure that I will be supporting



the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I wish we had known that the Minister of Agriculture's speech was so short and of such a reasonable nature, we would have been glad to let him deliver it instead of the Hon. Member for Touchwood, who I don't think really knew whether he was talking about wild oats or leafy spurge or what it was.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — He did do the job anyway and we must commend him for it.

Mr. Speaker, it is, I think typical of this Provincial Government and the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture that they don't agree that they should do anything on their own. Any problem that comes up in this province, the first thing they do is try and see what they can get from Ottawa. And whatever Ottawa suggests they usually don't agree with it so the problem simply doesn't get looked after.

It would seem unusual, Mr. Speaker, that we can't agree in this House on a very worthwhile but certainly a non-political motion such as we have here. If you look at the motion you will see that the original motion was put in a very mild manner deliberately:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to properly recognize the serious problem of wild oats on prairie grain farms and to consider methods of control and eradication.

Now this, you must admit, was a pretty mild motion. We weren't condemning anybody, we weren't suggesting where the fault lies. We were really with the motion, trying to draw attention to the magnitude of the problem. And it is a very serious problem on the prairies. This was the only idea that we had in mind with this. We weren't condemning anybody. We were careful to put it that way. But we did feel that the problem was not getting the recognition that it deserves, either among the Members, among the Government, among the farm organizations, among the farmers themselves and that it would be perhaps useful to have this drawn to their attention.

Mr. Speaker, it was a motion that certainly needed no amendment. Surely there are some things that we can agree on if the welfare of the farmer is to come first. We don't have to get into a political hassle over everything that comes up in this House. You would think that on something such as the problem of wild oats that we could be in some agreement.

I am not going to review, of course, what I said before but for those who don't feel that this is a problem, I think they should look at the whole agriculture situation on the prairies. We do have the best agricultural land any place in the world. We have a great number of acres of it. The fact that about 85 per cent of this agricultural land has some wild oats all the way from a very mild infestation to very, very severe, would indicate indeed that this is a very serious

April 2, 1974

problem. And the wild oats that are growing on these 85 per cent of the acres in western Canada on the prairies are visible evidence that the problem is there, the problem hasn't been solved. In fact, we are not even holding our own with the problem, it is getting worse.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is rather unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to put in an amendment to this which really destroys the intent of the motion. He has made a political football out of a motion which had the intention of just bringing to the attention of the people of the province the seriousness of the problem and I would think that the Minister would have been the first one who would want to get up and support a motion such as this, which would be doing something about this problem. He must realize that neither the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, municipal governments, universities, or anybody else, have really seriously tackled the problem because if they had we wouldn't have the situation that we do on the prairies today.

So, again, I must say that I was disappointed that the Minister saw fit to bring in an amendment to destroy the intent of a very worthwhile motion in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **Return No. 164**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin) 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.

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

That all the words after clause (b) be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(i) the total number of allocations made under competition, and (ii) in each case where a lease was not granted to the person receiving the greatest number of points, what the reason was.

Amendment agreed to.

The debate continued on the motion as amended.

**Mr. E. F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think our point with this question and this Motion was that the people of Saskatchewan must simply have more information on Land Bank. This is the purpose of the question in the first place and it is simply not good enough to

say that some of this information will be in the annual report.

We know that most land transactions occur in this province in the spring of the year. This is traditional. Perhaps in the months of April and May, so that any Land Bank transactions that are made now we shall get them in the annual report that is published for 1974-75, if they follow the practice they have before, we will get this tabled in December 1975. In other words, any Land Bank purchases that are made this month or next month, we are going to have to wait 20 months to get the annual report that is going to indicate the price that the Government paid for this land and some of the minor details of these transactions.

I think that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that in transactions of this nature, to get the information 19 or 20 months later, simply isn't good enough. The price that the land is being bought for, the description of the land is of very little value to anyone 20 months later. This is our point, that we should have this information available to us as soon as possible. The annual report, by the time we get it, is so obsolete that it is almost worthless.

I should like to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that the information in the annual report is very, very incomplete. The information that is there does give the description of the land and the price that was paid for, but no indication of who got the land, when they got it, whether they had the highest number of points, whether they were the most qualified and so on.

People are concerned about who obtains the lease to this land, whether the person who got the lease was entitled or not to receive it and this is what people are really interested in. I am sure that the Minister is well aware that these cases come up almost every day. I was home over the weekend in my constituency and I had three phone calls on one parcel of land. I happened to be listening to the Harasen Line this morning and someone phoned in about the same parcel of land, the same transaction. What had happened in that case was that four or five needy young farmers in that area had applied for this land. It is a good farm, about seven or eight miles west of Kennedy and it has been well farmed and it is in good shape. There were a number of needy young people around there and they all got a letter last Friday saying that the land had been leased to a fellow from Saskatoon and they gave his name and address from Saskatoon. Of course, they were very concerned about it and they asked me if I could do anything about it and I said that all I could do was ask the question in the House, which I did today, on the Order Paper and whether I'll ever get the answer I don't know. But whether the person who got it was the most qualified or not I really have no idea and I have no way of finding out, because of the information that we are being denied as a result of this amendment.

This, as I mentioned before, is the same parcel of land that was questioned on one of the hotlines this morning. I would feel, Mr. Speaker, that land is something that farmers are very interested in, the price of land, who gets the lease, whether the person who gets it is the one who should have it; if he is the most qualified. If we are denied this type of information it is a black mark on the operations of the Land Bank and will continue to be a black mark on their operations.

April 2, 1974

We are disappointed that they haven't seen fit to supply this type of information more readily to the people of the province.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **Resolution No. 16 – International Development Program**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. D. L. Faris (Arm River):

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.

**Hon. W. A. Robbins** (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Motion. I commend the Hon. Member for Arm River for its introduction and all Members on both sides of the House who have supported it for governmental consideration.

Mr. Speaker, non-governmental agencies have established a good record in achieving results where results were urgently required in this particular field. Monetary assistance from government, on a matching basis, would provide additional fund requirements where the greatest measure of benefit and impact may be achieved.

To date, Mr. Speaker, one of the major tragedies of our time has been our continuing practice of ensuring that moneys made available for international developmental projects in the so-called third world, has had strings attached to ensure markets for us abroad and jobs and material advancement for us within our own country.

True aid can only come in the form of grants made without any strings attached. When we attach strings, the recipient country has to produce more of their particular product, cocoa, copper, oil or ground nuts or whatever, to meet future claims related to that aid. It is quite conceivable that in some circumstances the expansion of aid may not only not assist very much but may actually be detrimental.

One of the targets in the world has been one per cent of the gross national product of the richer countries for those countries whom we classify as members of the third world. It may well be a misleading target, Mr. Speaker, for it has included private foreign investment, which when included as part of our objectives in the trade and aid business, produces the rather ludicrous result of our country becoming the chief recipient of its own overseas aid program.

May I illustrate with a concrete example:

In years past we offered a foreign aid program to Colombia, a country in South America. The Canadian Government provided some \$16.5 million for public works projects in Colombia, including the construction of a large dam for electrical generation near a spot called Cali in that country. The loan carried a service charge and a long term to maturity of 50 years. However, we were not being nearly as charitable as one might think. The condition of this loan was that the funds had to be used for the purchase of Canadian goods and Canadian services.

Colombians were required to use the funds to hire Canadian personnel and buy Canadian manufactured equipment, even, if the cost of the equipment was not competitive in the world market. I am afraid that aid, that kind of aid, was provided on the basis of what was best for Canada, where the per capita income is \$2,800 per annum and not necessarily what was best for Colombia where annual earnings average \$260 per capita.

The Hon. Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) contended that we must be willing, if necessary, to lower our standard of living to improve the standard of living of inhabitants of the third world. I agree, Mr. Speaker. What we require is a reasoned self discipline and a considered simplicity in our economics, which will permit us to attain that goal without concluding somehow that we have been cheated or hard done by. Compassion for others is not a sign of weakness, but a sign of strength.

The story of the Good Samaritan illustrates very well an approach which is urgently required. In that story there were three types. First, the robbers who beat up on the traveler and their motto was a simple one — Good old laissez-faire economics, what's yours is mine and I'll take it. The second group were those who passed by on either side, their motto is, "What's mine is mine and I will keep it." The third person was the Samaritan, looked down upon by the general populace. He saw the man in deep trouble by the side of the road and he had compassion on him and he helped him, not to enable him to gain a return on his endeavor, but because his motto was simple and straightforward — (What's mine is mine, but I am willing to share it."

That did not destroy that man's individuality, it made him much more of a man. I notice, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Star-Phoenix recently, which was quite critical of this Resolution and indicated that the responsibility with respect to trade and aid outside our country should rest solely with the Federal Government and the province shouldn't be involved in it. Their advice, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is the policy of passing by on the other side.

Helder Camara who is a Roman Catholic Bishop of Recife in Brazil, summed it up beautifully when he said;

When shall we shed the charity mentality and realize the relationship between the rich and the poor, between the 'haves' and 'have nots' should not be one of charity but one of simple humanity and simple justice.

All three phases of the Resolution are worthy ones, Mr. Speaker. Government matching of donated funds increases

April 2, 1974

the capability of such non-governmental agencies to provide real assistance to international development, with no ulterior motives or implications of gains for us, on an indirect basis. Some of the money used to develop awareness in the province should result in increased assistance through increased voluntary donations. Third, a reasoned liaison between government and non-government organizations, concerning international development programs should enhance their effectiveness and their value.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that all Assembly Members support this Motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. L. Faris** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in concluding this debate I will be brief.

I am very pleased with the general level of the debate and with the information that has been brought forward in many of the speeches. I think there has been general support expressed for all parts of the Resolution. I am particularly pleased with the concern that there be education concerning international development. I think that is very necessary and I think that some of the points that have been raised in a number of the speeches, including the last speech by the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) indicates some of the things that we have to learn about international aid. One of these things being that in the past, quite often in regard to all countries, including our own, this aid has generally benefited us to a greater extent than it has those countries we have been aiding.

There have been several occasions when the Members have been critical of the record of the United States and others have criticized Members for taking that position. I think there are a good number of people in the United States, themselves, who are critical of what has been done in the way of aid.

Senator Edward Kennedy, for instance, in the Washington Post in September 1970 was critical when he found that the United States aid program had purchased all the sugar substitute — that is the cyclamate soft drinks from major companies and had given these soft drinks, condemned as a health hazard in the United States as foreign aid in South East Asia.

I would think there are many examples similar to this in regard to tied aid. Examples of Canadian aid designed to benefit us.

Another point that has been raised is where Canada fits in regard to other nations of the world. I was very pleased to get hold of the 1972-73 annual report of CIDA, the Federal Government Agency, which is in charge of foreign aid and it shows, on the basis of preliminary figures for 1972, sort of the world ranking. I think the Members of the House might be interested in this. There are 16 members in the organization of developed countries and they rank as follows: — this is in regard to the proportion of their per capita gross national product that they dedicate to international development. It is interesting that the first three nations are Portugal, The Netherlands and France. This must surely raise some questions in your minds if you are aware of the situation of Portugal in regard to Mozambique and Angola, the colonial status of these

nations in Africa. We must ask ourselves how meaningful any of these figures are.

But following Portugal, The Netherlands and France, which all have either present colonial holdings or have had them in the near past, you find Australia, fourth; fifth is Belgium; sixth is Sweden; seventh is Denmark; eighth out of 16 countries is Canada; followed by Norway, United Kingdom, Germany and twelfth, is the United States, followed by Switzerland, Japan, Italy and Austria.

I don't think that any Members on either side, in terms of political partisanship can be proud, however, of the records of these nations. Those nations which have private enterprise economies do not rank, in fact, generally better than those which have social democratic economies. The Members on this side may take some small pleasure that Sweden and Denmark ranked ahead of Canada but in fact it is not really a very significant difference.

I think the truth is that all of the developed nations of the world, despite whatever their political flavor, have in fact been in the position of exploiting and living on the backs of these under-developed nations.

I think that we can all do better and I think that one of the important points about our Resolution is that it intends to draw upon the motivation of individuals and non-government organizations. There is no doubt but that the individual kind of concern that is expressed through various church groups and non-governmental organizations, is what we need if we are really going to have a deep kind of concern about the other half of the world.

I am not in favor of this kind of thing being carried out simply as government programs. I think the Resolution, having been supported by a good number of Members on both sides of the House, in fact, merits the support of all the Members of this House and upon conclusion of my remarks I will be asking that we have a recorded vote.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I move Resolution No. 16.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Motion was agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 43**

**Messieurs**

Meakes	Carlson	Lange
Smishek	Engel	Hanson
Romanow	Cody	Oliver
Messer	Robbins	Feschuk
Snyder	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Kramer	Cowley	Flasch
Thibault	Taylor	Loken
Larson	Matsalla	Guy
Brockelbank	Faris	Boldt
MacMurchy	Owens	Grant
Pepper	Mostoway	Weatherald
Byers	Gross	Lane

April 2, 1974

Thorson  
Whelan  
Kwasnica

Comer  
Rolfes

Wiebe  
Malone

**NAYS – 00**  
**Messieurs**  
Nil

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J. K. 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 proposed amendment thereto 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.

**Hon. J. R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — I’m in order, Mr. Speaker, I’m sure of it this time.

Mr. Speaker, western Canada and I think especially the Province of Saskatchewan have for years sought to persuade and convince the Federal Government to give more emphasis to the Port of Churchill. The Hudson Bay Route Association I think, has to be commended for their continued efforts in attempting to convince the Federal Government of the need for more attention for those facilities.

However, in spite of the repeated requests by the Association, supported by the Legislatures of both Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the port has failed to show any significant growth in its handling of grain during the past decade. Grain-handling has fluctuated between 20 and 25 million bushels, which is a paltry four, five or six per cent of total exports, compared to well over 50 per cent through eastern ports. This is notwithstanding the fact that the port can save the entire costs of transporting grain the thousand miles from Thunder Bay to the lower St. Lawrence Ports.

This year vital and scarce railway equipment is being used to transport grain in unit trains from Thunder Bay to Montreal and Quebec City in order to resolve the problem of inadequate



supplies of grain at the ports in eastern Canada.

It was announced with a good deal of fanfare that no less than six — 75 car trains would this winter, be hauling, hopefully in excess of 3.7 million bushels from Thunder Bay to Montreal and Quebec and 4 million bushels from Thunder Bay to St. John. This equipment would have been most welcome on the prairies this year.

Additional storage at Churchill would have meant this equipment could have been used in moving grain from the country directly to a seaport without involving expensive double handling in this progressive and technological age.

We also would have been able to avoid the reloading and the long haul that is now necessary to get grain to the eastern ports. It is an interesting anomaly in this age, Mr. Speaker, that the railway to Churchill was built and paid for by the people of Canada through their government and because it is operated by a Crown Corporation supposedly in the best interests of all Canadians, farmers' grain is being delivered to elevators on CP rail lines and finds itself in the position where it is not shipped to the Port of Churchill.

Thus we find that grain delivered to such points as Nipawin and White Fox and all other CP lines from Nipawin to Prince Albert; that grain delivered to such points as Codette or Pontrilas and Rose Valley and all others on the CP line from Nipawin to Wadena, we find that grain delivered to such points as Spalding and Naicam and Gronlid and all others on the CP line from Lanigan to Gronlid, and that grain delivered to such points as Middle Lake, St. Benedict and Hagen and all others on the CP line from Lanigan to Prince Albert cannot be shipped to the Port of Churchill.

Instead we find, Mr. Speaker, the CNR railway scurrying the country to send grain to Churchill on CN lines.

Last year in 1972-73 about 1,500 carloads of grain were shipped all the way from the Regina-Moose Jaw area, which includes the Radville-Gravelbourg area, to Churchill. Another 1,300 carloads were shipped to Churchill from the Craik-Davidson line. Over 2,000 carloads went to Churchill from southwest of Saskatoon from the Rosetown-Beechy-Dinsmore areas. While these 5,000 carloads were traveling east and north to get to Churchill, thousands of carloads of grain on CP lines from 100 to 200 miles closer to the Port of Churchill and farther from Thunder Bay and Vancouver were being hauled in the opposite direction. This sort of arrangement does not help to support the Port of Churchill nor does it permit farmers of this province to realize maximum savings from its use. Surely it would not be too difficult, it should no be too difficult to arrange a turnover of loaded cars at Melfort and Tisdale for shipment to Churchill and then a similar return of empty cars.

I admit to some surprise that anyone in Saskatchewan would in the words of the amendment proposed by the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) which quotes:

Commend the Prime Minister of Canada for indicating willingness to upgrade Churchill.

Perhaps the Hon. Member is unaware of what is necessary at the

April 2, 1974

port if it is to be maintained as a reasonable export port for Canadian grains. Requirements have been listed often enough. The Hudson Bay Route Association has proclaimed them loudly for the last two or three years. The very minimum requirements, Mr. Speaker, are first to repair and restrengthen the wharf; second, to dredge the harbour to a 40 foot depth; third, to enlarge the turning basin; fourth, to construct a causeway to control slab ice in the harbour. These are the very basic minimum, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, if this port is to take its rightful place additional grain storage and major improvement of the grain loading gallery is a necessity and is required.

This port which can save western Canadian farmers the entire costs of moving from Thunder Bay to Montreal has never, never received adequate support from the Government of Canada.

The Hudson Bay Route Association has continued its efforts. In fact, it was the Hudson Bay Route Association that originally persuaded the Russians to take grain via the Churchill Port. They did in 1964 and again in 1965 and in several years since then.

Last year 24 out of 33 ships into Churchill were Russian. They were there because of the efforts of the Hudson Bay Route Association and were not there for the first time through the efforts of the Hon. Otto Lang, as reported in the news media.

Now we, Mr. Speaker, are asked to commend the Federal Government for their willingness to upgrade Churchill. We have absolutely no indication, absolutely no indication of such attempts on their part. On the contrary, we are told that the Federal Government will spend through the National Harbours Board a total of \$12.5 million in the next six or seven years on the port. This is not upgrading, Mr. Speaker, this is barely maintenance. It will not do anything to improve the capacity of the port nor to make it more attractive to ship owners. It is perhaps one-quarter of what is required. It is the sort of grudging, penny pinching, tokenistic support that has been offered to Churchill over the years by the Federal Government.

Reasonable improvements to this important seaport are now long overdue and are an absolute necessity. Mr. Speaker, I very strongly disagree with the amendment and will be voting against it. I will support the main motion proposed and moved by the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. G. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two on this, both the motion and the amendment.

To begin with, I don't think that anyone has to sell anyone in Saskatchewan on the idea of the necessity or the desirability of more emphasis on the Port of Churchill. Or on the desirability or the necessity for the economic wellbeing of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan generally, by upgrading that port and making greater use of that port. But again it is typical of the NDP opposite that their total approach to this matter is again whine to Ottawa, cry to Ottawa and complain.

Now we have not been satisfied and certainly the Saskatchewan Liberal Party has not been satisfied over the years with the action or the lack of action by successive Federal Governments, Conservative and Liberal, in regard to the Port of Churchill.

The amendment to this motion indicates that we commend the Prime Minister, because in Calgary for the first time in my memory, a Prime Minister did indicate that he was prepared to consider an upgrading, a serious upgrading of the facilities of that port and a new look at it. We were not commending the Federal Government, nor are we commending the Federal Government for the actions they've taken in the past, for the actions that we see right at this present time. The money that they have promised to spend on the port is of course, totally inadequate.

However, I want to point out that when we were the Government, we did more than push and prod Ottawa to make more use of the port and to spend more money on it and to upgrade the facilities. We launched serious and successful programs to bring the use and the possibilities and the saving of the use of the Port of Churchill to the attention of people all over this country and people overseas as well. The late Premier Thatcher organized in the Crown Corporations, organized in business concerns in this province a strong program and a successful program first to buy British, to buy as much as they could from Great Britain, to encourage them in turn to purchase our wheat and then have those purchases shipped through the Port of Churchill. With the result that we saw for the first time ships coming in there bringing in large quantities of goods for the liquor board stores, for one example, the power corporation, Sask Tel. We made deals concerning automobiles, we made deals with people like Eaton's, the Hudson's Bay and Simpsons to hold promotion weeks to sell British and to insist that the goods be brought in through the Port of Churchill. We urged Manitoba to join with us and the Government of Manitoba did join with us in an effort, a successful effort to have goods that would have normally gone through the Port of Montreal diverted to go through the Port of Churchill. And as a matter of fact, there was more incoming freight in those years, considerably more incoming freight in those years as a result of these promotions.

The Government opposite has been in power now since 1971. I have yet to see any concrete, practical proposal to encourage people in Saskatchewan, or to encourage a joint effort between business firms, Crown Corporations in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba and in Alberta, either individually or by the Premier, the Attorney General or anyone on that side of the House, or working through the Prairie Economic Council, the council of the Premiers of the three prairie provinces. I have yet to see any concrete action taking place to direct buyers in this province, over whom they have control. I mean by that, government agencies, government departments and government agencies, or to encourage people in private business in this province or in the three prairie provinces because we all benefit and gain from more use of the Port of Churchill, to encourage them to take concrete steps to have goods shipped through the Port of Churchill rather than through the Port of Montreal.

And I think the Federal Government would pay far more attention, at least I hope they would, if this Government could show to them that they are really serious about the use of the

April 2, 1974

Port of Churchill. That they are prepared to practice what they preach. That they are prepared in fact to put their money where their mouth is in regard to the use of the Port of Churchill.

I think our case would be much stronger. Now it might not help. We've had, over the years, successive governments, the old CCF, our Liberal Government and this Government, and we have fought for many, many years with Liberal Governments and with a Conservative Government up to this point, in a vain attempt to make the Port of Churchill in fact a major port. But our case would be much stronger if the Government of Saskatchewan would take some positive action themselves and I seriously regret that up to this point in three years their total action has been again the typical cry to Ottawa in regard to problems that face the people of Saskatchewan. Instead of doing what they can themselves, they play cheap politics and rely on crying to Ottawa, whining to Ottawa in an attempt to divert the attention, and with some success unfortunately from time to time, of the public from their own shortcomings.

I will support the amendment because I think the amendment together with the motion makes a much better resolution for this House to pass if we are serious about attracting more support from the present Federal Government who are now on record through the Prime Minister as desiring to do this, than the original motion.

Amendment negatives.

Motion agreed to.

#### **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. L. Larson** (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather unfortunate that this House should be debating a resolution of this kind. It calls for an independent and judicial commission to inquire into all aspects of the policies and operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I had not intended to take part in this debate but after listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) the other evening I feel that I cannot refrain from doing so.

I tried very objectively to find out just what the hon. gentleman had in mind and the message that he was trying to get across to this House, probably to his colleagues but more particularly to the people of northern Saskatchewan. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that if there was any single message that came out of his ravings it was a very simple one. That simple message is the totally impossible position that the Liberal Party finds itself with respect to northern Saskatchewan and what this Government is trying to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Larson:** — Their dismal and total failure to recognize that some very serious and deep rooted problems existed is now coming home to haunt them. The only conclusion that I could come to after listening to the Member opposite is that he was scared and frightened of what is happening in the North. He is scared stiff that at last the people of the North are going to be given a chance. He is scared that he will no longer be able to fool them and buy them with a mess of pottage.

When you compare what is happening this year and what has happened during the last year with what happened while the Liberals were in Government, it's not hard to find justification for your fright and your uneasiness. If the Leader of the Opposition was not scared stiff why did he drag out all the old time-worn red herrings as he did when he spoke the other night. Why drag in a nominating convention and refer to it as a kangaroo court? Why refer to the NDS as monolithic and dictatorial? Why refer to the Minister and the Premier as the barons of the North? Why attack the Fishing Co-ops and refer to Mr. Bowerman as the confiscator of the fishing nets, boats, and accusing him of all kinds of misdemeanors?

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the answer again is that the Liberal Party is frightened of what is happening. I suggest that you know that no longer will you be able to hoodwink the northern people into believing that their whole destiny and their whole life must be subject to paternalism, hopelessness, suffering and grief. As if to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition finally had to confess that the charge of the Liberal brigade into the North to expose, to confirm and to really drag into the open his charges of corruption, fraud and mismanagement was a dismal failure. To try to justify his statement he suggested that there were threats and coercive tactics employed to silence those whom he had hoped would substantiate his wild and unfounded allegations. Truly, Mr. Speaker, an unworthy and despicable performance.

The very sad and disturbed position of the Leader of the Opposition was best displayed in his windup remarks. In his concluding remarks he fairly screamed and shouted over and over again, "Nothing is happening in the North, absolutely nothing."

I want at this time to remind this House and particularly the Opposition who through this Resolution are asking for a judicial inquiry into all aspects and operations of the DNS, what some of the related facts are. I further ask Members opposite to state precisely and clearly what you want investigated. I remind this House that as early as 1955 Government studies recommended the establishment of a single northern agency. By 1961 this had been given general government and Cabinet approval. By 1963 some details as well as costs of the single agency concept had been developed. Then from 1964 a Government Task Force on northern Saskatchewan was established and recommendations forwarded to the Government. This Task Force also recommended a single agency be established. I want the Leader of the Opposition to tell this House what action he and his Party took. You should further tell the people of the North what you did. As far as I am concerned the action you took was to give away to your corporate friends for a mere pittance, the resources that are the only means of livelihood

April 2, 1974

of these people. Through your deals with Parsons and Whittemore you virtually committed these people to exploitation and abuse in perpetuity. You committed this and future generations to be hewers of wood and carriers of water. I should like the people of the North to remember the famous quote of the Liberal Premier of your day when he said, "You can't do anything for them, they breed like rabbits." Yet, Mr. Speaker, with a record like that they now have the audacity to call for a judicial inquiry.

Let's review a little further the developments that have taken place since 1971 with a change of government. During the 1971 election campaign the NDP made it very clear that the one agency concept for the North would be established. In October of 1971 following the election, that pledge was fulfilled and the concept of the DNS became Government policy. In 1972, an Act assented to by this Legislature in the month of April established the DNS. This Act was proclaimed on May 1, 1972.

During the ensuing months responsibility for the North was transferred to the new department. In November to December 1972 headquarters for the Department were established at La Ronge. Since that time extensive local autonomy has been established. A Northern Municipal Council has been elected, a Northern Development Council is being established, local community authorities are being established to ensure full participation and consultation regarding policy and programs. It is now being recommended that northern school boards previously appointed by governments be filled by election. Increased budgets as well as staff will be transferred to the board for action. Under consideration is the establishment of elected regional boards. An adult education committee is being established to identify needs and requirements in programs and their implementation. And, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Leader of the Opposition calls absolutely nothing.

To add to this, the 1974-75 Budget calls for some very extensive expenditures. Created in 1972, the 1974-75 expenditures call for \$900,000 expenditure on air field construction, an increase of \$131,000 from 1973-74, \$1.2 million for road construction; \$151,000 for camping and recreation; municipal facilities \$580,000, and the Leader of the Opposition says nothing is being done. The acquisition and construction of public facilities \$600,000 for 1974-75. Construction and improvement of public facilities \$1.7 million. Again the Leader of the Opposition says absolutely nothing is being done. The acquisition and construction of educational facilities over \$1 million. Total expenditures for the DNS \$28,819,000 and the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party says nothing, absolutely nothing is being done.

I couldn't help, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Opposition but feel rather sad and rather disheartened at this approach. I was sad because what this House is witnessing is cheap, partisan politics being played for the benefit of the Liberal Party. I ask this House to consider that the very livelihood and way of life of a people, a very large number of people, in the North is at stake. The principle of establishing local government, local decision making and in essence the principle of self government is being opened up for these people. That we have politicians in the Liberal Party who would try to take advantage of this struggle is very disheartening. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that anyone on the

Government side believes that any program for the North of this magnitude was without difficulty or full of problems; that self-administration and the ability to correct all the deep rooted and serious ills of the North could all be cured in less than two years is just too much to expect. To try to take cheap political advantage by proposing this sort of a resolution is unforgivable and just too much to accept. It will take time, it will take patience, it will take trial and error to get the program into successful operation. I am, however, confident that given time and patience and an opportunity for local people to grow and to define and plan their own destiny, it will succeed.

Future generations will benefit as it is the first ray of hope that these people have had for any improvement. This Government is to be commended for the courage and the foresight to implement this kind of program. There is much more that should be said, there is much more that can be brought to light. I again regret that this kind of a resolution has to appear before this Assembly. In view of the absence of the Minister and in view of the many important aspects which have to be aired, I, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

### **FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WELFARE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mostoway that the final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare be now concurred in.

**Mr. J. Wiebe** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to join with the Member for Hanley in congratulating the members of the Special Committee on Welfare for the excellent two years, also to congratulate and to thank the staff that served us during that period of time in helping us to make the report.

Going over some of the remarks that were made by the Chairman of the Committee, he mentioned he was quite pleased with the fact that there was no politics involved with any of the Committee discussions which took place. I can heartily endorse that statement saying that while there may have been barbs across the table which is natural, I think that we conducted an excellent and good committee.

The final Report of the Special Committee on Welfare I feel is a complex document. I feel that it contains many ideas and concepts which could provide significant reforms in our welfare system in Saskatchewan. With a thorough review of welfare problems and a presentation of over 80 recommendations this Committee on which I served as vice-chairman, I feel has given full consideration to many realistic alternatives to the present welfare activities in Saskatchewan.

This Special Committee was charged with the responsibility of studying the present effects of welfare schemes in Saskatchewan, exploring new alternatives and recommending changes in existing programs as well as new programs. In our many months of considering the opinions of people across the province we developed some consensus of what might be done to provide welfare services both efficiently and effectively to meet the

needs of Saskatchewan people. The bulk of the recommendations contained in the report will help to improve welfare services and correct some of the abuses of the present operation. But there are some aspects, Mr. Speaker, of the report which I feel fail to provide adequate reforms which are now essential.

There are other aspects which we believe are hasty and shortsighted and fail to come to grips with the realities of people's needs for social assistance programs and for financial support. For these reasons, I and the two other Liberal MLAs on the Committee declined to sign the final report. As we explained in the Reservations included in that report, its recommendations were considered as a total package and were recommendations which included proposals which we could not conscientiously support. We consider some of the recommendations to be financially irresponsible and shortsighted in their pursuit of a comprehensive welfare policy in Saskatchewan.

I should like to outline some of those shortcomings and hasty proposals which we found to be unacceptable. The first shortcoming of the report was its lack of concern for encouraging a job creation program that could serve as an alternative to direct public assistance. Though the report mentions that a job creation program could be a sensible part of an overall welfare policy no recommendations are included to outline such a scheme. While the right to welfare assistance has been generally claimed as being essential in today's society we have been reluctant to recognize people's rights to contribute to our society in a productive and dignified employment. With the self-sufficiency and participation in jobs created by Government action we could encourage many of the unemployed to develop new economic opportunity. A guaranteed job alternative for the 10,000 unemployed people presently receiving unemployment insurance benefits should provide a means to ensure greater integrity in a welfare system.

The second shortcoming of the report is in its proposal for a guaranteed annual income. While there are many merits to such an income scheme the approach taken by this Committee to implement it ignored the basic aspects of cost and of eligibility. The Liberal Members of the Committee suggested that a cost estimate of the guaranteed income scheme be carried out by the research staff. No such study was carried out to see whether or not a guaranteed income program would be financially responsible. Without projections of the cost we cannot fully consider the possible administrative benefits which may or may not be achieved. It would be a concern to many of us if we were to implement an expensive income scheme only to find that we would be forced to curtail other essential social services in order to provide continuing financial support. At present many people are heralding the guaranteed income program as being a single solution to the major problems of welfare. It should be made clear that this is not a realistic overall solution. Unless we can see the full implications of a guaranteed income we should not attempt to lock the Government into such a program. One need only look at the problems which the State of Sweden now finds itself in terms of welfare, in terms of the guaranteed annual income program. They have had the guaranteed income program in Sweden for the past 16 to 20 years. In Sweden right now many people earning \$10,000 a year in wages are paying up to \$7,500 in income tax.



In an effort to assess the guaranteed income in Saskatchewan, I and my colleagues suggest that a full projection of cost be undertaken and that a trial program for people 60 years of age and over be set up and undertaken. As in the case of Manitoba's trial plan we could undertake this program in conjunction with the Federal Government to ensure adequate financial support. If the guaranteed income program could prove to be successful in its trial period it could gradually be extended by lowering the age of qualification. The participation of the Federal Government in this program and in the guaranteed job program are essential to their success in providing for the needs of people otherwise requiring welfare today. The guaranteed job program would alleviate federal government payments for unemployment insurance. The guaranteed income for people 60 years of age and over would supplement federal pensions and replace many of the present demands for income supplementation.

The third shortcoming of the Welfare Report is in its proposal to remove the extreme hardship clause. This is Section No. 9 (1) of The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan regulations.

Our concern with the removal of this clause is that we would be opening the eligibility for welfare funds to anyone regardless of need, or refusal to accept employment. Removal of the hardship clause would cause some welfare funds to be diverted away from those who are in real need of assistance. By maintaining the hardship clause we would be able to maintain a standard of integrity in welfare spending and make sure that those who are able-bodied, but unwilling to work would not be parasites on our welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, while the Committee's recommendations should be fully considered before legislation is prepared we hope that they will not suffer the same fate of indifference and inaction as on the Report of the Committee on Alcohol.

Welfare services are gradually losing their controversial atmosphere of people arguing in terms of too much versus too little public assistance. But even though welfare is becoming a less controversial political issue, its problems and challenges remain important for all of us to face.

There is still a great deal of public concern for the high administration costs of welfare services and much of the public support for a guaranteed income program is based on the belief that this scheme in fact would cut the costs of welfare. Again, I suggest that we look at the costs in Sweden. We should encourage the public to face the reality that a guaranteed income plan would not result in significantly low administrative costs. And by placing our reliance on such a plan to replace the present administrative schemes, we should realize that supplementary programs of education and job re-training would still be an essential part of our welfare services.

The special needs of northern people in their particular welfare problems, I feel, were not adequately considered in this Report. The unsatisfactory management of handouts and the total reliance on welfare payments is especially true in northern Saskatchewan. I feel innovative training and educational programs must permit native people to develop their own futures without the paternalism of welfare funds. In spite of the recent comments by the Minister of the Department of Northern

April 2, 1974

Saskatchewan we have seen the continuation of high spending with few new economic opportunities for northern people.

An outline of just what direction is being developed for welfare services in the North, should be provided by the Government so that we can assess its merits and proposed changes for alternate programs.

The Report has ignored the financial aspects and limits of taxpayers' ability to provide the financial resources for its recommendations. The concerns of welfare and social services made by the Economic Council of Canada should be considered closely. Their warnings about the financial limits to direct transfer of payments provide an insight into the possible financial havoc that might result from excessive spending in some forms of welfare. We already see the results of poorly considered welfare policies in the many cases where the head of a family can receive a higher income by staying at home than by being employed.

We should be trying to tune welfare services to the needs of our citizens through innovative programs, through dramatic action, through re-organization and most important through prudent financial judgments. We have been taught by the past decade that government will no longer be tolerated as a faceless tax collector and extravagant spender. The times demand performance, they demand government leadership in helping to solve the problems of people today. Government can be, and it must be, an instrument of social change, a catalyst for improving the quality of people's lives and the institutions that serve them.

In place of measuring our welfare schemes only in terms of more and more government spending, our ability to solve social problems must begin to be measured in terms of effective programs and their significance for the individual.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that justice towards welfare recipients should be measured in the ability of our programs to provide opportunities to seek employment or future training. To create hope and a brighter future rather than paying reluctant funds to maintain existence at standardized levels. The essential task in a reformed welfare system must be towards assistance that will overcome the frustrations of people not satisfied to be maintained at minimum standards of life, guaranteed or otherwise.

Through our welfare programs we must provide incentives to create hope for all welfare recipients to become full members of the community with their own contributions to their fellow citizens of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Feschuk** (Prince Albert East): — Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Intersessional Committee on Welfare, I have had the privilege of meeting people from all areas of Saskatchewan during our public hearings. We were able to listen to the Saskatchewan people outline their needs and their problems as well as to propose programs to meet the needs and suggest services that might resolve their problems.

As an elected representative, I now have a much better understanding of the needs of the people throughout this province.

Many of the members of the Committee undertook their task seriously and responsibly. As a member of that Committee, I stand behind that Report.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to challenge the Reservations made by the Members of the Opposition who sat on the Committee, when they state that there were a number of hasty and shortsighted aspects in the final report. In order to study the effectiveness of social security programs, both provincially and nationally the members of the Committee received a wide variety of reports and research papers to review in addition to holding public meetings. The Committee also called upon special witnesses and professional people to discuss the social problems that exist to discuss the proposals that might lead to the resolution of these problems.

Many of the points made in the Reservations by the Members of the Opposition who sat on the Committee, as well as their refusal to sign the final report, indicates their lack of interest in the social service needs of the people in Saskatchewan. It also indicates their minimal involvement, their lack of participation in many of the meetings and their inability to undertake a task seriously and responsibly.

As a Committee, we had the power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath. And if the Liberal members of the Committee were unhappy or dissatisfied with proceedings or deliberations, they had the responsibility to suggest ways and means of improving the approach taken by the Committee.

There was a period of 18 months in which they could have expressed their concerns about the matters they felt were dealt with too hastily. However, Mr. Speaker, they did not do so until the Report was finalized. Then they chose to make their criticisms known. One of the reservations, Mr. Speaker, states that the Report completely ignores any job programs that might serve to lessen the numbers of recipients. Since the Report is a public document, any person can readily see that no less than 15 recommendations deal with job programs, job programs such as employment creation, the establishment of guaranteed job programs, positive incentives to ensure that every employable will be better off to work rather than receive full welfare assistance and utilization of work training residences so that persons sentenced to a correctional institute would maintain their jobs while serving their sentences.

Mr. Speaker, if this is ignoring job creation as a welfare priority, I certainly don't think so. In their reservations the Opposition Members stated we are especially disappointed with the proposal for a guaranteed annual income in Canada and in Saskatchewan. In Canada support for the guaranteed annual income has come from a wide variety of knowledgeable and official sources, such as the Federal Government White Paper on income security for Canadians and the Special Senate Committee on Poverty Report, also the recent working paper on social security in Canada, the proposal for a five-year experiment in guaranteed annual income in Manitoba and the Quebec plan that provides a guaranteed monthly income to families with children.

April 2, 1974

The guaranteed annual income supplement concept is aimed at the alleviation of poverty among Canadians. And surely this must be one of our major objectives when we consider that one in four Canadians lack sufficient income to maintain a basic standard of living.

The Report outlines the general principles on which a guaranteed annual income should be established and very strongly recommends that a guaranteed employment program be necessary to complement it. Although we stated that there should be a guarantee for all citizens that should be related to an adequate income based on family size, we were not prepared to recommend an absolute figure. Several approaches could be taken in establishing the income levels, such as the Economic Council of Canada's figures on an average annual income in the province based on the last census report. We felt, however, that the technical details and the feasibility of such a plan should be left to the experts in this field.

There are many factors that will have to be dealt with on a Federal-Provincial basis before the costing of a guaranteed income plan with such programs as old age security, family allowance and Canada Pension plan, etc., can be considered. We talked about whether they should become a part of a master guaranteed income plan.

It would have been an oversimplification on the part of the Committee to assume that all of these programs would be phased out and the money from these programs would subsequently become available for a guaranteed income. This is only one example of factors that must be resolved before an estimation of the cost of the guaranteed annual income could be accomplished.

I feel very strongly that the Opposition Members who state in their reservations that they wish to maintain rather than remove the extreme hardship clause for employables from social assistance programs are, in fact, perpetuating long-term dependency and social problems. Studies have proved that negative incentives which consist of imposing penalties of granting less assistance to employable persons who are recipients have led to family breakdown.

Negative approaches have tended to lessen an employable person's efforts for self-improvement because he will not be better off working. Negative incentives do not recognize that there are many people who work full time at their optimum capacity and earning power but their income will never meet their needs.

Since basic financial needs are common to all people there is no justification in not meeting the needs of all people who qualify for assistance on an equitable basis.

In order to ensure equity of benefits, arbitrary judgments unrelated to needs should be removed from assistance programs. This would mean removal of the extreme hardship clause.

Motivation must be encouraged. It must be nurtured and rewarded within an assisted program in the same manner as it is in business and industry. If a low income wage earner is guaranteed an exemption on earnings, it will encourage him to work. It will encourage him to work harder, to improve his

standard of living through his own efforts. If all his earnings are taken away he will give up in despair and go on welfare.

The Opposition Members of the Committee had suggested that it should have been the intention and goal of this Report to provide recommendations to assure adequate incomes for those less fortunate, the disabled, the handicapped and the aged. It was never the intention of the Committee to exclude these groups from adequate income levels, even to the extent that the special allowances be granted to meet their special needs. However, the Committee recognized that some families can provide for these needs from their own resources.

To grant financial assistance benefits on the basis of age or handicap alone does not necessarily mean we should be spending our dollars where they are needed. A more desirable alternative is to spend these funds on the development of community service programs that will meet their special requirements. Services such as meals on wheels, homemaker services or developmental centres for the handicapped aren't the answer. These services will maintain people in their own homes and in their own communities for a longer period of time than if we chose to give them a few more dollars per month. For people who do not need the institutional care, however, I believe the Government should provide the care free of charge on the same basis as they are providing medical and hospital benefits.

There should be no distinction between the person who requires extended personal care and supervision or the person who requires intensive care with medical and nursing supervision. Every person who has lost his ability to be independent whether it is through age or disability should be assured that institutional services are available to him. Many persons are reluctant to use special-care home services when necessary because the cost will reduce them to a complete state of destitution in a very short time. They suffer and their families suffer because of this and surely one of our top priorities must be to include this service under our hospitalization plan. Other provinces have taken this step and I believe, Mr. Speaker, so should Saskatchewan.

I understand the Federal Government is not willing to cost-share such a universal program. Therefore, we can no longer use loss of federal funds as an excuse for not implementing this program. As a Government Member I will make every effort to convince my colleagues that we must provide a program of special-care to all those who need it without charge.

In closing I am happy to say that the many months spent working on the Intersessional Committee on Welfare were not in vain. Many of the recommendations such as increased rates, pre-audit budgets, expansion of job creation programs and day care have been acted upon and I understand that many are being given very serious consideration. I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that those of us who worked hard have done much to improve the quality of life and the standard of living in our province.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to be said about this report and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

### Final Report of Special Committee on Business Firms

Mr. A. W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Robbins (Minister of Finance) that the Final Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since the Interim Report was discussed in this House last year by all members of our Committee as well as debated by Members who were not on the Committee, I will not take the time of this House to belabor you with the details that can be learned by reading last year's Hansard. But I feel that one item deserves comment, Mr. Speaker, and that was that the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) was urged by many in this House strongly either to change his attitude or to resign from the Business Committee. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to listen to his remarks during this debate and you be the judge if he changes his attitude, he didn't resign.

Mr. Speaker, on occasion, Members on this side place some confidence in what we hear from Members on the other side of the House. I am sorry that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) isn't here tonight, oh, he is here. We have had little opportunity for soul searching, whether we should listen to this Member or not during this Session, because the Member for Athabasca has contained himself recently. Possibly this new mould into which he is trying to squeeze his integrity is quite narrow because of the constituency that he is running in. But at any rate he has chosen to remain silent for the most part this term. But last year he sought to give us some words of wisdom and advice on this report and I am quoting from page 2573, and he said, and he was speaking off the cuff and I enjoyed his comments and I believed him.

If you want to save the rural communities you will bring in the final report of this Committee. The Government will sit down and study it and in their wisdom they will bring in legislation that is required. If you do that you will get the support of Members on this side of the House, but if you don't do it, if you are going to procrastinate month after month, week after week, year after year, you can be sure that we are going to criticize this Report. In fact, our responsibility to the public of Saskatchewan is to criticize you for your procrastination in this regard.

You say people asked for help. How are they doing to get help until the Report is finalized and the Government finalizes its program of helping small rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, why did I refer to this quotation from last year's session?

**Mr. Lane:** — That's a good question.

**Mr. Engel:** — That's a good question isn't it? Well, I should like you to look at the reservations at the back of the book and the only word that I am going to refer to is "rush". Why the justification for the sudden rush to have printed a report not

fully considered nor incorporated and so on, nor incorporating reservations or alternatives. There was this bit of a rush.

If you look back you will find other Members of this House gave us a similar message, Mr. Speaker. In fact some even said that we shouldn't have bothered with an interim report. But my instructions, as Chairman, were clear and the message was loud and clear. Get your Committee together as soon as possible and get a final report to the printers. As Chairman, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I tried to do. That is exactly what the so-called rush was all about.

I could take the minutes of the last five or six meetings, even the seventh meeting, and we had a final draft or a draft of our final report read. All we did was change the wording. Other than just plain laziness or procrastination by our two Members opposite who did not get their resolutions written, so they decided again at the taxpayers' expense to print an excuse. I say this excuse was a lame excuse, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get into the text of the final report, let me just say a few words about our staff.

Mr. Andy Svetkov, the special research assistant, was a member of our staff. The contribution that this man made to our report was priceless, not only did he come to us with a wide background of experience, he also brought with him a good measure of enthusiasm, that will not be forgotten by Members of this Committee for a long time. He was on loan to us from the Department of Industry and Commerce. Let me also make mention that his background not only included business law – he had several years with IDB, he was a negotiator with DREE, as well as he had experience in other provinces, particularly in Alberta. To Andy, as well as to his Minister, Mr. Thorson for freeing him and letting us have him, I should like to say a big thank you.

Mr. T. Cheberiak from the Department of Finance joined our staff to help us draft our final report. I can say much to describe this gentleman. He is made of pretty good stuff. The long suffering and patience that Mr. Cheberiak demonstrated went far beyond the call of duty. I will ever be grateful to him.

Without belittling the know-how of either of these two people, I must say that most of the credit for the product of this final report, would have to go to our Assistant Clerk of the Legislature, Merry Harbottle. Her training, her past experience, as well as her noted talent in the field of journalism proved to be most valuable in writing and editing this final report. I should like to take this opportunity – even though she isn't in the House – to publicly say thank you to her.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — As far as organization is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we had a total of 51 meetings. I was able to attend 50 of these meetings. My colleagues were present – one 45 meetings; two 44 meetings and one was there for 43 meetings.

The Members opposite were away during 14 and 17 meetings respectively or for a total of 34 and 37 of the meetings that

April 2, 1974

we held. There would have been less rush to finish the final report had these two gentlemen availed themselves of the opportunity to attend all the meetings.

All the Members of this Committee got involved with and reacted to the problems as they saw them here in Saskatchewan. I want to say it was a pleasure guiding the discussions and drawing on their wisdom and listening to the sincere debate on many contentious issues. Many of the recommendations are watered down solutions, Mr. Speaker, compromises to get very close to consensus. On many problems the ideas crossed party lines and I feel confident that the committee system is the best way to obtain solutions to problems that exist in our society. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this Report and first let me repeat a statement that I made when the interim report was tabled.

I believe in the committee system approach to understand a problem and to seek out a solution. And after our final round of meetings, I still believe in this approach.

The Committee devoted much of its time to obtaining the views of the business community as to what its problems are and what might be done to overcome these problems. It soon became evident that the prosperity of the business community is directly related to that of the agricultural sector. The many briefs that were heard at public meetings, as well as those received in writing, indicated the dependence of the businessman on his neighbor, the farmer, for his prosperity.

The problem is further complicated by a breakdown in transportation and distribution. Today's all time high prices in the farming community prove that other factors are involved that frustrate and complicate the situation to the extent of nearly making it impossible for many of our small businessmen to exist or to remain in business.

Some of these factors are policies designed in eastern Canada, such as freight rates and other industrial disadvantages that work an unfair hardship on manufacturing in western Canada.

A third general problem area is the population decline in rural areas and in smaller centres. One of the contributing factors to the decline of rural population is the continuing trend to larger farms. Since most smaller centres depend on serving the rural population, all have witnessed a tremendous decline in number of local rural businesses. The kinds of problems that resulted from this decline were very evident in many of the briefs presented to this Committee.

The Committee addressed itself to two main areas of concern, Mr. Speaker. One, problems faced by small businesses and the second, a more complicated problem, that is that the Saskatchewan industrial scene is dominated by primary industries of agricultural and an extraction of raw materials and natural resources.

To solve this second problem will require a concerted effort over a long period of time. That is, to change from an agricultural and mining economy to an industrial based economy. Then you add to this the planned interference by easterners which has successfully hindered the development of the manufacturing sector in Saskatchewan. In the past, efforts by our



province have largely centered on encouraging what some prefer to call natural growth, that is local firms grow larger or outside firms establish branch plants.

Most Members of our Committee felt that existing industrial assistance programs do not adequately serve those enterprises that require funding for development of ideas that are new to western Canada or especially that are totally new ideas.

Many potential opportunities have not led to manufacturing enterprises because the necessary equity capital could not be raised. These are some of the reasons that led the Committee to believe that waiting for natural growth alone to take place, was not good enough. To provide more stimulus to encourage development at a faster rate, the Committee presented a number of recommendations.

Among the recommendations is a proposal to create a new agency. The purpose of this agency would be to help start new industries based on innovative ideas and processes. To further assist in the establishment of new enterprise, the province should be willing to provide part of the equity capital. The small businessmen described their problems in many presentations in all parts of Saskatchewan. The problem of obtaining financing was voiced most frequently, working capital, fixed capital and inventory financing was more difficult for a small firm to obtain.

Other presentations requested assistance with marketing and increased promotion of products made in Saskatchewan. Many businessmen felt it was difficult to obtain timely information and statistics on which to base decision making.

The Government was urged to provide better access to business advisory financial assistance service by establishing regional offices. Here again, I would like to underline the value of committee work. This problem was announced shortly after the problem surfaced. Opposition Members questioned this in the interim report as part of their reservations. I am pleased to inform this House that we, on some occasions, do get good press coverage of the work we do. I would commend the Press for covering the public meetings that we were holding throughout the province. Anyone could have picked up a paper and read detailed accounts of the briefs that were presented to our Committee, especially the problem that many businessmen had in obtaining information, when they compared how easy it was for the country neighbors to go to their local Agreps for help. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Industry and Commerce in his selection of the fine caliber of people he has put into these positions.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — Six regional offices have been opened throughout the province and we are anticipating more.

Tourism and tourist related activities were the subject of numerous briefs, Mr. Speaker. The briefs indicated that this sector of the Saskatchewan economy should receive more attention and assistance from the government. The Committee was concerned that proper management of our tourist and recreation areas should not be sacrificed for the sake of tourist dollars. We

April 2, 1974

agreed that the promotion of tourism is an industry. I, for one as a member of this Committee, was very happy when it was announced in the Throne Speech that tourism and renewable resources would be put under one department or one administration.

This move will prevent a great controversy from developing, where the promotion of tourism will be related to preservation of our parks and recreational areas in this province. This vital resource and beautiful heritage that we have here in Saskatchewan must be preserved for coming generations. I believe this union of two departments will give us the best of both worlds.

Saskatchewan has the potential to become a much more important tourist area. We are of the opinion, in this Committee, that a planned program will encourage persons traveling in our province to stay longer and to visit locations off the main east-west traffic routes. Actions being taken by the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Department of Natural Resources to help expand the tourist season are encouraging. There has also been a marked improvement in providing information on the province's activities.

A new Minister has been appointed to the Department of Natural Resources and even if he isn't able to be in this House tonight. I am sure that he won't mind if I call him a middleman. The Hon. Mr. Kowalchuk is not from the north nor from the south. Mr. Speaker, let me commend him for the interest he takes, not only in the natural beauty of the North, where we in Saskatchewan had been brainwashed to believe that beauty is only water and trees, but this Minister also has an eye for beauty in all of God's handiwork and creation in southern Saskatchewan as well as the North.

I want to assure this House if I am allowed a personal comment, that I do not intend to let our established friendship be wasted. I intend to use every avenue open to acquaint this new Minister with the tourist potential of the extreme south, an area, that has been neglected by so many for so long. I would love to tell you of all these attractions, but I believe that would be stretching my privilege as Chairman of this Committee.

I should like to summarize, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I am excited about Saskatchewan's tourist potential and about development particularly in southern Saskatchewan.

Tourist operators told us they had difficulty in obtaining financing. Part of this could have a result of lack of information on existing sources of financing. The other reason was because of the seasonal activities. The Committee felt that the Government should actively encourage the establishment of new and additional facilities in areas of tourist potential.

The recommendation on page 20, that the Government actively promote a broad assistance program for existing establishments and development of new facilities in areas having tourist potential, by means of loans for expansion, upgrading of existing facilities or construction of new facilities, providing working capital, loan guarantees, and providing direct grants or forgivable loans to encourage development of tourist facilities in areas with relatively few other job opportunities,

are important recommendations, Mr. Speaker. I feel that if these are acted on we shall get development in the tourist area in this province.

If I can turn to financing in the 1973 annual report for SEDCO that was tabled in this House – and I checked on loans to accommodate recreation. In 1971 no loans were made. In 1972, three loans were made for approximately \$175,000. In 1973 this was increased to 19 loans for a total of \$3,476,000. Mr. Speaker, our Minister has his ear to the ground and had an idea and was ready to act on our recommendations as far as improving loans and making loans available to tourist operators.

Another reason why SEDCO is prospering, is the reason that the caliber of people who have been placed in that agency indicates the degree of importance that the Government has placed on SEDCO. To me the two, Andy Svetkov whom I mentioned as a former research assistant and Dave Dombowsky the former Deputy Minister of the Department of Industry and Commerce. The experience and the diplomacy that these two gentlemen bring to this agency will go a long way to providing additional funds to fulfilling the recommendations of this Report.

At this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the comments found on page 16, and I will quote:

When loans are made it is desirable that the loaning agency be able to review the day to day transactions of the borrower. The agencies that are in the best position to do this are the credit unions, banks and similar financial institutions.

Another advantage that credit unions have is that they are usually located in the same community as the business establishment. They are better able to assess the management ability.

To encourage these financial institutions to provide more of the fixed and working capital loans, we recommend that the Provincial Government should guarantee up to 90 per cent of the amount of loans. If the local credit union assumes the balance of the risk this should help to ensure that the operations of a borrower are continuously monitored to keep the loan in good standing.

Mr. Speaker, I did not exclude other institutions but I personally do favor the credit unions. The profits that are made by credit unions are plowed back into the community – where the local people will benefit from a thriving business rather than a few eastern big money men, as would be the case if guarantees were made just to established banks.

Another way that the Department of Industry was encouraged to promote tourism in our report and in this case both for Saskatchewan as well as for visitors from outside of Saskatchewan was to improve and develop a calendar of events. The Committee agreed that there should be a central registry as well as a calendar. The idea was to avoid overlapping of popular events in neighboring communities. To cite just one example, and maybe the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) will talk about this, was the Moose Jaw Band Festival. This very popular event has achieved international prestige and we felt that it was too bad that other events were organized on the same weekend

April 2, 1974

when these organizations involved the same people who would attend a band competition. We are aware the duplications are impossible to avoid but in the light that dates for these events are set by many of these people often years in advance, there would be an added advantage to having this kind of a calendar circulated on a regular basis as events and dates become known.

I should just like to talk a little bit about how tourism relates to the Department of Highways. The matter of a sign policy has been in the debate arena for a long time. First let me point out that none of the Committee favored a sign jungle like you see when you travel just south of the 49th parallel. I am not presumptuous when I say that I speak for all the Committee members in this regard. There was general agreement that this policy should be relaxed as it was with the Department of Highway new sign program. This program that provides pictorial information on services available is a good program, Mr. Speaker. Judging by the number of towns and communities that have participated in this program I would say that this program along with the Community Access Road program was a tremendous success.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Engel:** — All that I would like to add to this program, Mr. Speaker, is that many briefs strongly favored, or I can even say pleaded for, some lead time in highway signs. Travelling tourists would need at least 30 to 40 minutes notice of a camping facility, etc., to decide if that was where they were going to stop.

I have referred to some of the recommendations that have already been acted upon by some departments. The Regional Business Reps, the expansion of SEDCO, the new Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, the Department of Highways Signs Program. In total, Mr. Speaker, we made 17 recommendations that related to the small businessman; ten recommendations related to tourism; nine recommendations related to the business support services; five recommendations to market development promotion; one to innovation and five recommendations on transportation and freight rates, for a total of 47 recommendations. I am pleased to say that action has been taken on 23 of these recommendations; 18 are under study and only six have not reached the planning stage.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a few general comments. Members listening today will note what steps some departments have taken to implement so many of the recommendations we have made. Possibly to Members opposite the Committee on its mission to look into the problems and prospects of the business community, appeared to be on a highly secretive mission. Members opposite after seven years of administration, the great defenders of free enterprise, saw no need for this kind of study. The very idea that we would have to go out with a Committee demonstrated to all of the public that problems did develop. And then Members opposite shouted that nobody will tell you what their problems are. Mr. Speaker, that simply was not the case. The business community came out in full force and demonstrated that they had confidence in this Government to solve their problems.

Mr. Speaker, in no way did I attempt to cover the entire report. I tried to touch on a few of the topics that are of special interest to me. Other Committee members I am sure will enter this debate and present their views on the remainder of the recommendations. At this time it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. F. MacDonald** (Moose Jaw North): — The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) was going to speak on this. I just want to touch very, very briefly on some of the remarks that the Chairman of the Committee made.

He started off by saying why all the rush. We questioned in the report why all the rush to submit the report. We contended that we should be given ample time to enter our reservations in the final report. We asked why all the rush and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) suggested that it be put in a real hurry. Mr. Speaker, we suggested at that time that there was no rush, that the report would be tabled but not be brought up in this Legislature and sure enough four months after the date that this report was tabled, it had to be written in such a big rush that we were allowed two hours to submit reservations. Four months later it is introduced in this House. I would ask the Chairman again, what was the big rush that allowed us only two hours to submit our reservations? I suggest to this House that the big rush was the fact of the Lakeview by-election was one week away, that the timetable that was chosen by the Government Members was one that would allow the report to be made public one or two days before the Lakeview by-election. I think there was no question, looking back on this, that this was the reason that we were allowed two hours.

The Member said, and I am sorry that he chose to spend so long as a Chairman introducing a report, to spend so much time on his personal, political views on the Committee and so on. That is exactly what happened during the whole of the Committee work, that's why this Committee was less than successful in bringing forth a good report, a well considered report. Time and time again petty politics got involved.

The report up until the very last minute was nothing more than a collection of papers. That's exactly what it was. The Committee was confused from the beginning, it lacked direction and really I think it was the worst Committee that I have ever been on. The Chairman submitted the attendance record to this House, not once did it show the number of people who came and stayed for a very short time, maybe a half an hour or an hour because they had other commitments, politicking and so on as the members will remember. Not once does it show the number of meetings that were supposed to start at 9:30 in the morning to go until noon and the members didn't show up until 10:30 and the meeting didn't start until that time — a one and one-half hour meeting, time and time again, that hardly allows the Committee to get down to the work at hand. As I said the Committee was confused from the beginning. One of our staff members, a civil servant, resigned and resigned because of the lack of direction of the whole Committee, and this isn't just the Chairman's fault. He resigned because of the petty politics

April 2, 1974

that kept getting involved. Certainly the department that this staff member worked for was SEDCO and the obvious politicking that kept occurring in open meetings made this gentleman resign and I think he had no choice but to resign.

The Chairman said that the business people came out in force, I think that is exactly the words he used, "The business community came out in force." Certainly in Moose Jaw is a good example, every businessman who had an E & H license was notified of the meeting and asked to submit reports with intentions of submitting briefs. The local Chamber was informed, City Council was informed, and not one single submission, not one single brief or intention to appear before our Committee came. The Chairman of the Committee had to get on the phone personally to contact the Chamber and contact the City and say, please, won't you submit a brief. It could hardly be called the business community coming out in full force. They came out, the Chamber of Commerce and the City came out at the insistence of the Chairman and they told us a few things. They certainly didn't reveal all of their problems as might be expected. I think these are a few of the things that made rather a farce of the Committee and I am sure that other Members of this Legislature can see by the very introduction of this Committee Report into this Legislature what our Committee went through trying to form this Report.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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