

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Seventeenth Legislature
69th Day

Friday, May 10, 1974.

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

QUESTIONS

INCREASE IN WHOLESALE PRICE OF MEAT IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps I should direct it to the Minister of Consumer Affairs but to my failure to get him to move in this particular area, I will direct it to the Minister of Agriculture. To do so for the background, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read just a brief little card. The question has to do with increases in wholesale prices of meat in the Province of Saskatchewan.

A night of two ago I was out to a local restaurant here in the city, I had been there about two weeks before, but on this night there was a little note that says:

There will be a surcharge on each dinner of 10 per cent until the current meat crisis is over. We believe today's meat prices are artificial and temporary. However, to maintain our high quality and portion size, in the face of recent cost increases (over \$1.00 a pound) we must charge an additional 10 per cent per dinner. Thank you for your understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is aware that this kind of misleading advertising, I say, is going on? I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is aware that his colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs has done nothing whatever to check into the increases in wholesale meat prices? My question to the Minister is: would he investigate this kind of advertising? Surely to goodness an industry in the province using a farm product shouldn't be blaming our Saskatchewan farmers for a problem that isn't theirs in the first place. I am sure the Minister would be anxious to defend the farmers' rights in this regard.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly aware now of the concern that the Member for Wilkie has brought to our attention in regard to what I think appears to be not only misleading advertising, stating misleading facts, they simply are not factual or true. I think that they are relating directly to a retail price, not a wholesale price, certainly not a price which relates to producer prices of beef right now. I happen to have right here the wholesale prices for A-1 sides, I do not have the prices for loins which I assume this Blade and Barrel Restaurant would be selling. I take note that the Member for Wilkie said he thought that the surcharge had taken place within the last two weeks. I am looking at wholesale prices for A-1 sides, April 13th, where I see the price of \$74.60 (\$74.60 a hundred) or .75¢ per pound. I have some records going right back to

May 10, 1974

August 4, 1973, and that is the lowest price wholesale cuts have been selling for during that period of time. The peak was somewhere around August 25th, when A-1 sides were selling for \$92.44 per hundredweight.

Mr. Speaker, if the information that the Member for Wilkie has is, in fact, accurate and I have no reason to believe that it is not, it means that this particular retailer has chosen a time when the wholesale cuts of beef have been at an all time low to try to attempt to convince customers that the prices of beef have increased by as much as \$1.00 per pound. That simply is not true.

I know I am relating to sides rather than loins but even if the price of loins has increased significantly, they certainly should not have increased \$1.00 per pound as shown by the evidence that I have related to on wholesale prices of sides.

I think that there should be some sort of investigation carried out. I don't know whether we have the power in the Department of Agriculture, perhaps they are within the realms of the Department of Consumer Affairs. But I suspect that this is obviously a deliberate attempt on behalf of a retailer to try and confuse patrons of that restaurant in order to gouge excessive profits from them. I certainly do not agree with it. This Government certainly does not agree with it and I think that individual should be dealt with most severely.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, just a supplementary. Would the Minister also agree to try and put his offices and his Government on record as defending the fact that the farmer needs even further increases in the price of beef if he is going to be able to stay in the beef raising business? And I think to put the case for the farmer to the public that the Government opposite has the responsibility, and I would hope the Minister would agree that he will try and put the case for the farmer at this time. They talked about artificial and temporary prices — they still have to go higher.

MR. MESSER: — Yes, I certainly will. We have been promoting for some time some means of stabilization, primarily agricultural products, stabilizing the price so that we will not be confronted with the dips and dives that we have now. I must say that this certainly isn't the kind of way that we are going to return any moneys to the farmer because the price returns at least as far as beef are concerned to the farmer is at an all time low. My records indicate that this has affected the wholesale price of beef as well. But we find that the end user, the end seller of that product is increasing the price to the highest that it has ever been. I think we have to find some alternative means of being able to guarantee that the returns are going to go by some more direct means to the farmer. Nothing of this is going to the farmer, that is for certain.

ORGANIZATION OF WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Culture and Youth. I have given him forewarning of this question, it has to do with the organization of

the Western Development Museum. There have been representations made to me as I am sure there have been to the Minister by Mr. Philps and others that they would like to have established a membership structure of the museum, a membership structure which could thereby elect the Board of Directors of the museum at least apart thereof as opposed to the museum being run by a government appointed board.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is: has the Minister any intention to reform the organization of the Western Development Museum in order to try and create a membership structure for it?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, there have been representations made to me only by Mr. Philps and none other, making that specific proposal and recommendation. We have been looking and will continue to look at reorganizing the structure of the Board and will continue to look at reorganizing the structure of the Board in its administrative sense and amending the legislation accordingly. Because we do have that particular proposal we of course will be considering that as well, but you must understand, Mr. Speaker, and the Member I am sure will, that there are some difficulties with saying you are going to have an elected board that is going to be elected by a membership. Because the question then is: who is the membership? At this time, I don't see how you resolve that particular question. We have not made any decision to do it that way at this time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

FIRST REPORT OF THE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND PRINTING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie) that: **The First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing** be now received.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, following the suggestion made by the Attorney General, I shall not be too long.

Just a few comments in regard to this Committee and some of the accusations that have been floating back and forth in this House regarding who is responsible for the Report being made and the accusation against DNS.

I think there is something that the Members have overlooked when they try to say there was some ulterior motive by the Auditor in that the mess in DNS was made public. And yet when one looks at the Report of the Provincial Auditor, you can find nowhere in that Report where the Provincial Auditor has mentioned anything about the abuse of public funds or the gross mismanagement of the Department by the Minister or by the Deputy Minister.

This mishandling, mismanagement and abuse was brought into the open by the intensive questioning of the Opposition Members of that Committee, Mr. Speaker. It was only by their intensive questioning that this entire mess was revealed to the public.

I must point out as well that there was literally no co-operation or concern shown by any of the Government Members on that Committee. It appeared that their only purpose on this

May 10, 1974

Committee was to protect the Government. This group as you know was headed by the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair and the NDP Members just like sheep followed the directions and the guidelines established by Mr. Brockelbank. Their only concern was protect, don't embarrass the Government, don't ask any questions.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Members on the Committee did not show any or exercise their responsibility to the taxpayers of this province or to their own constituents. Their only concern as I mentioned, was to protect the Government and their Party. To protect the NDP Government.

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, how much more could have been revealed, if information that the Opposition Members or other members of the Committee had asked for had not been voted against and not allowed to be revealed.

That was a strange performance by the Government Member's opposite. A motion was presented asking for information dealing with how certain funds were spent or allocated. Once this motion was presented, immediately the Government Members called Notice of Motion. This gave the Government Members an opportunity to wait 24 hours before a vote was taken on that motion. What did they do during that 24-hour period? I am sure that they went to check to see the Minister in charge of this particular department, to see if the information that was requested would embarrass the Government, Mr. Brockelbank's lead was then that they would vote against the motion. If the information granted would not embarrass the Government, of course they would vote in favor of that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Public Accounts Committee is a very vital and a very important aspect of this Legislature and of the legislative process. It is vital and important to the taxpayers of this province. I say as well that a vast improvement is needed before MLAs in this Legislature can adequately look after their constituents and the taxpayers on this Committee as our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to determine that government funds are handled and spent correctly. I should like to make a few suggestions on how I think the Public Accounts Committee can be improved and in turn the MLAs of this Assembly can carry out their responsibility to the taxpayers and to their constituents.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the Public Accounts Committee authorized to meet more often than just during the sitting of the Legislature. As was shown in this Report, the Committee met twice as often this year, as they have in any other year in the past. We are spending twice as much money now as we were just going back three years ago. I think that Members of this Committee need a greater length of time to assess and look into each and every department of the Government.

As well, I should like to suggest the Committee be comprised of an equal number of Members from Government and Opposition. I might say this that the Committee does not deal with Government policy. There is no debate in Committee on Government issues or local issues of the day. There is just questioning on how the money is being handled and looked after by each and every department. It is for this reason I should like to see an equal number of Government Members as well as Opposition Members on that Committee.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to see that the Committee be comprised only of MLAs, no members of the executive council on that Committee. I think this has been clearly demonstrated if one looks through the transcripts of what took place; that the executive member who was on the Committee this year, was the one who gave directions to all the other Members on the Government side and they in turn followed his direction like sheep.

It was because of this that I have made these three recommendations and I should like also to recommend to the Government, to the Premier and to the House Leader, that an intersessional committee be set up to deal with rules and proceedings of this Legislature. I think that they are outdated, our budgets have doubled, the legislation has increased, and as I mentioned earlier, Public Accounts are becoming more involved. I think it is vital that a committee be set up to look into the modernizing and the streamlining of our proceedings, not only in the Public Accounts Committee but in this Legislature as well. I think that we have to make ultimate use of all MLAs. This has been evidenced during this particular Session and previous sessions that there is a considerable amount of time that is wasted by Opposition and Government Members in this Legislature.

It is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I make these few comments in regard to this Public Accounts Committee. I feel that it is an extremely important and vital Committee. I regret that the Government Members opposite did not exercise their responsibility to the fullest to the taxpayers or to their constituents and I hope that we will see vast improvements in the years ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words in closing this debate.

I think perhaps one of the most amazing aspects of the debate has been the non-entry of any of the Government front benches into this debate. The Report very clearly indicated mismanagement and maladministration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The recommendations upon which Government and Opposition Members differ, the recommendation of the Committee to express disapproval or regrets at this kind of mismanagement and recommend a tighter and stricter control by the Comptroller in the future, I say is an understatement of what was going on and allowed to go on in that particular department.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the regrettable part of it has been as I say the non-entry of any Government front bench into this debate. This certainly indicates either their complete lack of concern or their cavalier attitude toward the throwing away or the lax handling of public funds both on the receiving side and the spending side.

The one Minister from Saskatoon who did get into the debate discussed several other issues that were totally irrelevant to the issues at hand. He never really zeroed in on the problem and for the crux of his whole argument, he quoted from the Verbatim Report an incorrect transcript of the Auditor to try and justify his arguments and that, I think, Mr. Speaker,

May 10, 1974

demonstrates much more clearly than I can say, the weakness of his argument, indeed the nonargument put forward by the Minister of Government Services.

The Auditor since corrected that statement which the Hon. Member used in his remarks here, the Hon. Government Services Minister. As I say the fact that he quoted a statement from the Auditor that has since been demonstrated to be a misquote in the first instance very clearly shows that he had absolutely no argument at all to refute the goings-on in that particular department, and to refute the fact that this Government has not taken this entire issue seriously enough. I would hope that if the work of this Committee, Mr. Speaker, is going to carry on as I am sure, and I hope, it will carry on and I hope that it will continue to be, as the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says, an even more effective Committee. It is now a good responsible Committee and I suggest one of the best in the House. We shall see the members of that Committee carry on in the future and diligently work at their task — and it is becoming a larger task — with more and more Government agencies, with more and more government spending. The budgets are up in every department each and every year, so there is more money to check into; there is more money to review insofar as spending is concerned. If this Committee is going to retain the stature that it has and has been developing through the year, I suggest that the one way that that can happen is for the Government opposite to accept that Report seriously and to take some action and do something about it.

I regret that the Premier or the Attorney General or the Minister of Finance did not get into this debate and did not tell us, during the course of the debate what plans they had for future rectification of the problems that were unearthed in DNS in the course of this Committee's hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the other even more amazing thing was the fact that the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan himself did not see fit to get into the debate. In the course of the study of the Estimates of his department, over the last day or two we did manage to extract some facts from him with respect to this. I suggest that we certainly didn't extract all of the facts that need to be explored as yet. I hope that when this Committee meets again at the next session of the Legislature that the year 1973-74 will be examined very thoroughly and very closely by the Committee on Public Accounts with respect to DNS. At that time an indepth exploration will be possible and I am sure that the Committee doesn't need my direction nor my suggestion to have that happen.

Again, I regret that the Minister of DNS took such a yellow attitude, and I don't know of a kinder phrase, in Committee in defending his inaction and his cover-up attempts in DNS. To me the cover-up is even more serious than the poor administration and the maladministration that went on in that department.

Here was a Minister who had problems in his department and we all realize it is a difficult department; it is a new one in a tough geographic area of the province, but to me in here and try to tell us that because a 10 x 12 office is located in La Ronge it is impossible to file in that office or to work in that office as opposed to that same office being down here in Regina. It is complete nonsense, Mr. Speaker, but that is the kind of red herring that the Minister tried to drag into the

argument. And when he finally did get into the argument, after going for almost a full year, because it was June of 1973 when these problems were unearthed, the Minister said nothing at that time; he said nothing then in the course of this House; even when the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and other Members put forward a Motion asking for an inquiry into DNS, the Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland (Mr. Feschuk) got up and said that everything was going tremendously in DNS. As we learned when the Minister brought in his Estimates it is still not going well in DNS and it won't go well because of the attitude of this Minister and his Deputy in the handling of that department.

How in the world is he going to tackle the problems of northern Saskatchewan if he can't tackle the problems of his own department in an honest forthright manner and he hasn't done that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — So he is not going to have any success in DNS until such time as he faces up to the problems, makes a clean breast of it, which he didn't do. As I say, to me the cover-up is a much more serious matter than the administrative problems that did occur in that department. I predict that until that Minister and his Deputy are relieved of their responsibilities, this Government will have problems in Northern Saskatchewan.

I regret, very much, Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that I have seen a Government Cabinet Minister, of either administration over the last few years, use such a cheap argument to dodge his parliamentary responsibility by trying to implant the other night that all of the problems in DNS were due to one civil servant. I have never seen such a cheap political trick; such cheap tactics employed by a Minister in my time in this House or to my knowledge in any other provincial Assembly.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that to me was the great revelation of this particular debate and I regret that we have a Minister sitting opposite, who isn't prepared to accept his responsibilities in true parliamentary fashion.

Again, Mr. Speaker . . . If the Member for Nutana South had got up on his feet and made a speech from his feet instead of his seat — he had an opportunity to get into this debate!

Mr. Speaker, just in closing may I again say, there were differences between Government and Opposition Members as to the severity of the problems in DNS. I suppose to some extent that is natural. I do hope that next year this department is examined very thoroughly and very completely because part of the year that we were working in — the year stopped in March 1973 — there was a considerable carryover that the Committee was unable to delve into. I do hope that next year a more thorough examination is made.

I can say and I can agree with the Member for Morse that this Committee is becoming more and more important because of the growth and the expansion and the development of government and the increase in government spending. I hope that further

May 10, 1974

steps and further considerations are given to facilitating the work of this Committee. Suggestions have been made and further suggestions, I am sure, will be examined in the future.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the vice-chairman, to the staff of the Committee, to the Auditor's office, the Comptroller's office, for their excellent help to this Committee in the conduct of its hearings and express personally my appreciation to all members on the Committee because I can say, very honestly, Mr. Speaker, my job as chairman was an easy one due to the excellent co-operation I had from all members.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS

TELEGRAM TO PRIME MINISTER PIERRE TRUDEAU AND JUSTICE MINISTER OTTO LANG

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved, seconded by Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education):

That this Assembly send the following telegram to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and Justice Minister Otto Lang:

The Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan strongly protests the action proposed by your Government last evening to deny provincial royalties and mining taxes as deductions in the calculation of corporate income taxes. This measure destroys the federal-provincial framework in which resource taxation has been set since Confederation. It is a direct encroachment on the province's right to determine a fair return for its resources. Furthermore, it appears to discriminate in a particular way against the Province of Saskatchewan. The Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan calls upon the Federal Government to withdraw the section of the Ways and Means Motion which makes royalties and mining taxes paid to a province taxable.

And that this Assembly requests the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to sign this telegram on its behalf.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like in moving this Motion to make some comments with respect to the proposal which the Federal Government brought down in the Budget — its ill-fated budget one might say — the other day on the 6th of May, to lead that Party and all Parties in the House of Commons into an election.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to deny provincial royalties and mining taxes from being deducted from corporate profits in the calculation of corporate tax payable is most unreasonable and ill-conceived as a tax measure.

Secondly, this particular measure is extremely selective and is directed at the people of western Canada. Constitutionally there is little question as to the ownership and management of natural resources. This area clearly falls within provincial jurisdiction.

Equally clear is the fact that the Federal Government cannot possibly argue that this is a question of national interest. It was just one month and ten days ago that the Prime Minister of Canada announced, after meeting with the Premiers of all the provinces, that the agreement on the domestic pricing of crude oil was a true victory for Confederation.

The proposal put forward by the Federal Minister of Finance is a negation of the spirit of the agreement reached between the First Ministers on the question of crude oil pricing and the distribution of the returns resulting from the increased prices in the world and domestic markets.

This particular measure is a direct encroachment upon a provincial right, the right of a province to achieve for its citizens a fair return for the exploitation of a depleting provincial resource. This proposal destroys the federal-provincial framework in which resource taxation has been set, since almost the time of Confederation.

Let us look at the proposal a bit more carefully. What the Federal Minister of Finance is saying is that the money which a private firm pays to the government of a province for the right of exploiting a provincial asset or resource is not a business expense. That is, we will not recognize the payment to the province for the right to exploit a provincial resource as a business expense.

This would be precisely the same as saying to the farmer that he cannot deduct payments to the landowner, whether they be in kind or in cash as a rental from his income for tax purposes. Or similarly, the municipal taxes which you pay on your farm property are not really costs of doing business and hence you can't deduct these amounts paid to a government body as a business expense.

What this legislation says that if you are a mineral producer on Crown land, the money you pay to the Crown in the right of a province, is not a business expense, whereas the money you pay to a free-holder is deductible. Carrying that to its logical conclusion, then the Federal Government is saying that provinces do not really own resources or if they do they can't charge for them. If the Government of Canada were to argue that such payments were not tax deductible, since they were paid to a non-taxable agency, the province, then this proposition becomes a method for levying federal taxes on a provincial government.

Then the Federal Liberal Government is saying that it is their intent to tax provincial governments. That proposal is not only unconstitutional but also it is tremendously discriminatory in that it taxes only those provinces which have an abundance of natural resources and ignores all other areas which give rise to income.

To do this is just exactly the same as saying that we shall tax the farmer because his income comes from the land, but we shall not tax the doctor, the dentist, the lawyer, the manufacturer, the carpenter or anyone else, who does not derive his income directly from natural resources such as land. If it is the intention to tax governments then the tax base must be broadened to include all sources of income, not just the economic rent derived from resource exploitation.

May 10, 1974

Thus, the Federal Government should be taxing the income tax base of the central provinces, Ontario and Quebec, as well as moneys derived from resources.

The amendments to the Corporate Tax Act further infringes upon provincial rights in that it in effect may penalize the province which chooses to restrict or protect a provincial resource for use within its own borders. The big losers in that circumstance will be the consumers in that province. And to be specific I want to take an example — natural gas.

In this province we have for years required that natural gas produced in Saskatchewan be sold to the Power Corporation for distribution to Saskatchewan consumers. Accordingly, we have been capable of holding down the price of natural gas to Saskatchewan consumers by this method to some extent. As this federal legislation is presently being proposed this will no longer be possible or we shall not be able to pass on the full benefit to Saskatchewan consumers, since a corporate tax equal to 30 per cent of the difference has been the price that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation pays for Saskatchewan produced gas and the price we must pay to Trans Canada Pipe Lines.

For example, if gas from Trans Canada Pipe Lines is 60 per cent per mcf and if the Saskatchewan Power Corporation pays 17 cents per mcf for gas produced in Saskatchewan, then the Federal Government could, under its legislation, value Saskatchewan gas at 60 cents per mcf and deem the 43 cents to be a royalty to the province, which would result in an additional 12 cents in federal corporate income tax becoming payable to the Federal Government. They would deem the 43 cents which the company had not received as being a royalty, in kind, having been paid to the province by the virtue of having sold the natural gas to the province at 17 cents versus the 60 cents, which would be deemed to be the fair market value.

Given the public utility basis of this production, this can only mean an increase to Saskatchewan consumers of 12 cents per mcf on gas produced in Saskatchewan or a reduction in Saskatchewan natural gas production.

In the Budget Address the Hon. John Turner, Federal Minister of Finance, stated, "A provincial resource is a national resource and the Federal Government has the responsibility to see that a reasonable portions of this gain is shared by all Canadians."

When one considers crude oil as an example, we must certainly ask: just what does the Federal Government want? What does it think is a fair distribution between Canada and the provinces?

The international price of crude oil is over \$10.70 a barrel; the domestic price is \$6.50 a barrel, leaving a difference of \$4.20 a barrel. Let's now cast this into a different light. For each barrel of oil produced in Saskatchewan and Alberta Ottawa gets \$4.20 for the benefit of all Canadians — and this goes in two forms; \$4.20 by the export charge and \$4.20 is the lower price that other consumers in Canada are paying. Thus, \$4.20 to the Federal Government, one way or another, which they choose to pass on in two ways; \$3.40 to the province in royalties and \$3.10 to the producer.

In global terms then what Mr. Turner is saying, is that of the \$8.56 billion, at present international prices, in the value

of oil produced in Canada, the Government of Canada should be receiving more than \$3.4 billion, which it is already receiving. Almost half a billion dollars more. To maintain the present operating circumstances this means that the provinces or the operators will have to receive that much less.

This, I would suggest, is unreasonable. Almost inconceivable in view of the fact that just slightly over one month ago the First Ministers agreed to the distribution of the additional funds to be derived from the increased prices of oil. This must be considered as a breach of the spirit of the agreement and contrary to the concept of co-operative federalism.

We, in this province, would not have opposed an excess profits tax. Indeed, we felt there should be one. However, we feel that such a tax should apply to excess earnings derived by all corporate taxpayers. Any reasonable returns being realized by the resource sector because the owners of the resources were not charging enough for their resources could be taxed for the benefit of all Canadians. Similarly extraordinary returns of other producers could be assessed on a fair basis.

The Government of Canada, obviously, chose not to follow this route.

Mr. Speaker, just before I move this particular motion I want to make one other comment.

I was interested in reading in the Finance Minister's speech where he was talking about getting new revenues and he was saying that he was going to go where it was the easiest to get the revenues. Obviously the Federal Liberal Government knew there was an election coming. If they are any kind of politicians at all they should see that coming with the kind of Budget that they brought down. He was looking for the easiest place possible, he said, to find tax revenues.

Look at what he did in the corporate sector. Most of the manufacturing in Canada is in eastern Canada. He put on a 10 per cent surtax on corporate profits, but they excluded manufacturing. But when it came to a resource, which was solely located — almost solely — in western Canada, indeed to a great extent in two provinces. That's where they put the bite on in terms of taxes.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what the Finance Minister was talking about where it was easiest to find them, I think he was talking about where it was least politically difficult to live with them perhaps. Mr. Speaker, I so move the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, let me state very clearly that we will not join in sending that telegram and we're quite prepared to have the NDP Government join in agreeing with the telegram we sent. We've already sent it. But let's take a look at this whole situation and see who is really attacking the spirit of federal-provincial fiscal arrangements or the Federal Fiscal Agreements Act of 1972.

May 10, 1974

You know, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley) talks about the Federal Government, how much does the Federal Government want from the oil resource, and he talks about them getting \$4 and some cents a barrel. Well, let's make it very clear, they do get that on all the oil we export which is about 40 million barrels. They get little or nothing except the corporation tax, their share of the corporation tax on the other half of the oil that we sell for consumption within Canada.

Now, again I say as I said before let's look at the whole picture here. The Minister paints a picture of what's happening in oil, but he doesn't talk and he failed again today to mention what they are doing to potash and what they intend to do to uranium and probably every other mineral resource that comes into a viable market position in this province. Certainly they've done it to oil and they intend to do it to potash, that's very clear.

Let's start with the oil. The NDP are attempting to claim, are claiming that the Federal Government have moved in to place a new tax on what has up to this point been a provincial area of taxation, that is, the resource minerals, oil, potash and so on. In this regard they are right. Last September when the Federal Government put the 40 per cent export tax on oil, this was an invasion of what had up to this point in time been clearly a field of taxation left to the provinces. Now whether they had the legal right to put the export tax on or not, I don't know. The NDP Government opposite doesn't know either and they don't seem to be about to find out. I said then and I say now, that when Premier Blakeney agreed with the Federal Government's move to put an export tax on, he then at that moment in time, sold out the rights of the people of Saskatchewan. That's when he should have moved in, right then, when it was 40 cents and placed his royalty, increased his royalty or moved in and had the confrontation with Ottawa at that time. Instead, what he said was, we agree as long as we get the money. He didn't even disagree in October or November when the tax was raised subsequently to 90 cents, then to \$1.90. He didn't even disagree when it went up over \$2 and even up to as high as \$6.

He then went to Ottawa and in effect he agreed with the Federal Government's action when he made the deal at the first energy conference and was given half of the export tax and allowed to charge one extra dollar if he could collect it. Again he sold out and I said it then and I say it again, he sold out the rights of the people of Saskatchewan.

What should he have done? I say he should have advanced right then and taken this thing through to the Supreme Court which most people in this nation expected him to do. He went down to Ottawa, he went to Quebec, he went to the Maritimes and he talked tough. He came into that conference and the first morning he still talked tough. He was a nine-day wonder around there until noon of the second day. The Premier of Alberta who had 85 per cent of the oil was doing none of the talking, Premier Blakeney who had 11 per cent of the oil was doing 100 per cent of the talking. But after the noon conference, and he came back out of that conference, it was obvious for everyone in Canada to see, that the Premier had sold out, he had caved in, he had given in.

Okay, then we come to the next conference and again we had tough talk here in the Legislative Assembly. As soon as the Premier got back home in his own back yard, backed by his own

followers on that side of the House, he again mounted a very tough campaign. He was going to go right to the limit, he was going to have a confrontation with Ottawa, he was going to find out once and for all who had the right, first right of taxation on the minerals of this nation. And his argument, and I agree with it, was that it was the provincial government. But again he went down East and again he made another deal.

Now, the question of how much money the Federal Government is getting out of the export tax is not relevant to the problem we now face. There are two problems here. One is that the export tax is a very obvious invasion by the Federal Government of what up to this point has been a provincial right. And in that, we on this side of the House, take a strong stand and we would be prepared and we will be prepared if it's still in vogue when we are the government to take it as high as we have to go to get it settled, to the Supreme Court if necessary. We will not back down like the Premier did and the NDP opposite.

MR. COWLEY: — That's all you know about it!

MR. STEUART: — But now, that's all I know about it? No, at least I'd have the nerve to try it. At least I'd have the nerve to try it, which is more than you people obviously have. If you think you're wrong say so, don't get up in this House and whine about provincial rights, about the BNA Act, about the rights that you have as a province if you're not prepared to put your actions where your mouth is.

Okay, we have another problem now. Because of the actions of the NDP in increasing their royalty from roughly 16 per cent to now where it stands at 54 per cent, and because of the action they intend to take and have publicly stated they intend to take the potash industry, raising again their royalty from \$16 million to \$17 million to as high as \$55 or \$60 million, this NDP Government have clearly indicated that they intend to move in on the field of mineral resources and push the Federal Government totally out of this field of taxation. So the Federal Government has decided in the Budget they brought down to disallow royalties, provincial royalties on mineral resources, to disallow it, as an expense and exemption for corporation tax. Now, let me make it very clear, this is not by itself an invasion by the Federal Government of the rights of the province to royalties from resources. It is not by itself, it is merely an extension of the corporation tax to which they have a very clear and a very established right. I don't agree with them, I don't agree with what the Federal Government is doing, because by the greedy and irresponsible action of the Provincial Government we have already driven the oil industry to the wall. We've caused serious unemployment, we have pushed out oil industries so that there is no exploration at all going on in this province now, we've broken, bankrupted a great many small Saskatchewan based companies and within the next few months, by the actions primarily of the Provincial Government, secondary now, the threat of the Federal Government will complete the job.

Okay, where does that change announced in the Budget by Mr. Turner now stand? Well, of course, it's inoperable. The Government has been defeated, the Government is going to the people and that tax isn't, or that exemption or that change in the corporate tax is not now in effect. Okay, what should this Government be doing instead of sending politically motivated

May 10, 1974

telegrams? They should be preparing their case to go down on July 9th or 10th and sit down with the new majority Federal Liberal Government and discuss this whole thing sensibly. I think the Federal Government is wrong, but I think their actions were brought on again by the irresponsible actions, shortsighted action, stupid actions of the Government opposite.

We've got a mineral industry in this nation, we've got an oil industry, potash industry and a growing uranium industry in this province. Surely no one argues that both levels of government have a clear right to collect taxes for the people they represent, from these resources. It has always been that way, the provincial government, the first right in the form of royalties and corporation tax and the federal government in the field of corporation tax. But if one government, either one, moves in to squeeze the other out, then you've got a real problem.

But who is going to be the real loser in this fight that is going on, this head-on confrontation that is now going to exist between the government in Regina and the government in Ottawa? First the industry. Well, you may say we're not going to shed any crocodile tears for these large corporations, mining or oil companies or mining corporations. However, let's take a look at what happens when you push them out, when they take their money, their skills and their facilities and move them out. Who gets hurt? The people who depend on those industries for their jobs, the small industries, mostly Saskatchewan or mostly Canadian who service these mines and these oil wells. These are the people who get hurt and in the final analysis it's the people themselves, all the people that suffer.

Now, what is happening here is, we have already effectively set the oil industry in the Province of Saskatchewan back 40 or 50 years. You're now playing a dangerous game with the potash industry. The Federal Government is playing a dangerous game. I don't know why anyone would come into this nation and invest any money in the development of mineral resources. But if they did by some chance come into Canada, I can be sure, or we can be sure that the actions taken now by the NDP Government and contemplated and planned by the NDP Government they'll draw a ring around this province and they'll avoid it like the plague. We are right back, we're worse off then we were back under the old CCF. At least when Tommy Douglas gave his word, he kept it. But that can't be said for Premier Blakeney, that can't be said for the present NDP Government. They are known from one end of this nation to the other and now they are becoming known internationally as a government that has no regard for a contract, as a government that has no regard for its given word, as a government that will do anything and everything to exploit for their own greedy ends, anybody who comes into this province and invests their time, their money, their skills.

So I won't join in sending this telegram, because it's the wrong action. All it is, is politically motivated. But I would join in if this Government was prepared to say they would sit down with the Federal Government as soon as the election is over, and there will then be time and sensibly plan not only with the Federal Government or the Provincial Government, but with the industries involved, with the oil industry, the potash industry and the mining industry, and decide how much money should be taken from our resources for the people of Canada.

How much money should we take? Well, of course, we have to be competitive with other parts of the world if we are going to get mining capital. If we don't need it, if we can generate it here, either through government action or private action, then we don't have to be competitive. But in some areas that will work and in some areas it won't work. But however, how much we decide to take, and surely that's not that difficult to calculate, then the split between the provinces and the Federal Government again shouldn't be that difficult to calculate. At the same time, let's have some consideration, let's have some consideration for the industry, consult them in a meaningful way so they've got a reasonable profit, a reasonable profit, pay their expenses, to repay their capital investment and to continue to search and to continue to explore and to continue to develop the oil and the other mineral resources of this province and of this nation. If we don't they'll move out as they've done in the oil industry. If we're prepared to replace that capital and that knowhow with government money, government industries and government corporations, I wouldn't agree with it, but at least we would be doing something.

But up to this point in oil and in potash all we've got is something on paper. We've got a politically sad joke, Saskoil and I don't think the one talked about by the Federal Government is much better. And so until we can replace them with something else, it's ridiculous to push these other people out, the private oil industry, the only ones that have found any oil up to this point, the private people who are the only ones who came into this province and risked their money in search for potash and developed it and until such time as you find a better system, I say you are playing a dangerous game with our double taxation, your greedy taxation. You are going to force them to the wall and force them out of the province.

So we won't join in with this telegram, it's the wrong action at the wrong time. We would join with you if you were prepared to make a statement to this House and to the public, that as soon as the federal election is settled you would sit down and have a meaningful conference, not only on energy, but on all mineral resource development in this nation and come up between the provincial governments and the Federal Government with the industry involved with a responsible and a sensible taxation program. There is need of a program with the demand for our mineral commodities in the world, there's room for everybody. There is no need for the provincial government to have the greed that they have, there is no need for the Federal Government to take the action that they contemplated in the Budget they brought down and were defeated on, absolutely no need. There is room and plenty of room for everyone. We're acting like dogs in a manger, we're acting like banana republics and it's no wonder that the reputation of this province is in the gutter, in tatters, as far as the investment capital and sensible people are concerned, not just in this province or in this country, but outside our boundaries as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing that's in the gutter and in tatters in this province it's the Liberal Party sitting opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I won't take very long to reply to that tired old record over there. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that we should sit down and have meaningful consultation with the Federal Government. Well, we did that in January, and February and March and we reached an agreement and they're the ones who are now changing the rules of the game again. The Leader of the Opposition, he looked into his backwards crystal ball and said, you know, boy you should have thought about that export tax way back when. In December the Leader of the Opposition was saying, don't hurry with this Bill, we don't need it right away, there is no rush, take time, take months. The Leader of the Opposition is a man of contradictions. You know, he is so busy straddling that fence that one of these days he's going to fall with one leg on either side.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the potash industry. Well, all I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition is the Federal Government's proposals in terms of changing the corporate income tax structure would likely result in a reduction of the tax payable under the new proposal for the potash industry. I think the Member opposite would agree that a federal government that had both of its eyes open and was looking anywhere was designing a new tax and trying to get more money from resources in the case of western Canada, shouldn't have been raising them on the petroleum industry and lowering them on the potash industry. Indeed, one could suggest that perhaps the other way around would have been a more reasonable approach. That's the kind of policy which this telegram is directed, towards asking the Federal Government to state now — the Federal Liberal Party, not after the campaign is over, but to state now — that it made a mistake and that it wouldn't proceed in the unlikely event that only half a dozen people turn out to vote in each constituency and the Liberals may get re-elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 32

Messieurs

Meakes	Michayluk	Matsalla
Smishek	Byers	Owens
Romanow	Thorson	Gross
Messer	Whelan	Feduniak
Snyder	Kwasnica	Comer
Bowerman	Carlson	Rolfes
Kramer	Cody	Hanson
Thibault	Robbins	Oliver
Larson	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
MacMurchy	Cowley	Richards
Pepper	Taylor	

NAYS — 12

Messieurs

Steuart	Grant	MacLeod
Loken	MacDonald (Milestone)	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Boldt	Weatherald	Malone

ADDITIONAL HOUSE SITTING

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move, not to encourage anyone but just simply as insurance:

That on Friday, May 10, 1974 and on each Friday until the end of the Session, Rule 3(3) be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7:00 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.; and

That notwithstanding Rule 3(4) on Saturday, May 11, 1974 and each Saturday until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 5:30 p.m.; that there shall be a recess of one and one-half hours at 12:30 o'clock p.m.; and that the Order of the Business shall be the same as on Thursday.

I so move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health).

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved that Bill No. 129 — **An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act** be now read a third time.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to repeat once more our objections to this Bill. I think it is dangerous. I think it is ill-advised what they are doing to the potash industry. I think it is going to bring great harm to that very important industry in the years ahead, harm which this Government over there cannot foresee. I think it is a mistake, I think it is going to do our reputation, again, a great deal of harm. I think that when they get into the very competitive potash business as they obviously will, if they are in power long enough, it will be both a disaster from the point of view of the people of Saskatchewan directly as it involves them in that industry and also for the potash industry itself, upon which so many people depend for their livelihood. That is why we object and object most strenuously to this particular Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could introduce for the MLA for Swift Current, the Hon. E.I. Wood, 43 Grade Five students from the James O. Begg school in Swift Current. I believe they are sitting right opposite us. The teachers are Linda Arons and Harvey Lane — I hope I have pronounced those names correctly. If I haven't my apologies to you. I am sorry the Minister is not in his seat but we welcome you to the Legislature and hope that you enjoy the proceedings.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

May 10, 1974

MR. A. THIBAUT (Melfort-Kinistino): — I should like to introduce a fine group of students from the town of Melfort this morning, Grade Five students. They are led here by parents, Mrs. Arlene Blair, Mrs. N. Michalycha and Mrs. Alice Lavrans. Their school teacher, Mrs. Elizabeth Byggdin is also with them.

I want to tell the House that the town of Melfort is the largest town in the province. It is a very nice town to visit, right in the heart of the Carrot River Valley. It is one of the most productive areas in the province.

We have a fine group of students here this morning and I am sure you will join with me in welcoming them here. They are touring the city and I hope that today's experience will be a very educational one.

I am sorry I have to leave this afternoon as I would like to keep them company a little more but I am sure that you will make this day for them a very educational one. I wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to introduce to you and other Members of the House and welcome to the Assembly 26 Grade Three students from Assiniboine School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Anderson, and four parents, Mrs. Grey, Mrs. Berstein, Mrs. Berek and Mrs. Perron. I hope they will find our deliberations enjoyable and educational this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a group of young people here from Whitewood accompanied by Mrs. Santo, Mr. White and Mr. Metzler. I haven't had a chance to meet them yet but I will when they leave the gallery. They made the arrangements some time ago and weren't sure if the Session would still be on when they came but fortunately they are getting a chance to see the Legislature in operation and I hope they have a pleasant day and good trip home.

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 29 — FEED GRAINS PLEBISCITE

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin) moved, seconded by Mr. Weatherald (Cannington):

That this Assembly regrets the action of the Minister of Agriculture in not consulting with the farmers in provincial agricultural policies and further regrets that the ballot to be used in the forthcoming feed grains plebiscite is slanted to favor one side of the issue.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone is aware of the reason for this Resolution. I might say at the outset that we have

advocated plebiscites on agricultural issues at various times as everyone in the Chamber is aware, and we certainly are not going to object now to the idea of a plebiscite.

We asked the Department if you will recall for a plebiscite or a vote on hog marketing and we became convinced at that time that the NDP Government just didn't believe in plebiscites or votes on these issues. There have been a number of non-agricultural issues such as the ward system where there just wasn't a vote allowed.

We asked the Minister to consult with farmers on various other agricultural policies such as foreign ownership of land, on the Land Bank and other issues of a strictly provincial nature. And I want to note the difference in the type of issues that many provincial issues have been bypassed where there hasn't been a vote and it does seem rather odd to us that the Minister would not call a vote on an issue that affects the people of the province but is certainly largely beyond the jurisdiction of this Provincial Government.

The Minister apparently didn't believe in plebiscites at that time. But in this issue that is beyond the control of the province the Government quite suddenly becomes democratic. I believe it is perfectly obvious to everyone that the reason for the vote at this time on the feed grains situation is strictly for political reasons. I don't think we need to try and kid each other back and forth about that. There is no doubt that the timing of vote, the calling of the vote is strictly for political reasons.

We have had a feed grains issue with us for months, even years. I recall, I have here my note some place, a resolution that was passed in 1970, by Mr. Kowalchuk and Mr. Bowerman, where they advocated the movement of feed grains freely in the West. We know we've talked about these issues for years. It is not something new. But if the Government really wanted an expression, a vote to give them an expression of farmer opinion on the feed grains that is fine. But in this case of course it is fairly obvious that is not the reason for having the vote.

We first have to look at the timing of the vote and we note that it is very carefully timed. There is a federal election coming. When the vote was called it was almost sure the federal election would be July 8th, this is now confirmed. So the Minister immediately sends out ballots which he asked to have back by the 24th of May. This is extremely short notice of course for a ballot. It is an unreasonably short time, but if the Minister is going to have time to tabulate the results of this and then if he is able to get results that favor his position, to use these effectively in the Federal campaign, then he has only time to allow the people of this province about two weeks to get their ballots back in.

Now, in spite of the fact that this is an extremely busy time of the year, that farmers are going to be rushed in getting their crops in, all of the other times it would be possible to have a vote, he didn't of course choose, he chose this time strictly to get involved in the federal election. He wants to use the results to interfere in the federal election and there is no other reason for him having the vote at this time and I am sure this is perfectly obvious to everyone.

May 10, 1974

If the results are as the Minister would like to have them, then he has time to tabulate them and use them in the campaign. If this is his purpose and obviously it is, we have to look at how he does attempt to get the results that he favors and he does this in two ways.

First of all he does it by having a ballot this is entirely and completely misleading and slanted and biased in a very blatant manner. And it is designed to be confusing to the people who are voting. It is a ridiculous type of ballot and the Minister knows it. It was purposely designed this way so that anyone marking his ballot really wouldn't know what he was doing.

Of course, the second method by which he hopes to get the results that he wants is by restricting the time, so that the farmer who is now very busy, at a busy time of the year, just isn't going to have the time to delve into all of the aspects of the vote. He gets this thing in the mail, he is busy with his seeding, he either throws it in the waste paper basket or he marks an X some place and throws it back in the mail, his time is short and this is what the Minister wanted. He doesn't want the farmer to have time very carefully to sit down and scrutinize the ballot as the farmers had all kinds of time in the last four or five months to do exactly that, but the Minister very carefully didn't give them the ballot in January or February or March. He waits until that farmer is out on the tractor seeding, sends this out hoping that this will contribute to getting the type of results that he wants.

We can see, Mr. Speaker, that the whole idea of a ballot, a plebiscite at this time is a complete waste of \$30,000 because the result will be absolutely meaningless. The ballot doesn't give the farmer an opportunity to express his true intentions. I don't know what the results will be, but whatever the results are they are absolutely meaningless as far as giving any direction to the Provincial Government or the Federal Government because of the short time and the fact that the ballot is so blatantly biased to favor one position. It means that it is just an exercise in futility. I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that farmers generally are getting fed up with being used by the NDP for political purposes and this is the most obvious example of this that you could possibly get. Ballots sent out at this particular time, the time to coincide with the federal election. Very obviously the Minister is hoping to use the farmers of this province, just use them as a political tool.

I think the farmers are going to resent this. They don't want to just have the Minister be able to use them at his whim for a special political idea. They remember very well how the NDP scuttled and destroyed the Federal Stabilization Bill. I am not going into the details of this because we have talked about this before. This was basically a very excellent concept where the farmer put in 2 per cent of this gross sales and the Federal Government put in 4 per cent.

You know, Mr. Speaker, by now this would have resulted in a federal contribution of over \$200 million to the farmers of this province, \$200 million in federal money deposited to the account of western farmers. This would be \$2,000 at least for every farmer in Saskatchewan. But of course, the question is: has the farmer got it? We have to say, No.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP very proudly took credit for scuttling and destroying this Stabilization Bill and

I think they are still doing this. I would hope they keep saying that they did destroy the Stabilization Bill.

I have a clipping here back from October 1971 when this was an issue and it is from the October 4th issue of the Leader-Post and it says:

The New Democratic Party instigated the court action against Federal Minister E.J. Benson, said one of the farmers who signed the application for a writ of mandamus. The application is supported by the Saskatchewan Attorney General.

It goes on to say:

That Roy Ames, a farmer in the Milestone district said Friday, that he was approached two or three days ago by Les Benjamin, NDP Member for Parliament for Regina Lake Centre. The 59-year old farmer said he believed that Mr. Benjamin had approached several others seeking relators for the application.

It goes on to talk about who the other people are and this farmer said:

We are acting as individuals but it is through the efforts of the NDP that we are acting, said Mr. Ames.

Mr. Ames said all four farmers are members of the NDP and participated in the September 18th nominating convention for the Assiniboia Federal by-election scheduled for November 8.

It is obvious that the NDP scuttled the stabilization plan, and also took credit for it. The reason they did it of course was for political reasons, political reasons only.

I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how any NDP politician whether he is federal or provincial can now go around to the farmers of Saskatchewan, drive into their yard and say, "I am an NDP politician, I am the guy who destroyed the Stabilization Plan, I'm the person who is responsible for you losing \$200 million." This is exactly what happened, they took credit for it, everybody in Saskatchewan knows it. I would be surprised when the federal campaign is on if some of these federal politicians, Benjamin, Gleave, Burton and so on that took responsibility for assisting in this how they can go out to rural Saskatchewan and say look, "We are the people who lost you \$200 million. Three years have gone by, you haven't got a stabilization plan yet because of the actions of us, the NDP."

This is exactly what happened before. Here again we have another example of an attempt to bring partisan politics into a very important agricultural issue.

I don't know whether Benjamin, Gleave and Burton are behind this one again. I suspect they are. I doubt whether the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan dreamed this up on his own, but I see the find hand of some of his federal colleagues in this particular attempt to bring politics into something that is very serious, very important to the people of this province.

May 10, 1974

Feed grains, as we all know are now selling at a good price in Saskatchewan. After having had a very severe winter and problems with moving the grain, it is now moving very well and statistics indicate this.

Farmers generally throughout the province are very happy with getting \$2.50 for their barley, \$1.50 for their oats and a good price also — \$3.50 initial price for their wheat, with a possibility of a good final payment.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this province don't want this destroyed as the stabilization plan was destroyed by the actions of the NDP for political reasons. They don't want to lose their \$2.50 barley, just because the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan wants to make a political issue out of something that is very important to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — You know, farmers get very nervous in this province now when they see the NDP interfering politically in an issue that affects them as did the Stabilization Plan and now the Feed Grains issue. They are very suspicious and they are suspicious with very good reason.

The Minister's action in using taxpayers' money to promote one side of an issue is unfair to people who are perhaps supporting the other side of some issue. I would remind you in this regard of the rape seed vote where the people of Saskatchewan — the taxpayers were forced to spend thousands of dollars promoting something that the farmers themselves rejected, subsequently by a democratic vote.

The Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture sent out approximately 80,000 bulletins to farmers indicating that they should vote one way in the rape seed issue. They put ads in the paper — it cost the taxpayers, the farmers themselves thousands and thousands of dollars to do this. It promoted one side, the farmers later said look, we don't want that at all, we favor the other side. I think it is unfortunate that the farmers would have to have their own money used against them to vote one side of an issue, an issue that they indicated they simply didn't support.

I should like to also say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, about some of the ridiculous statements that have come out of the NDP supporters and some of the groups who are supporting them indicating that some individual or some group is out to destroy or undermine the Wheat Board. I don't think anybody takes this seriously any more. It is complete nonsense, everybody here knows it and particularly if they are referring to the Hon. Otto Lang, who has done more to preserve the Wheat Board to move grain, to get the Wheat Board acting properly and responsibly than anybody else has ever done. And for someone to get up now and say, oh, they are trying to destroy the Wheat Board, you might have got away with scaring farmers with scare tactics years ago, farmers generally are too smart, I believe, to believe that type of thing today.

There are those people, Mr. Speaker, who believe that farmers should have some greater freedom of choice in marketing their grain than is presently provided through the Canadian

Wheat Board. Whether they are right or wrong, this is their feeling.

The plan proposed, as I understand it by the Federal Government is to give farmers a choice, not to tell them they have to use any particular method but to give them a little more flexibility, a little more freedom of choice and apparently this is the part of it that is being objected to very strenuously by the Minister of Agriculture and the NDP.

Many individuals and many organizations feel that this flexibility would be a long-term benefit to the producer of feed grains. Those who take this position, Mr. Speaker, do not have a democratic opportunity to express their views on the ballot that is sent out by the Minister of Agriculture. It is a very purposely misleading type of ballot. Anyone who looks at it can see that it is a joke. The people who really want to express their views don't get a chance to do this. They are really insulting the farmer by sending out this type of thing, 'Do you wish your oats and so on marketed through the Canadian Wheat Board system of orderly marketing,' or do you favor one of these other terrible things, of course they don't say anything about orderly marketing or in connection with that. It doesn't say anything about barley that goes to Japan or barley that is used in eastern Canada or British Columbia, it's an indication there, number 1, the key question and it is completely absolutely meaningless. It doesn't say anything about the domestic market, the export market or anything else. It is purposely made misleading so the Minister will hopefully get the type of results that he expects and of course the results are going to be meaningless when he does get them.

There are of course many organizations which are concerned by what the Minister is doing and I am not going to quote from the article in last night's Leader-Post, "Feed Grain Pool meets with Mixed Reaction." I am sure the Minister knows there are people who come out on all sides of an issue, I am certainly not going to debate the issue. There are one or two points in the federal plan that I think require some modification and one of these in particular would be anybody who markets feed grain by any method should probably have the advantage of a quota system. I would hope that any plan that is suggested by any changes that are made would include a quota system however the grain is sold. I don't think there is anybody advocating that as any restriction or lessening of the Wheat Board. I certainly wouldn't. I can't see that anybody else is doing this. We all know the importance of the feed industry in Saskatchewan, we don't have to go over this again. We all know the importance of preserving markets for our grain both in Canada and abroad. Our first concern, primary concern, has to be for the producer of this feed grain in Saskatchewan because he is the person who is right here, who is most involved and he would require our number one concern.

We also have to be concerned about the consumer or the feeder of feed grain both in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. If you are in business of any kind, you must show some interest in your customers. I think this is one of the requirements of any business for no other reason than simply to keep them as customers. We realize the dilemma at the present time, how to get a good price for feed grain for the producer, and still make grain available to cattle feeders at a price that will allow

May 10, 1974

them not only to survive but to make a margin of profit so they can stay in the business. Everyone realizes this problem. To get up and say that feed grain prices should be higher, then you are immediately making it tougher for the feeder. If you say they should be lower, then you are perhaps not giving sufficient margin to the producer who suffered for 30 years of too low prices for his feed grain.

In this Session I believe the NDP have demonstrated time and time again that they really have no concept of business or the operation of business, and I think the feed grains issue is certainly another indication. It is not surprising that they approached the feed grains issue in the same manner.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other people who I am sure would like to make a comment on the feed grains situation and perhaps look at it from a little different point of view. I will move the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Moosomin has gone and done it. I could hardly believe my eyes when I saw the kind of resolution on the Order Paper. His remarks and his accusations are of course just as ridiculous today as they have been throughout the whole session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — He and the Liberal Party have been talking ever since the election about consultations about plebiscites and about votes and about all the kinds of things that we have been doing wrong. Now when we do choose to have a plebiscite on the issue that is as important as the preservation of the Wheat Board in Canada, then of course we are committing another cardinal sin. I say to him that you can't have it both ways. You can't seem to make up your mind. He gets up and makes the accusation that it is being done for political purposes. I couldn't think of anything more political than in the dying moments of this Session to put a resolution of this kind on the Order Paper. Certainly this must be the most desperate move that they have made since 1971.

He talks about the quality and the questions and the bias in the plebiscite. I want to remind him of the plebiscite in the rapeseed vote. I want to remind him of the vote that we were called on to choose, and how this was conducted. Absolutely loaded. Any farmer who hadn't produced rapeseed for the last three years didn't have a vote. I produced rapeseed for a great number of years, but I wasn't allowed to vote in that plebiscite. Certainly if there ever was a loaded and biased plebiscite, it came from the famous Otto Lang in his rapeseed vote. The Member for Cannington is worrying about by brains. If he wants to talk about brains, I think probably he ought to keep quiet and not enter this debate at all. I think he would then probably display a better amount of brains than probably some of utterances that he is going to make.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that what is at stake in this province of ours at this time is the preservation of the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — The Members opposite are, of course, opposed, diametrically opposed to the principle of orderly marketing. They have shown this on several occasions. It took Otto Lang to have the guts and the courage to come out and say where they stood. Now they are trying to laud him. I want to remind the Member for Moosomin of the struggle that has been going on for the last very great number of months since this whole change in the feed grains situation was announced. I want to remind him of the stand of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and their concern. I want to remind him of the stand of the Federation of Agriculture and their concern. I want to remind him of the stand of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, their plea to meet the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa and he refused to do so. All of these organizations have been very concerned and have shown continuous concern, almost despair at the spectacle come August 1st that we are going back on to the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange for pricing of our grain, bypassing the Wheat Board, bypassing any semblance of orderly marketing.

I have said in this House before and I want to repeat today that the principle behind this whole move is to supply eastern Canada and the eastern Canadian feeders with an unlimited supply of cheap feed grain. This is what is behind the whole thing. There was absolutely no concern expressed when farmers in Saskatchewan were selling feed grains at a cent a pound and bootlegging it through the feed mills, no concern at all. All that was worried about then was that the feeders had cheap feed. Pressure on the Wheat Board to open the boundaries, to let the grain go. Now that we at last have a fair market for grain, then it must be stymied. Surely if there ever was a case of the Liberal Party being finally flushed out into the open it has been during the last few months.

MR. ROLFES: — On the eighth of July they are going to get flushed.

MR. LARSON: — Yes, on the eighth they will get flushed down!

The Member for Moosomin worries about the timing of the plebiscite. I ask him if there could be any better timing? Does he realize that on August 1st this whole deal comes into effect.

Yes, the farmer from Lumsden, he probably will be flushed down the Qu'Appelle River one of these days!

Come August 1st we are going to be faced with the realities of this situation. Then it is going to be too late, the farmers are now being given an opportunity to speak and to speak in a plebiscite that has some meaning to it. Every farmer who holds a permit book is going to have a voice, not just a few who are selected by Otto Lang and cohorts or by the Member for Moosomin . . . This is the difference between the kind of plebiscite that is being organized in Saskatchewan and the one organized . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Doesn't the Member for Lumsden realize that he cannot talk from another seat. He is not only interrupting but talking from a different seat! I am asking for order.

May 10, 1974

MR. LARSON: — Mr. Speaker, coming from him and the mental capacity that he has displayed in this House, you couldn't expect any better. Thanks for reminding him of a few of the very simple and most fundamental rules. You couldn't expect him to know that. He has displayed that kind of ignorance all through the Session.

Then the Member for Moosomin gets snarled up on the Stabilization Bill, just as if that hasn't been debated enough in Saskatchewan, just as if the farmers haven't expressed themselves a number of time what they thought about this Stabilization Bill. Certainly his argument is totally irrelevant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Will the Member put that pipe out!

MR. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Pardon, Mr. Speaker!

MR. LARSON: — A truly regrettable performance by the Liberal Party. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the results of the plebiscite will strengthen the hands of the farm organizations that are in the forefront fighting this battle. It will strengthen the hand of the Provincial Government, knowing that steps we have got to take in order to protect us against the chaos that is going to exist after August 1st. Certainly the wording of the resolution is meaningless, it is absolutely a political gimmick, a political shenanigan that someone along the line in the Liberal Party hopes is going to get them some votes in the federal election. Certainly it is not conducive to any help in the problem and in the fight that is taking place in Saskatchewan at this time.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this Resolution and I urge all Members of the House to turn it down flat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this matter. I want to mention a couple of things that the Member for Pelly brought up. First of all he wonders why the resolution came in at this late date in the Session. Well, it is only two days ago since the Minister announced the plebiscite, so we could hardly put in a Resolution before he made the announcement. That may be too hard for the Member for Pelly to understand, most people can understand that.

The second thing is the old bogey man that the NDP drag out about eastern Canada. I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan that there are more cattle fed, fattened and slaughtered in the province of Alberta than there is in any other province in Canada and has been for some time. I should give them all a copy of the 1974 statistics for every month of the year. There is not one single month that the Province of Alberta didn't lead Canada in slaughtering of fat cattle. I might add that the feed grains policy that was enunciated, while there are two or three things which I personally disagree with, which I will be glad to mention later that the Government of Alberta backed that policy 100 per cent. So the NDP in their narrow parochial political views bring out the old bogey man of east against west. I remind them and the people of Saskatchewan that western Canada now slaughters more cattle and has more interest in feed grains than does eastern Canada. So I hope that that point will be kept in mind.

MR. MEAKES: — There are more voters down there.

MR. WEATHERALD: — Well the Province of Alberta is quite happy with the feed grains policy. I don't know what that has to do with voters. They are very interested in their economy. If you are talking about cheap grain for eastern Canada, Alberta doesn't think so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this Resolution. I do believe that it is extremely unfortunate that the debate is necessary. I want to say that the debate is necessary simply because of the meddlesome nature of the Minister of Agriculture, the NDP is not interested in a fair and rational vote on this subject at all.

The Member for Moosomin very well put forward the political position that the NDP is attempting to take on this crucial matter as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned. The only thing that this NDP Government and the Minister of Agriculture are interested in is political propaganda at government expense that may be to the benefit of the NDP politicians

The feed grains issue has been under discussion for at least nine months when the original proposals for discussion were made. It is interesting to note that any time during that nine-month period we could have taken the vote that has now been suggested. We didn't take a vote. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that if he really wanted to find out what the farmers thought, he should have taken the vote before he announced the Saskatchewan Grain Marketing Commission which he announced last fall. He didn't have a vote before he announced it. I am really surprised that he didn't bother taking a vote before he announced the grain commission, in fact we have a lot of money appropriated for the Saskatchewan Grain Marketing Commission here in this Budget. We didn't have any vote. In fact he announced it last November and just started the whole thing in the ash can himself.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan then began his political manoeuvre with the Feed Marketing Commission which never got off the ground, and he quickly abandoned it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you against the Wheat Board Tom?

MR. WEATHERALD: — No, I am not against the Wheat Board, I'm 100 per cent for the Wheat Board. But I am getting tired of this garbage peddled by the NDP that think that they are the only people in Saskatchewan for the Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, I would have no objection to a fairly presented ballot on the feed grains issue. I mean a fair ballot in which both sides of the issue are presented. This in no way is a fair ballot, it is a loaded ballot on which the Blakeney Government intends to get an answer favorable to its own political position, so it can be announced in the middle of the federal election campaign. It is obvious

May 10, 1974

that that's why it was announced when it was, it is obvious that's why the date of May 24th is on the ballot for its return. This, Mr. Speaker, is a disservice to the agriculture industry and the farmers of Saskatchewan. No farmer in this province will be fooled by such a crass political move by the Blakeney Government at the expense of our taxpayers of our province.

Let's look at the record of this Minister of Agriculture. We had such nonsensical things as The Family Farm Protection Act brought in that put the bad debts part of it right on the back of a credit union and the small implement dealer. We had a Foreign Ownership Bill brought in here, Mr. Speaker, that the Government quickly abandoned, a foreign ownership bill saying non-resident Canadian owners were foreigners, then saying it wasn't a Bill, although it said Bill right on the front, certainly it wasn't a White Paper.

Mr. Speaker, then we had the successful attempt to sabotage the Grain Stabilization Bill that cost the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars because the Federal Government would have put up \$4 for every \$2 that the farmers of Saskatchewan did. This was largely done because of the Assiniboia by-election to be able to help the NDP politicians to try and get elected. Then the Minister of Agriculture interfered in the rapeseed vote which was a fair vote in which the people that carried it out presented both sides of the case and certainly in all respects the information was good provided both sides and the vote was in a very fair and rational manner.

MR. LARSON: — How come I didn't get a vote?

MR. WEATHERALD: — Well, I think you are likely retired anyway, so you shouldn't! I doubt very much if you are an active farmer any more.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had the final act of all, when we had the promise of The Natural Products Marketing Act which had provided for farmers in this country to have a vote, to have a marketing commission and the Government, of course, the NDP, took that vote away and instituted the Hog Marketing Commission at their own will.

The record of this Government is one of bungling and inconsistency in agriculture. It is also guilty of political involvement at every conceivable opportunity.

Farmers in Saskatchewan, I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, are sick and tired of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Blakeney Government's attempt to interject NDP politics into every conceivable discussion on agricultural policy that takes place in agriculture. The farmers of Saskatchewan, I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, deserve a much better fate.

What is the intention of this loaded ballot paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan but an attempt for the aggrandizement of the NDP candidates? Firstly, Mr. Speaker, there is no attempt to provide a fair and honest ballot which we would support. Secondly, there is no attempt to give a fair and honest explanation of the issues involved, as there was during the rapeseed vote.

What are the issues involved, Mr. Speaker? Well, I should like to read what issues are involved from the Report on Farming, November 24, 1973. I'm not going to read the whole article but I am going to read part of it. It is written by the Financial Editor of the Free Press Weekly. I think it would be good for the Members opposite to listen to the article, in fact, I'll even give them a few extra copies if they want me to.

The recent decision of the United Grain Growers' delegates favoring an open market set up for the marketing and selling of domestic feed grains has driven a sizeable wedge in the argument that such a policy runs contrary to the interest of prairie producers. Sam Uskiw and Jack Messer, respectively, Ministers of Agriculture for Manitoba and Saskatchewan, totally oppose the concept of free marketing and are fighting tooth and nail with the Federal Government's Feed Grains Policy, which agriculture industry authorities expect will eventually throw domestic feed grains on the open market.

Farm organizations also against the long-term feed grains plan are the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and its counterparts in Manitoba and Alberta, which generally toe the line, and the National Farmers Union which is politically aligned to the philosophy of Mr. Uskiw and Mr. Messer.

However, any possibility of major western farm organizations putting up anything vaguely resembling a united front to the Feed Grains Policy was completely shattered at the annual meeting of the United Grain Growers in Edmonton. Without one single vote of dissent delegates in passing a resolution calling on Ottawa to allow prairie producers to sell onboard grains anywhere in Canada have in effect been endorsed. If anything in the decision is spotlighted once more the inability of Canadian agriculture organizations to come up with a system for the marketing and selling of feed grains acceptable to the nation as a whole. They are deadlocked as ever over the issue.

Only last December the Canadian Federation of Agriculture the debating arena of farm politics and policies, confessed it couldn't arrive at a compromise agreement following a lengthy dialogue, which involved farm groups involving every aspect of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say that on the one hand we have the three prairie Pools, the National Farmers Union, along with some few civil servants in the Wheat Board, dead set against any policy that looks towards an open market. On the other hand there are those who are supporting an open market of the kind that may be introduced — those supporting are: United Grain Growers, Palliser Wheat Growers, Canadian Cattlemen's Association and various provincial livestock groups, Unifarm which is the largest farm organization in Alberta, and the Alberta Government, which completely rejected the stand of the Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I have read that is to indicate to you, that this issue has many advocates on both sides. It's obvious that the line-up for or against the open marketing of domestic feed grain (which I might say will involve only 10 per cent of the feed grains produced in our country), is the

May 10, 1974

National Farmers Union, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta Pools for the suggestion of the open marketing system, for domestic marketing, are the United Grain Growers, Palliser Wheat Growers, Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association, Unifarm Alberta, which is one farm organization in that province, and the Alberta Government, which I think is of great significance because they are the No. 1 cattle producers in our country. The Alberta Government completely rejects the stand of the Governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Undecided, because they were unable to come up with a legitimate solution or one that they thought would be satisfactory was the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of support for both sides of the feed grain marketing suggestions. It is for this very reason that farmers who belong to all of these organizations will heartily resent (and I say that sincerely), they will heartily resent the obvious attempts of the NDP in this province to make it a strictly partisan political issue. Those farmers who oppose this intrusion by Mr. Messer and the Blakeney Government into their affairs, should, I suggest, destroy their ballots. I call on them to do so, and show once and for all that they do not want this constant political intrusion into their affairs. Mr. Speaker, simply by not returning their ballots they can illustrate to the NDP politicians that farmers are only interested in a fair and honest ballot with honest options when they vote.

Mr. Speaker, people that don't return their ballots can show that they are interested in a fair and honest ballot, with honest information presented for both sides of the question when they vote.

Mr. Speaker, the feed grain marketing system is important and it deserves, I suggest, a more honest, intelligent approach than this Government opposite is apparently willing to give them. I have no doubt farmers will protest with great strength by not voting on this plebiscite, which is obviously nothing more than a political manoeuvre.

Having said those few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I personally, and I know Mr. Lang personally supports the Canadian Wheat Board to the fullest extent. I think that the past record is proof enough. I would suggest that I feel that the plan that is presently put forward should have a couple of changes made in it and I hope that this will be done. I would suggest that the plan presented should, if it went forward . . .

MR. ROLFES: — . . . tell us!

MR. WEATHERALD: — Oh, I'll tell you if you'll just sit tight. I don't suppose the Member for Saskatoon knows a row of radishes from a barley field.

First of all I would suggest that if the present system of open marketing for domestic grain, if it does go forward, I say 'if' because it is still under discussion by all farm groups in our province until the date of August 1st . . .

MR. MESSER: — It is not!

MR. WEATHERALD: — It is so, it is so. It is under discussion and you know it!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. WEATHERALD: — There's no final announcement made and it's still under discussion and he knows it!

The point is, what I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that the plan is not yet in effect and that in itself is proof enough that it is still under discussion. The plan is not in effect and it won't be for some time. I want to suggest two changes that I think should be made if that plan goes into effect. If there is an open market (I say, if the plan goes into effect, because I still say that the plan is under some discussion amongst the farm organizations) if it goes into effect there should be a quota system applied to the domestic marketing of grain — there should be a quota applied to that as my colleague the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) suggested.

I want to make a second suggestion. The grain that is traded on the open market which applies only to our domestic production, that we must have also a guaranteed minimum floor price which producers will know the grain cannot fall below. While the grain to be traded if we had it on the quota system and we also add in the guaranteed price which producers will know, the grain cannot fall below that price, I think that that will largely overcome most of the objections. I hope that those two suggestions are noted by farm organizations in the discussions in the next month and a half because I know that the plan is not final, it is not in operation and the plan is still very much under discussion by farm organizations all over the Province of Saskatchewan.

I just want to make it clear that we have put this on the Order Paper today simply because we couldn't get it there any faster, the Minister only announced the plebiscite three days ago. We want to voice our very strong objection to the obvious attempt by this Government to make absolutely nothing more than political mileage out of an issue that has many supporters on both sides of it and deserves a lot of serious consideration not in the political atmosphere of a federal election.

I think that the obvious attempt by the Minister to try and make it a partisan political issue when it deserves much more rational discussion is a condemnation of this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, this Legislature has been sitting 69 days for this Session now, and during all of those days I have not seen or can recall such an attempt to talk about unrelated issues as have the Members of the Opposition in regard to the Motion that they have put on the Order Paper and the decision of the Province of Saskatchewan to conduct a plebiscite in regard to the orderly marketing of feed grains in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but go back when I see the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) trying to talk about everything but the issue, go back to the days of the task force, the Federal Task Force on Agriculture, that task force which was implemented and endorsed and promoted by the Federal Government and the

Minister who is now responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. That task force recommended fewer farmers for Saskatchewan, move them off the farms and move them into urban centres and put them on welfare so they can get rid of those people in agriculture. That task force that recommended the open market system for grain and the discontinuation of the Canadian Wheat Board, for their orderly marketing system. I can't help but remember as a Member of the Opposition sitting where the now Member for Morse is sitting (Mr. Wiebe), how the Government of the day, those Members who are now sitting your left, Mr. Speaker, who wanted to avoid that issue. Talk about everything but the Federal Task Force on Agriculture, and we see them trying to do the same thing now because we know that they, as their Federal counterparts have indicated, are for the task force proposals and they are against orderly marketing. They are against the continuation of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Moosomin says it's strange that we would want to conduct a plebiscite at this time and he lists a number of reasons why he thinks it's strange. We introduced the Hog Marketing Commission and we didn't have a plebiscite. We didn't have a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, because we had endorsement from a good many farm organizations in regard to that Hog Marketing Commission, endorsement from farm organizations that don't endorse the Federal Feed Grains Policy, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Wheat Board endorsed that Commission, as did the Federation of Agriculture, as did the National Farmers Union, and even a large percentage (in fact the majority) of the members of the various commodity groups in Saskatchewan including the Saskatchewan Hog Breeders and the Hog Producers Organization in the province.

But, okay, they decided that wasn't good enough. We debated it in this Legislature, there was dialogue with not only the producers but the organizations in the province as to what that Commission would do and they said that wasn't good enough — they in fact implemented a plebiscite of their own by using some of the members who had broken away from the Hog Producers Association, they had a plebiscite, they had a full-page ad in the back of the Western Producer. The results of that plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, were that about 2 per cent of the hog producers in the province said they didn't want a commission. That was what the results of it were, in fact, we were then acting on the recommendations of most of the producers in the province.

He goes on to say, why don't we have a plebiscite in relation to the Land Bank? Well, governments bring in programs and policies at various times during their political careers and there's no legitimate reason why we should have plebiscites in regard to such programs as the Land Bank. The Land Bank is purely a voluntary program when it relates to either the seller or the lessee of the land and hence no real reason to have a plebiscite. Those arguments are totally unrelated to the question that we should be turning our minds to this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Member for Moosomin said that the feed grains issue is not new. That's about the only thing that I can really agree on with him in regard to the remarks that he addressed to the Legislature a few moments ago. He says that we have deliberately, that we have deliberately chosen this time to hold the plebiscite in regard to the feed grains question. He said we have done it so that the farmers will not be able to

scrutinize the ballot, they won't have the time to really relate to the questions on the ballot. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that every farmer in Saskatchewan knows where he stands on that feed grains question. It has been debated for a long time and he is most frustrated that the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in the Federal Government does not listen to his pleas to change that proposed policy and he doesn't need a great deal of time to consider what his vote is going to be and what he is going to vote for. He goes on to say that we haven't really expressed or taken the time to advocate both sides of the issue. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the ad on the back of the Western Producer is most straightforward. It's analytical, it's factual and it has three, I think, very simple and direct questions in regard to the matter. Answering those questions, I think, will give a good deal of advice to those people who will ultimately have to be responsible for the implementation of this program.

Mr. Speaker, they made some remarks in regard to the Stabilization Bill — no relevance to this particular motion, but I feel that I should reply to the remarks of the Member for Moosomin.

He says he can't envisage, in fact he questions how any NDP politician can go into a farmer's yard and advocate the policies of the New Democratic Party and ask for his support, when we stood several years ago four-square against the implementation of the Stabilization Plan, the plan that lost \$200 million for prairie farmers. That's utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and he knows it. Utter nonsense. By opposing that plan we hope that we have got a better stabilization plan in regard to grains that are produced in Canada. We haven't got the mechanics or the details of the plan that was announced a week or so ago, but from the information that we could get from the Press it is certainly a much mended and much better plan than was being advocated several short years ago.

But I want to ask the Member for Moosomin, Mr. Speaker, and the Members who sit to your left, how can they go into a farmer's yard? How can their candidates go into farmers' yards and ask that those farmers support them in the forthcoming federal election, when they and their counterparts in Ottawa introduced a program called LIFT (Lower Inventories for Tomorrow)? They say that our opposition to the Stabilization Plan cost farmers \$200 million. I ask them, how much did they cost the farmers of Saskatchewan by forcing them not to grow grain because they would not be able to sell it unless they had summerfallow acreage? How can the Members of that Party solicit the support from farmers in Saskatchewan when it cost them not \$200 million, but much, much more than that, Mr. Speaker? The advocates of LIFT, the advocates of the Task Force and the advocates of the destruction of orderly marketing of not only grains but all agricultural commodities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go into some detail of the feed grains proposal, the long-term plan that is expected to be announced in the not too distant future, and I just want for the Member for Cannington's information to bring to his attention an article that was in the Leader-Post of Wednesday, May 1st, where Mr. Lang has said that he will be announcing the plan prior to August 1st, and I believe the Member for Cannington was precise in saying that there would be no announcement before that.

May 10, 1974

MR. WEATHERALD: — I didn't say that.

MR. MESSER: — Yes you did.

MR. WEATHERALD: — I said the thing was not finalized, if you were listening.

MR. MESSER: — If the thing is not finalized, Mr. Speaker, then I should like to know why the Federal Government is announcing a proposal that is not yet been finalized, it's an impossibility because they are certainly going to have some mechanics to put into place. The article in the Leader-Post says, and I want to quote:

A new feed grains policy will be announced in a few weeks Otto Lang, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board said in the Commons, Tuesday. He said that in reply to a question from one of the Members in the House of Commons.

I advocate, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that Otto Lang has already decided what that feed grains plan is going to be. He is not interested in consultation and any consultation that's going to take place is going to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, that leads us to what is the question that we should be considering here. What really is the question? It's much more than this bogus motion that the Members to your left put on the paper, it's much more than what the ballots are asking for, those that are on the back page of the Western Producer that they make reference to today. It's the question of orderly marketing. And they are trying by every devious means that they can to make available to them, to try and convince farmers that they are not against orderly marketing, when I know and I am sure the majority of Saskatchewan farmers know that they are. And their actions certainly speak for that.

The way they conducted the rapeseed as the Member for Pelly brought to the attention of the Legislature, the way they have chosen not to respond to the pleas of not only individual farmers but also major farm organization in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I could give a good deal of history leading up to the seriousness of the situation today. Mr. Lang announced, I believe, on or about August 30, 1973, that there was going to be a new feed grains system of marketing for Canada. And there were attempts to have some negotiations and consultation in regard to that program. Certainly the Government of Saskatchewan and I, myself, as Minister of Agriculture had on some occasions an opportunity to talk to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Lang. But at every one of those meetings it was clearly evident, Mr. Speaker, that they weren't willing to listen to proposals that we were advocating.

I think that is why in the more recent months, the farm organizations have tried in a most impressive way to bring to the attention of the Federal Government their opposition to the feed grains proposal. In fact, in November of 1973, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool annual meeting totally, totally, Mr. Speaker, rejected the federal proposals and recommended full Wheat Board authority for feed grains marketing. The Federal Government,

Mr. Speaker, chose not to listen to nor to heed that advice. I say, Mr. Speaker, another nail in the coffin of the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing.

In December of 1973, the National Farmers Union meeting in Winnipeg, their national meeting, rejected the federal proposals and asked for full Wheat Board authority. Again, Mr. Speaker, a major farm organization asking and directing the Federal Government to change their attitude in regard to the feed grains proposals, again it fell on deaf ears. In January of 1974 at a Western Agricultural Conference composed of the Federations of Agriculture in the three prairie province and representing over 90 per cent of the grain producers in those provinces rejected again the federal proposals and asked that the Wheat Board marketing system be retained and again it fell on deaf ears, and again another nail was added to the coffin of the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing.

More recently, Mr. Speaker, on January 30th, the Federal and Provincial Ministers of Agriculture met in Ottawa with both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. And we outlined our provincial positions again, again they fell on deaf ears.

On April 17, 1974, because the time was, I felt too soon approaching when the policy would be announced and would come into effect, I held a meeting with representation from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the National Farmers Union in regard to whether a plebiscite would be a course that should be given consideration. From that meeting a decision was made that a plebiscite would be an alternative, a means of indicating to the Federal Government once and for all whether or not the Saskatchewan farmers were for the proposed federal feed grains proposals.

On April 18th, I sent a Telex to Mr. Lang proposing the plebiscite and asking that a meeting take place so that we would be able to convey to him why we wanted a plebiscite and what the questions on that ballot should be. Again, on April 22nd, I sent another telegram because I had not received a response from Mr. Lang, again on April 26th, I sent another telegram asking for a meeting and giving him the information in regard to our feelings in relation to a plebiscite, again I did not receive an answer until April 30th. At that time we had agreed to go ahead with the plebiscite because it seemed that the Federal Government and especially the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board was not interested in involving himself or with the results of a plebiscite.

I might also, Mr. Speaker, bring to your attention a number of other meetings that clearly indicated that there should be some other policy than the present policy brought into effect in regard to feed grains. At the Western Economic Opportunities Conference at Calgary, it was expressed by all four provinces that there should be a different proposal in regard to the marketing and handling of feed grains in Canada.

It was strange that the Federal Government said that they would consider those proposals, but it was only a matter of a few short weeks, ten days after that, that the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board announced the Interim feed grain proposal and said he would be announcing at a later date the long-term feed grains proposal, giving further indication,

May 10, 1974

Mr. Speaker, that they were not interested in the recommendations that were coming from western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the Members have tried to insinuate that the ballot is in fact a confusing one. Mr. Speaker, I take some exception to that because I think the ballot with the three questions couldn't be simpler. It is designed to not only give to them in a condensed form some factual information in regard to what will happen if the Wheat Board is no longer responsible for the marketing of Canadian feed grains. And it is simply asking that they express their opinion. Those three questions, the first one asking whether they want to continue to market their oats and barley and feed wheat through the Canadian Wheat Board, I think could not be simpler put. Because it is simply asking them whether or not they want to continue the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board as they were prior to the interim feed grains plan.

The second is, if the Federal Government chooses not to follow the orderly marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board, we want to know whether they would be in favor of a provincial agency co-operating with what remaining powers the Canadian Wheat Board has to retain orderly marketing in Saskatchewan.

The third is, if the Federal Government goes ahead and removes the power of quotas and of prices from the Canadian Wheat Board, if the domestic market for feed grains is taken away from the Canadian Wheat Board, do they want their grains priced on the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange?

Mr. Speaker, those are three simple questions which I am sure every grain farmer in Saskatchewan can relate to and I am certain that he will exercise his vote in expressing which kind of a system he wants operating in Saskatchewan. And I think it is deplorable that the Member for Cannington has the audacity to say in this Legislature that he recommends those farmers to destroy their ballots rather than to vote. I think it is a further indication, Mr. Speaker, that provincial Members of the Liberal Party are attempting to distort what the farmers' feelings are in regard to the orderly marketing system so that they can have their federal counterparts remove the orderly marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, a few more words in regard especially to the remarks that the Member for Moosomin made. He says there are some things wrong with the federal proposal, as does the Member for Cannington and they have a great deal of faith in Mr. Lang, changing his mind which he certainly hasn't given any indication of doing, at least at this time. And the Member for Moosomin after saying that there were some problems said that there was going to be — he would hope that there would be — a quota system attached to the movement of feed grains and even though the Canadian Wheat Board is not responsible for that. I don't know who is really going to be able to administer a quota system when the Canadian Wheat Board is not there. But I want to bring to his attention — I am sorry he is not here in his chair, but at least to the attention of the two Members who are to your left, Mr. Speaker, two items out of a document of March 1st, which emanated from the Federal Government. No doubt it is only a draft of the domestic feed grains marketing principles and operational details.

They are saying at this time and it is a current document,

Mr. Speaker, and they say and I want to quote two sections from it, under Operational Details:

(d) There will be no quota on feed grain delivered in the Canadian Wheat Board designated area for the domestic feed grain market.

They again say under the Operational Details:

(a) Western feed grains sold on a commercial basis for the domestic feed market will not be subject to quotas and may be bought and sold freely.

Mr. Speaker, I think, again ample evidence that they would want wherever possible to disrupt the orderly marketing system. I don't think I have to tell Members of this Legislature what happens when we don't have a quota system in Saskatchewan. It simply means that a good percentage, unfortunately a very large percentage of farmers will be cut off from being able to deliver their grain because there will be bottlenecks at the elevators where those people who are closest to it have plugged the facilities and in fact a good many producers could well be in a situation of not being able to deliver any large quantities of grain at all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close on one other issue which relates to why we need to have this plebiscite.

For those Members who are not really well informed in regard to the marketing system that pertains to marketing of grain, interprovincially, and intraprovincially, there was an Act passed in 1949 entitled, The Saskatchewan Grains Marketing Control Act. Now that Act was passed in order to place feed grain marketing under the Canadian Wheat board. That Act in 1949 was passed at the request of not only the producer in Saskatchewan but the Federal Government. Both parties requested that the province bring forward a Bill that would provide for Saskatchewan grain marketing. It was needed because feed grain marketing is under the constitution not only as a provincial jurisdiction or responsibility, but also a federal responsibility so that it is a joint federal-provincial responsibility. The Act stipulates and I want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, stipulates that feed grains may only be sold by a farmer to one of two parties; (1) to another farmer, and (2) to the Canadian Wheat Board. Under that Act which was asked for by farmers in Saskatchewan and by the Federal Government, there are only two parties whom a farmer can sell to legally. One is to another farmer, the other is to the Canadian Wheat Board. The section of that Act that makes it very clear is Section 4, which says and I want to quote:

(1) Which prohibits anyone from selling grain to a person other than the Canadian Wheat Board and which prevents anyone other than the Canadian Wheat Board from purchasing grain; and

(2) Which exempts transactions between farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the federal proposal, if it is implemented, requires the repeal or amendment of The Saskatchewan Grain Marketing Control Act. If it doesn't then farmers who are selling feed grain in the commercial channels would be in contravention of the Act as would anyone who is purchasing. So that they

May 10, 1974

are now making a proposal without ever consulting the Saskatchewan Government that would not only make it illegal for farmers to sell, but also make it illegal for those who are purchasing grain in Saskatchewan if they are not resident farmers or if it is not the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is deplorable that the Federal Government would at one time ask us to pass legislation which would enhance their operations or at least the operations of an agency which they were directly responsible for, and then on the other hand turn around and pass legislation or implement policy without giving the provinces an opportunity to consider whether or not the producers which the provinces are responsible for really want that kind of situation.

As a result feed grain marketing is then a totally provincial matter, all feed grains that are marketed within the province, not only constitutionally but operationally as well. The Provincial Government in my mind and I believe in the minds of farmers, Mr. Speaker, has a right to determine what producers want prior to our repealing or amending The Grain Marketing Control Act as well as prior to taking any other action on the feed grains marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the most important reason that we, at this time, saw the necessity for a plebiscite. Because it is going to be up to us if we want to see that kind of feed grain marketing take place, it is up to us whether we want to take action and prosecute not only farmers but purchasers of feed grains or whether we are going to amend the Act. Before we can do that, we say that we should have some indication from farmers in regard to whether they want the Canadian Wheat Board to continue to do it, or whether they want a provincial agency in the absence of the Canadian Wheat Board to be responsible for quotas and for pricing and for pooling of feed grains.

Mr. Speaker, when the Members opposite say that they suspect I know what the outcome of that ballot is going to be, my answer is, Yes, I believe I do know. I am proud of the fact that I do know, because I have got faith in Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Faith that they do stand four square for the Canadian Wheat Board and for the orderly marketing system. We have stressed that at every opportunity that we have had. Whenever we talked to a Minister of the Federal Government, when the administrative staff in my department talked about the proposed feed grains policy with administrators at the federal level, we at every opportunity advocated that the point of view of Saskatchewan farmers was that we want the continuation of the orderly marketing system. But up to this time, after nearly a year of debate, after nearly a year of confrontation, the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board who as a Saskatchewan Member — hard to believe — has chosen not to heed or take the direction of Saskatchewan farmers. He has chosen, Mr. Speaker, to sell the farmer short, to destroy the Wheat Board and to destroy orderly marketing of feed grains in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — That, Mr. Speaker, is why we've got this ballot. And I make no apologies for it coming now. We acted now because it was obvious from the press item I just referred to a few minutes ago that Mr. Lang is going to announce and put the policy into effect. And we are saying as a last resort, we are going to have a plebiscite in Saskatchewan, so Saskatchewan farmers can tell you, we don't want your feed grains plan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — . . . We want the Canadian Wheat Board to have its powers broadened and to continue to be responsible for the selling and the moving and the pooling of our grains in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, say that this is a perfectly legitimate endeavor of the Province of Saskatchewan and if it happens to come at a federal election, that is well and fine. And if it happens to be a major point of discussion in that election, that is even better because I am . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — . . . certain that when those ballots are counted on July 8th, the Federal Government again is going to be told by the farmers of Saskatchewan, we don't like your attitudes in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — We should like to have some recognition and we are sick and tired of you catering to the central areas of Canada where the majority of support is for you . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — . . . at the expense of us in western Canada where our population is not as great. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to close in saying that I want every Member of this Legislative Assembly to oppose the motion that is on the Order Paper now and stand up and be counted whether they are for orderly marketing or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is good to hear the Minister of Agriculture getting wound up and getting warmed up and kicking off the campaign. There is going to be a vote all right. There is going to be a vote, I think it is July 8th or 9th. The Minister wants to run a little preamble. He got busy and drafted a full page ad, and I presume this appears on a dozen other farm papers, so he is going to get in there with his little political gimmick before the actual vote that counts comes along.

It is very interesting to hear this Minister get up now so

concerned about polling the feed grain producers. Where was he a year ago, where was he went the hog producers were faced with a commission being rammed at them, with a compulsory marketing scheme? Where was he with his vote then, Mr. Speaker? He made a totally different kind of speech at that time. But here all of a sudden an area that is not under his direct jurisdiction he is going to conduct a poll, even though the marketing scheme is not under provincial jurisdiction, it's outside of his jurisdiction. Albeit, I know he is involved and he should be. But when the ball was right in his own court for him to decide he chose not to have a vote. He says some of the producer organizations backed him. A lot of the producers themselves didn't and he knows that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province have a lot more intelligence and are a lot better informed than the NDP opposite ever give them credit for. They've watched this Minister and this Government opposite in power now for a couple or three years, they know their record in agriculture in Saskatchewan. The so-called Family Farm Protection Act, they know it was balderdash then, it has been ever since. They know their foreign ownership moves and the phony little Bill that was passed here earlier today, with a great deal of fanfare, that it really comes down to nothing when we get at the Bill. They know that this was the Minister who closed down the irrigation at Outlook. They know that this is the same Minister who over the last 10 or 12 months has expressed no concern publicly whatever for the plight of the livestock industry, the cattle industry particularly in this province, so they know the NDP record. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province know the NDP record of false claims that they've made against Otto Lang and the Federal Government, they know that too.

Remember that claim about the two-thirds of the farmers, that that was a Federal Otto Lang policy, what a bunch of nonsense. It was a Task Force report something like the dozens of reports this Government has prepared for it, something like the programs and the reports they have prepared. It was never implemented, it was nonsense in the first place, and the farmers know of course, that the great Task Force speeches were nothing but baloney then.

Okay, their Income Stabilization Program, the Income Stabilization Program, introduced a year or two ago which the Members opposite, I must say, effectively politically made use of, but the farmers since know better, they realized what they would have gained, and realized that what the NDP told them were lies then.

The third little item we've had — the Minister and his staff and his Deputy I think it was, I forget whether it was his Deputy or not, his Deputy to begin with walked out, walked out of the Winnipeg meeting to discuss and consult on the feed grains issue. There's one kind of consultation that this Government likes to do, Mr. Speaker, there's only one kind of consultation and that is . . .

MR. MESSER: — On a Point of Privilege. The Member is accusing an individual who does not have the right to answer himself in this Legislature. His walking out of a meeting was later by the Press reported to be an error by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of Canada, who said that there was no walking out of any meeting and it was the Minister, Otto Lang who was in error in that regard.

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, the people know different, the farmers know different and there's no doubt that he walked out of that meeting and there's no doubt that this Government never did try to get together with the Federal Government and develop a feed grains policy and they never did try. Consultation as far as they are concerned means sit down with us and do exactly what we want you to do, what we tell you to do. That's their version of consultation.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, — and farmers will remember — I recall myself, last fall in August or thereabouts, this Minister opposite claiming that the new interim feed grains policy, the APB, being a cheap feed grains policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's right.

MR. McISAAC: — Well, just let them talk to any cattlemen or any hog producer who has bought barley all winter at \$2 and something or \$2.40 or \$2.50 or whatever it is and yet this Minister tried to say that that was going to be a cheap feed grains policy. Well, I'll tell you it wasn't and all he has to do is go out to his area and all these other Members have to do is go out and ask some of their farmers and apparently they haven't . . .

MR. MESSER: — . . . One scrap of evidence!

MR. McISAAC: — Lots of scraps of evidence. You can dig up a pressing clipping, no problem.

They made the charge that this federal policy, the interim policy on the new proposed policy was a policy for cheap grain for Quebec and eastern Canada. We've heard them make that charge. Mind you we've seen that anti-Quebec, anti-Canadian kind of sentiment and divisive policies express too often, expressed too often, from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in this province today, they know very well what Otto Lang has done for them over the years. They know very well and they trust Otto Lang, they trust Otto Lang, they know very well he's not going to harm or jeopardize the Wheat Board. On the contrary any move he makes will strengthen it. They know that. And, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this coming election will prove that the farmers know Jack Messer and the NDP and they don't trust them any more, they don't trust them any more. This old approach of destroy and wreck and tear down of theirs, isn't going to work, it isn't going to work any longer. The Task Force Report wasn't implemented, the Wheat Board has been strengthened and streamlined and vastly improved under Otto Lang and it will be even more so and they know that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one has to conclude and one has to think David Lewis, who last week forced this country into an election, forced this country into a vote, phoned up quickly to Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Messer, the Saskatchewan NDP and said, fellows we've got to think of an issue in a hurry. I didn't really mean to get back into this corner that I'm in, but it looks as if we're going to have to have an election. And of course, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, David Lewis and the Conservatives, as somebody said, a rather ungracious looking team, did go together and are sending the people of this country to the polls for an election that nobody wants.

May 10, 1974

So the NDP in Saskatchewan along with David Lewis and a few of his cohorts here had to think of an issue. So what better kind of issue could they dredge up than this old fear of destroying the Wheat Board. We'll tell them Otto Lang and the Liberals are going to destroy the Wheat Board. It makes a great story, we've used it for thirty years. We'll keep on using it. And also of course, what's not new with the NDP they said, we'll try and tear down and destroy Otto Lang. We've had a few trial runs at that before, so that shouldn't be too difficult to work on that. And this is what they are trying to do. There are the two moves.

Somebody mentioned the LIFT Program, somebody opposite, I forget who it was, whether it was the Minister or the other Member who left. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you and the Members opposite something about the LIFT Program. When this campaign is over, it will be the campaign that lifted the NDP right out of office across this country. They'll be reduced federally, they'll be reduced in Saskatchewan and there's no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, there's just no doubt about it!

To talk about orderly marketing of feed grains, there is absolutely no doubt that much more orderly marketing of feed grains will take place under any new policy, than has been the case over the last 10 or 15 years in this province. We know the kind of disorderly marketing that's been going on, 25-35 cent wheat a few years ago, when you could get 60 cents over in Alberta for it, two miles away, this kind of thing. And the Members opposite continue to talk about orderly marketing as though we've had orderly marketing for all these years in the feed grains, we haven't and they know. And as I say, any plan, any plan in the future to be announced in the next short while, is bound to improve and increase orderly marketing.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I have to think that Members opposite have no recognition of the fact that television, radio and mass media generally have resulted in the farmers today, being much better informed, much more knowledgeable than when they hark back to those old '30s speeches and this kind of thing, this fear for the Wheat Board. They'll recognize this ballot for the cheap little political trick that it is and the real vote will come on July 8.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one point. The Minister got up on a Point of Order and talked about his delegation at the Conference. I'd like to quote to him from the Winnipeg Tribune, August 17, 1973, which says:

The meeting of western agriculture spokesmen and the Federal Government was little more than an hour old when Mr. Uskiw accompanied by the Saskatchewan delegation walked out.

And it goes on to say Mr. McArthur's comments.

Mr. McArthur added, there wasn't much point in pursuing the matter so we left.

Now this indicates again that the Minister just doesn't know what went on at that Conference, his own Deputy Minister is

quoted in quotation marks as saying that there wasn't much use in staying so he left.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention a word or two about some comments in the debate. I was surprised some of the younger farm Members didn't get up in the debate. It's too bad that some of the old politicians who are living in the past have to carry the ball for them over there. They talk about orderly marketing and so on, what happened back in the '30s, the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson) gets up — it's rather pathetic really to hear the way he goes on. He doesn't really understand the problem, or know anything about it, but he does say we're going to destroy orderly marketing and the Wheat Board and he's living back in the 1930s and it's just an unfortunate situation. The Government does have sharp, young farm Members over there with a little imagination and I had expected that some of those Members would get up and give us their opinion on this particular Resolution.

A couple of the Members, including the Minister, also mentioned LIFT and I must say a word about this because it's an indication of the Members over there, their attitude toward business in general. They don't realize that as long as there is surplus as we had — we had a surplus of wheat for 20 years — if you've got a surplus you've got a low price and this is what we had for a number of years. If you have a shortage of something, you're going to get a higher price. Why are we getting \$5 wheat now? We are getting \$5 wheat because there is a shortage. And why is there a shortage, it's because we cut down in production and had LIFT for one year and we're now getting \$5 wheat. And for some reason or another, the Members over there just can't seem to understand this at all, they can't understand why you cut down your production for a year or two, get rid of the surplus and the prices goes up. This happens all over the world, it's happened again here, they talk about LIFT and they don't realize that the farmer is enjoying \$5 wheat now simply because there was a reduction in the surplus. We cut down on our production for a year and now we have this much higher price and much better situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I just want to say that again it's unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture and his cohorts are interfering with the good prices that the farmers are now getting for feed grain. We don't want to see the good prices destroyed as the Stabilization Plan was destroyed, we don't want to end up selling barley, three for a dollar again., we don't want the Provincial Government to start meddling in the feed grains situation because the farmers are satisfied with the prices they are getting now, they are happy with the situation as it is. Individual, provincial governments meddling in the feed grains situation can only be detrimental and we regret that they found it necessary to take this political action just before a federal election to get a very serious situation involved in a political campaign and it is obvious this is what they are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on division.

SECOND READINGS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 134 — **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in Bill 134, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, are consequential upon the adoption by this Legislature of Bill 133, The Representation Act, 1974 — that great Bill. Bill 134 repeals the existing Section 2 and Schedule I of The Legislative Assembly Act, which respectively provides for 60 Members in the Assembly and described the constituencies of those 60 Members, will now be 61.

Bill 133, The Representation Act, sets the number of 61 and redefines the boundaries. It is proposed that Bills 133 and 134 become concurrently effective.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 134.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 135 — **An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with MLAs' Superannuation Act and the specific amendments deal basically with four approaches. To increase the allowances payable to persons who cease to be Members on or after July 1, 1974; to increase the allowance payable to a person who becomes a widow of a Member on or after July 1, 1974; to provide an additional allowance to those persons currently in receipt of pensions from the fund and to avoid the duplication of contributions by the Minister of Finance. I'd like to deal with these specifically just very briefly and I hope that we shall get into the details of course, on the third reading. I want to warn you in advance that there will be some amendments in third reading, simply because this draft had to be made very quickly and the staff was under a lot of pressure in relation to drafting this Bill.

With respect to the first item to increase the allowances payable to persons who cease to be Members on or after July 1, 1974, I don't think I need to say much. Obviously this will increase the demands on the fund and you will find a little later on in the Bill provisions for increasing the percentage paid by Members to meet these costs. The same would apply with respect to the second item.

I want to say a word or two with respect to the additional allowance to those persons currently in receipt of an allowance. It is obvious that there is great need here and I think generally perhaps Members aren't aware of how small some of the pensions are being paid to MLAs currently. Without divulging any names or giving away any confidentiality with respect to them, I had a look through the list here and I find the Member who has the lowest monthly payment to him at the present time, has a pension of \$110.60 a month and yet that person served 19 sessions in this Legislative Assembly. The lowest person on the scale, that's out of 33 persons, the lowest person on the scale in relation to widows, and you are aware of the fact that widows

get 50 per cent of the pension payable to the Member, the allowance payable to Members is \$33.60. Yet the widow of that individual Member, that Member had served 14 sessions in this House.

So I think Members will agree that there is need to do something in terms of the rising cost of living and the inflationary impact on Members currently now on pension.

The last item I want to mention is simply this one to avoid duplication of contributions by the Minister of Finance, that is a minimal amount, not a very important section except that perhaps we didn't realize it was really happening. What has happened up to now is where one who was a Member of the House, has made contributions, they've been matched by the Treasury of the province. When he terminated his stay in the House with the consent of the majority of his electors he immediately was paid this sum of money that he had paid into the fund. When he came back to the House or if he came back to the House, a number of Members have done that, came back to the House when he had the right to elect to repay the contributions and earnings that had been withdrawn plus an accrual of interest over that period of time. A number of Members did that and when they did it, the Treasury matched it the second round, the second time and since the first amount of money had remained in the fund it was really a duplication and this amendment will take out that particular section.

I mentioned previously that Members realize that these increased costs must be paid for in order to eliminate or prevent the possibility of a debt balance in the fund. It is proposed that the levy, the 7 per cent levy be increased to 9 per cent of each MLA's indemnity.

There is no change with respect to the money paid to people who are members of the Executive Council, the Leader of the Opposition, the Government Whip, the Opposition Whip, Legislative Secretaries, the Speaker, or Deputy Speaker, because the formula remains the same for the contributions that they must make on the salaries they receive. The only change occurs at the Member level.

I might mention one or two other things in the Bill. Reduction of eligibility for pension from age 55 to age 50 with actuarial reduction. We have had some cases in the past of Members who had served for a fair length of time in the House, I believe one case as much as 28 sessions. The person was out of the House but still couldn't draw a pension because he hadn't attained age 55. He could have had the option if this had been in the Bill to start his pension a bit early and obviously would have taken a somewhat smaller pension, reduced by one-quarter of one per cent per month or 3 per cent per year or 15 per cent, if in fact he started the pension at 50 years of age.

I think the most significant change in the Bill is related to a lock-in and vesting. Up 'til now the Members have had to have 8 sessions to qualify, this is eliminated under the amendments to the Bill. The individual automatically gains ownership of employer-employee contributions in accrued earnings for pension some time in the future when he becomes eligible for pension.

The only withdrawal will occur in relation to those persons

May 10, 1974

who have served less than one year. This goes beyond, of course, the provisions of the Saskatchewan Pension Benefits Act, which provides lock-in after 10 years of service and upon attainment of age 45. I think that is a most important provision frankly and a real model perhaps for pension plans in the future.

There are other items in the Bill that perhaps should be mentioned in passing. Removal of the ceiling, and I just mention this very briefly. It really is largely meaningless; there has been a ceiling in there, but to date only two Members have exceeded that ceiling and those have been Members who have retired fairly recently.

I think, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, perhaps we can leave the remainder of the discussion of the Bill to third reading and I think those amendments are reasonable and beneficial and in the interest of the Members of the House and they should be approved. I move second reading of the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a very few short remarks in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to indicate that Members on this side of the House, I think most of them are going to support this Bill.

There are two major reasons why I personally have come to this conclusion and the first one is that it increases the protection for wives and dependents of MLAs in the amendments or the changes in the MLAs' pension scheme. I think most of the Members of the House are aware that if one of the Members went out of this House and was hit by a car and didn't reach the age of 55 and was at that time on pension, his wife and his dependents would receive nothing. It has also increased the percentage from 50 to 60 per cent. I don't really think that is sufficient because I think that is the most important provision in the Bill.

The second major reason I support the Bill is that it does improve pension benefits of retired MLAs who no longer sit in the Legislature. I am not going to repeat the figures, I have those figures which the Minister of Finance indicated. Some of the pensions are hopelessly inadequate. I can remember on one or two occasions we had to bring special Bills into the House just to see that a retired MLA, and on one occasion a retired Premier, could adequately look after himself in his retirement and in his old age.

I, of course, am also supporting the principle of increasing the amount of contributions by MLAs toward the pension benefits because of the fact that the pension allowances will be increased. I think this is a good idea particularly with the rising costs and inflation. When the majority of Members do receive the pension I would suggest that perhaps inflation would have eaten away any benefits that are now accruing.

I should like to make one suggestion to the Minister of Finance, and I think I express the feelings of both sides of the House. This is the third occasion in which I have been forced to stand up in this House and vote myself and other Members of the Assembly either an increase in salary or an improvement in my own personal pension benefits.

First of all, I think it is embarrassing for both sides of the House but even more so it is repugnant to me, that we should be involved in the decision as to what our pension should be, as to what our salary should be. I think as a result of that in most cases it is inadequate. Because everybody has the inherent fear that this is going to be politically unwise and as a result, for example, I know many MLAs on both sides of the House are now attempting to make the MLA's job a full-time job and quit their job or their permanent vocation in life in order to devote full time as MLAs. I would suggest that if that is the case the existing salary level is not adequate.

Therefore, I have a suggestion to the Minister of Finance; that the Government would sit down and figure out what is a reasonable salary and what is a reasonable pension. Then bring in a cost of living index that will be related to the rising cost of living, so that this kind of an embarrassing situation will no longer be required. And that that cost of living index would increase as the cost of living does, or if the cost of living went down, the pension would go down and the salary would go down in accordance with the cost of living. And if we started off with a reasonable salary, reasonable pension, then I think the necessity of bringing these two Bills back into the Legislature and asking Members to take personal embarrassment, would not be necessary. (I know it is repugnant to the majority of us of having to vote this kind of improvement in our own personal allowances.)

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance and the Government to consider this because I think it would be advantageous to all the people of Saskatchewan to know that Members of the Legislature are not perpetually bringing in at periodic times their salary schedule and their pension benefits and voting themselves an increase; that any increase or any improvement in either their allowances or pensions is directly related to the cost of living. I would hope that the Government would consider that. With those few words I will support second reading.

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, just one word on the Bill that is presented here today. I should like to say that I completely agree with the Member for Milestone and I am glad that as the Session ends I can completely agree with him.

I should like to suggest that the Government bring in possibly for the next session what the Member for Milestone has suggested. However that the contents of that suggestion or that Bill would not take effect until after the next election so that the people of Saskatchewan are completely aware of what we would be getting as a pension or as a salary as MLAs.

I think it is way overdue that we have increases in our pension, and I do agree with the Member that the MLAs' job has changed. It is becoming a full-time job and I would certainly concur with everything you have said and with what the Minister has brought in today. With that I will certainly support the Bill in second reading.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that Mr. Robbins is on his second go round, now is the Bill actuarially sound?

May 10, 1974

MR. ROBBINS: — My comments, Mr. Speaker, will be very brief.

I agree with the Member for Milestone and the Member for Nutana South, that Members of the Assembly should not be involved in the process of setting their own indemnities. Frankly, I think if your pension set-up is properly devised it will not matter, after your indemnity is set up by a special committee or a committee which is independent from the House if your pension formula is a reasoned one, it will on application to that indemnity bring the necessary results. It is the intention of the Government to work on this over the summer months and perhaps bring in in the fall further amendments. For instance there is nothing in the present amendments related to an escalator clause as yet, although we have been looking at propositions. We have had some very interesting propositions in relation to pensions.

I am just going to mention one. We have had one Member say to us, if for example, my pension was \$6,250 and the current indemnity is \$12,500, therefore it is one-half of the current indemnity. If the indemnity went to \$15,000 then that Member's pension would go to \$7,500. If the indemnity went down to \$10,000 then the Member's pension would go down to \$5,000. That is a very simplistic approach but it might be by far the best type of approach we could devise in terms of an escalator clause.

I am pleased that Members generally take the approach that it would be wise, if at all possible, to get a committee outside of the House to devise an indemnity formula. I think that if we apply the pension formula to that then we will not have much difficulty.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Finance) moved second and third reading of Bill No. 136 — **An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending respectively the Thirty-first day of March, 1974 and the Thirty-first day of March, 1975.** (Appropriation Bill)

He said: Mr. Speaker, before moving the Motion under Rule 48(2) I should like to make some remarks on the Appropriation Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the Appropriation Bill before us provides the sum of \$48,927,410 for the further Estimates for the fiscal year 1973-74, and also provides \$680,505,230 in funds to the various Government departments and agencies to provide the means to carry out the programs of this Government during the fiscal year 1974-75.

Our Government, Mr. Speaker, is interested in serving and meeting the needs and aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan. This Appropriation Bill provides the means to do so.

A little over two months ago the New Democratic Government of this province brought down its 1974 Budget. Since that time

we have witnessed criticism of those proposals from the Opposition.

I am extremely proud of this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, it is a bold Budget that breaks new ground for the people of this province and for the people of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — It is a fiscally sound Budget that is well suited to the temper of our economy.

Over the last two months I have been pleased to hear the positive reaction to our Budget from the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, it's a good and popular Budget. And that is why the Opposition doesn't like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Their criticism and frustrations during this Session are quite understandable.

The Saskatchewan economy is presently experiencing a period of unprecedented buoyancy. Farm incomes are high and other incomes have been greatly increased. Public and private investment has risen substantially. Housing starts are at record levels. Employment is growing and unemployment is the lowest in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — However, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan residents are suffering along with the rest of the country from the inflation that has resulted from the mismanagement of the national economy by the Federal Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Their recent Budget which provides an opportunity to deal with this nation-wide problem was a miserable failure. Mere window dressing when bold new initiatives are required.

Provincial governments, particularly one such as Saskatchewan can do little to attack the root causes of inflation. That is the responsibility of the Federal Government through its monetary and its fiscal policies. However, in contrast to the Federal Budget, the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan has taken positive steps to help the citizens of this province to cope with the inflationary problems of this day.

May 10, 1974

Let me review some of these steps. The removal of medicare premiums - \$72 a family, \$36 for single persons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — A total of \$15 million. The Property Improvement Grant up to the equivalent of a 20 mill tax reduction; \$300 maximum for farmers; \$200 maximum for businessmen; \$160 maximum for a householder, an increase of \$20 million since we came to office over the former Homeowners Grant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Increased school grants. We have picked up 100 per cent of the increase in recognized school costs for the third year in a row. A total increase of \$48 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — A new urban package, Mr. Speaker, which puts over \$20 million a year into the hands of the municipalities to help them hold the line and in some cases reduce the property tax burden. If you add those three items alone, the Property Improvement Grant Increases, the increased School Grants and the new Urban Package, you will find \$88 million in assistance in reducing the tax on property.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, \$88 million. A new Family Income Plan providing basic income supplement to all low and many middle income families at a cost in the current fiscal year of about \$10 million. A transfer of three cents a gallon of gasoline and diesel fuel tax to the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund to prevent an increase in insurance premiums and to provide premium reductions to 77 per cent of last year's private vehicle owners. An actual saving to the motorists of \$9 million.

I want the Opposition to take special note of the fact that that is not an increase in gasoline tax, simply a transfer. Further to that a gasoline tax reduction of seven cents a gallon and a diesel fuel tax reduction of five cents a gallon, combined with a farm fuel cost rebate of seven cents a gallon to offset the coming increase in fuel prices. That is worth \$35 million to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — In addition, Mr. Speaker, this House is well aware of the major new thrust provided in this Budget for economic development.

A firm basis has been established for stabilizing and diversifying our agricultural sector and new developments are planned in our manufacturing and processing industry. Steel, to name one of them. All of these developments are planned to reduce the historical vulnerability resulting from our dependence on the grain industry. We are continuing our fight

to end the discriminatory national policies which have hindered our progress in the past and still do, Mr. Speaker, to the present day.

Members opposite are critical of our spending program. I should like to ask them what they would cut out of it? Would they cut the Denticare Program? Would they remove the Urban Package which is providing \$75 per capita for very village, town and city in Saskatchewan. A total value of \$45,750,000. Would they remove the Unconditional Grant of \$10 per capita, at a cost of \$6.1 million to the Treasury of this province from all villages, towns and cities? Would they remove the Equalization Grants of \$4.3 million? Would they, Mr. Speaker, cut out the proposed expenditures for the Family Income Plan expenditures to assist working families on modest income in these difficult inflationary times? They never say what they will do, Mr. Speaker. They are afraid to say. They are afraid to take a stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — They level nebulous, unsubstantiated charges. They do not offer credible evidence with respect to those charges. Every budget brought down by this New Democratic administration has contained substantial surpluses. Revenues have exceeded expenditures each and every year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — They say that these budgetary appropriations are inflationary. When a government authority does not make a net demand on the economy as we are not doing when our revenue inflows exceed our expenditure outflows, it is not inflationary. We agree that when the Government expenditures outflows exceed revenue inflows, an inflationary impact on the economy occurs. The Opposition should be directing their criticisms to those jurisdictions in Canada which are running sizeable deficits in their current financing, such as the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, they haven't very good aim and when they do take aim they draw a bead on the wrong target. A typical Liberal strategy.

We have diminished the inflationary impact on a goodly number of people in those segments of our society who are least able to withstand that impact. We do not apologize for that approach. We have consistently argued that taxes should be related to the ability to pay principle. One of the most regressive taxes in our society is the property tax. We said that we would reduce the tax burden for educational purposes and homes, farms and small business to 25 mills. We have gone beyond that promise and have increased Property Improvement Grants from \$12.9 million in the last year of Liberal administration to some \$32.9 million in the current year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

May 10, 1974

MR. ROBBINS: — Opposition Members say we haven't reduced taxes. That is patently false. A few examples will illustrate, Mr. Speaker, as previously mentioned we increased the Property Improvement Grants by \$20 million. That has an impact on property taxes. We have increased school grants since this Government took office by \$48 million, that helps hold down the property tax rates. We have set up a Community Capital Fund of approximately \$20 million a year for the next five years along with unconditional Grants and Equalization Grants payable to every city, town and village in this province. Add those three together and you have \$88 million. We removed deterrent fees at a saving of \$7 million to the people of this province. We removed the Medicare and Hospitalization premiums at a saving of \$15 million to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — We are reducing as of May 15th, gasoline taxes by seven cents a gallon and diesel fuel taxes by five cents a gallon and we are making a rebate to farm fuel purchases of seven cents a gallon which totals \$35 million. We made payments into the Workmen's Compensation Fund of some \$6,650,000 to enable pensions for people who are disabled and widows of workmen who were killed on the job, to bring those pensions up to a reasonable level. Add all those totals up and you will find you have a total of \$152 million. Add to that figure the AAIA premium, a transfer of \$9 million and you have \$161 million of direct effect in terms of savings to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Opposition Members will say, oh, but you have offset those reductions with an increase in income tax. The personal income tax did rise by three per cent and the corporate tax by one per cent. We don't apologize for that.

MR. LANE: — Six per cent.

MR. ROBBINS: — The Member opposite says six per cent, knowing that is totally wrong. We contend that we should get our revenues from a progressive tax like income tax and from increased resource revenues and we have currently a cash carry forward exceeding \$45 million set aside for a rainy day. That is responsible budgeting, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Just one further brief word on our resource revenue. In our Budget Speech on March 8th, last, I said and I quote:

Further evidence of arbitrary action is apparent in the Federal challenge to the constitutional right of the provinces to control their own resources.

Those words proved to be prophetic, Mr. Speaker. Witness the Federal Budget of May 6th with its proposal to disallow provincial government royalties, mining taxes and payments and similar effects as deductible items in computing income tax. A direct

intrusion in terms of our right to collect on our own resources.

Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Lumsden would stop braying from his seat . . .

Mr. Speaker, it did occur to me that I should deal with some of the substantive criticisms of this Budget by the Members opposite but in reviewing their comments I find that there haven't been any.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — In fact it appears that they have carefully avoided addressing themselves to the content of the 1974 Budget. I must say, Mr. Speaker, this is the one area in which they appear to have exhibited some wisdom.

In summary I want to repeat that I am extremely proud of this Budget. It is a Budget outstanding in its content and fiscally responsible in its design. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 48(2) it gives me great pleasure to move second and third reading of this Appropriation Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie): — Just a few comments on this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KRAMER: — Swan Song.

MR. McISAAC: — It may well be, Mr. Member, it may well be.

My remarks on the Bill are going to be fairly brief. I have made my criticisms of the Government's Budget, Mr. Speaker, in the course of my original reply and I have repeated those in speaking to a number of other pieces of legislation that been brought forward to implement the proposals in the budget. I think we have had a good Budget Debate this year, a real good one and it has been a tough long Session.

Mr. Speaker, for a moment or two I want to deviate a little bit from the principle of the Bill. This may well be my last comments in this Chamber. I say, may well be, that depends on a number of things. I intend to seek the Liberal nomination in the Battleford-Kindersley Federal riding . . .

HON. MEMBERS: : — Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — . . . if, of course, Members will be aware, if successful in that particular step, I wouldn't be back here next session. On July 9th, the answer is fairly simple and the decision I have to look at was fairly straightforward, depending entirely on the will of the electorate on July 8th, I'll either be retired fully from politics on July 9th or I'll be engaged full time, more so perhaps than ever.

MR. MESSER: — With all due respect, I hope you enjoy retirement!

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, I don't expect any different sentiments

May 10, 1974

from my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. But as I say it may well be presumptuous of me to say a word or two at this time.

Since the defeat of the former Liberal Government of which I was a Cabinet Minister for a number of years, I have worked very hard at establishing a veterinary practice in the city of North Battleford and it has been a difficult job, Mr. Speaker, to serve both my constituency and the Legislature and my clientele. If I may say, the lot of a country veterinarian and in the fact that the calving seasons matches or coincides with the Legislative Session, makes it particularly difficult for anyone in veterinary practice in Saskatchewan and perhaps less productive in many ways too.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the thought of the possibility of leaving here and not coming back because despite the headaches I have really enjoyed the place, the associations I have made, the acquaintances I have made both in the Chamber, in government and across the province. It has been a tremendous ten years and it has always amazed me how in the House — it took me a little while to get used to this when I first came — in that you can see Members on both sides and we can fight in here back and forth, real cross fire, very similar I suppose to the hockey teams in the Stanley Cup. When the game is over you fraternize and develop the kind of relationships and friendships, certainly with my own colleagues on this side but with a lot of Members on the opposite side. It has been a great ten years, Mr. Speaker!

HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Well, I must say I find that a tough act to follow, I don't intend to announce I am leaving but I must say I want to welcome Cliff McIsaac into the contest in the Battleford-Kindersley riding. I can say that in my short stay in this Legislature I have come to know Cliff, the Member for Wilkie, reasonably well. His constituency borders on mine and I have come to respect him as a Member of the Opposition who does his homework and who can put in some pretty good cross fire in this House when he wants to as well. And who when it is all over on prorogation night usually ended up sitting around with a few of the other fellows, having a chat and doing whatever else we do when prorogation night comes. I know we are all, on this side of the House, going to miss the Member for Wilkie if he is successful in obtaining the nomination. I think we will miss him in this House but as it goes in politics we'll probably be out there working alongside our candidate, Rod Thompson, trying to help Cliff towards his retirement. That is the way of the political wars.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words about this Budget. I am very proud of this Budget too. I am proud of the way in which the new Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins), the member for Saskatoon, put this Budget before this House, put up the case for the New Democratic Party and the New Democratic Government in this Budget and has dealt with the little serious criticisms of this Budget that came from the Opposition.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one problem the Liberal Members had in this session is the fact that they couldn't make any real hard criticisms about this Budget because it is a good solid Budget in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, they like to talk about tax reductions, they like to talk about tax increases. I saw here and I haven't added up all the figures like the Minister of Finance has, but I think when I got the totals, when I heard the totals and I am sure when the Members opposite heard the total of the kinds of taxation reductions that this Government has supplied to the people of Saskatchewan versus the kind of Black Friday Budget which the Members opposite brought down when they were on the Treasury Benches, it made me proud to be a Member of this New Democratic Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — I want to say here there is one way in which the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) is fortunate, he is leaving this House possibly in two or three months and leaving as a Member of the Legislative Assembly and he won't have to wait to leave this House with the will of the majority of the people of his constituency along with the other Members in opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this Budget. I am proud to have been a part of this Budget in its early formative stages. Proud of the part that we have all been able to play on this side of the House, contributing to the good things that are in this Budget for the people of Saskatchewan. And I am confident that when the provincial election comes, whether it is 30 days from now or a year from now, we will be returned to this House by the people of Saskatchewan on the basis of that Budget by an even greater majority than in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like also to say a few words about this Budget. Like the Members opposite, and the Member for Wilkie, I will be brief and I hope I serve as a good example for future speakers to be brief as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this Budget is similar to the legislation that the Government has passed in this Session in that it is characterized to me by two things. The first of these is the evidence of continued desire, avid desire of this Government to take more control and more power to themselves over all our means of production and also in the daily affairs of all of the people of Saskatchewan.

The second characteristic of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, is that it shows the complete utter and abject failure of the Government to come to grips with the social needs of the day in this province. I say that this is particularly reprehensible, Mr. Speaker, from this Government because the NDP historically has always regarded themselves as the social conscience of the people of Canada. It is also reprehensible, Mr. Speaker, in the facts that this year we have had record revenues from the usual tax sources of income taxes, totalling a billion dollars and as well other hundreds of millions of

May 10, 1974

dollars coming to the coffers of the province through the sale of oil and potash.

Now, I spoke of control, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to refer to just four Bills where this control is shown.

The first of these, Mr. Speaker, is the infamous Bill No. 42. The effect of this Bill was to nationalize completely the oil industry in this province. The Bill didn't affect the corporate giants which it was supposed to affect such as Exxon, Gulf and so on, but what it did do was severely damage the small oil operator and completely ruin the oil supply industry in Estevan and other areas.

I suggest that the control that the Government has sought by means of this Bill has not worked to the advantage of the people of Saskatchewan but has worked to their complete disadvantage.

The second Bill, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to refer to is The Mineral Taxation Act, which we just amended, I believe, today or yesterday which now allows the Government, in effect, to take over complete control of the potash industry and which I suggest means the end of future potash development in this province.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, is the Agricultural Land Bill. This Bill effectively stops other Canadians from enjoying the rights in Saskatchewan that we, as citizens of Saskatchewan would enjoy in other provinces. I would suggest that the Bill is merely a thinly disguised ruse to put even more land into the hands of the Land Bank and thereby under complete government control.

The fourth Bill, Mr. Speaker, and the last Bill which I should like to refer to is The Elections Act. Again, I submit that the effect of this Bill is to put power and control of election procedures into the hands of the Government. Now the aims of this Bill, I suggest as I have mentioned before, are admirable, however, the aims of the Bill are not carried out by the legislation. The Elections Act seeks to control elections, which I suggest is proper, but not to have them controlled and thrust upon all other political parties by the party in power. This Bill, of course, will only help the NDP Government and will hurt all other political parties.

I suggest, as well, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is a direct infringement on the freedom of choice of the people of this province to support political parties in the manner in which they may choose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Now those are the control aspects, Mr. Speaker. Let me turn briefly to the social needs I refer to. To be fair I would say that the Government has done a few things in this regard. I would suggest that the highlight is the Family Income Bill, which is not in effect as yet and it is certainly too early to tell if it will be of any assistance to the poor people of this province. As I have said before I welcome this Bill and I will certainly not criticize it until such time as it shows that it is not doing the job.

I would suggest that the Dental Bill and the Drug Bill are a step forward. The Dental Bill certainly does not accomplish all of the ends that the Minister of Health indicated that it would, but it is a start. The Drug Bill, as well, is a start however, it will not help completely those people who are required to take or have many prescriptions of drugs through the years. However, in future sessions this will be changed.

I suggest that there are important things where the Government has failed and failed completely.

The first of these is old age pensions. The Government has not done one single thing to put one more penny into the pockets of the elderly of this province. We have had record incomes, as I say, from the usual tax sources and hundreds of millions of extra dollars from oil and we will from potash and not one penny of this is being used to assist our people. The purpose of the Act, according to the Premier, was to use this money for the assistance of our people, not for Saskoil and not for other little developments that the Government may pursue.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Government, notwithstanding the comments of the Minister of Finance, has done nothing really to protect the citizens of this province from inflation. Those people on fixed incomes have received no benefits whatsoever from the budgetary proposals of the Minister of Finance.

Further, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps on a more personal note, I submit that this Government has done nothing to stop or even investigate the growing rate of abortions which is becoming a social and moral scandal to the people of this province and people of all Canada.

The Members opposite, when you make these criticisms, usually acknowledge that there may be some truth in them, however, they have one reply always — if they can't step in and socialize something or nationalize it they then blame it on Ottawa. Everything that I have mentioned the Government has blamed on Ottawa. They said we can't give an increase to old age pensioner, Ottawa won't let us. I suggest to them that the NDP Government in British Columbia found no difficulty whatsoever in giving an increase in money to the elderly people.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is another matter that the Minister of Finance has failed miserably in and that is allowing people to remain on the tax rolls to pay provincial income tax where they do not have to pay any tax whatsoever to the Federal Government of Ottawa. This is scandalous. We brought it to his attention time after time during the Budget Debate and yet nothing has been done about it.

I would suggest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in closing that this Government has sadly misjudged the mandate that they received from the people of Saskatchewan in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — When elected the people did not elect them to put controls and give themselves more and more power. The people of Saskatchewan, like people of all the other provinces of this country, seek social justice and equality before law. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Budget and the legislation

May 10, 1974

brought into this Session by the Government does not give this to the people. I suggest, as well, Mr. Speaker, that when the next election comes along — and I hope it comes soon — the NDP will realize that they cannot pass legislation of this nature and I trust they won't have the opportunity to pass this legislation or present further budgets because they will be over here after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, in moving the Budget the Hon. Wes Robbins stated and I quote:

This Budget brings to fruition the New Deal for People, virtually completed, not in five years, Mr. Speaker, not in four years, but in three.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one sentence well sums the attitude of this Government. It is a government that is self-satisfied a government that is sure of itself, that it is doing the best that it possibly can, to regulate capitalism as we know it.

I don't want to deny that there are important reforms both in the Budget, both in the legislative program brought down by the Government. The Prescription Drug Program which I had the privilege of, in part, working with for two years, is a valuable step forward and nobody should deride it. The Family Income Plan, which has been worked upon in the Department of Social Services by people whom I know and respect; the Legal Aid Bill, worked upon by people also whom I know and respect as competent people. These, Mr. Speaker, are all valuable and worthwhile reforms for which it was worthwhile to defeat the Liberals in 1971 and elect the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it as I launch into a criticism of the Government, it was a valuable step forward to have defeated the conservative and the reactionary forces which dominated this province during the 1960s and of which the remnants stand here today.

Mr. Speaker, there were also valuable reforms that have come out of Ottawa dating back to the old age pensions which Woodsworth extracted out of Mackenzie King in the 1920s; to the various reforms which David Lewis has extracted out of the Liberal minority government since 1972.

The question has to be asked, as we sit here on the eve of a general election, with a minority government in Ottawa having fallen only within the last 48 hours: Why has the NDP broken with the Liberals federally? What is the significance of the Government of the NDP in Saskatchewan, the significance of the coalition de facto which existed for 18 months between David Lewis and Pierre Trudeau in Ottawa? What does this tell us about the evolution of Canadian politics, of Canadian political parties?

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that what we have in Canada today is that we have a convergence in Ottawa in which the Liberals and the NDP have come to represent the same issues, the same policies, the same kinds of people. And you see that from the interchange of the civil servants, the deputy minister who

flew back and forth between the Federal Government in Ottawa and the provincial Government in Saskatchewan and these civil servants fit in and design the programs of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and they design the programs of Allan Blakeney in Saskatchewan.

The DREE officials design programs for DREE in Ottawa and these same officials are seconded and they design the programs for the forest development of northern Saskatchewan. And what does it mean, Mr. Speaker? That the NDP has finally broken with Trudeau in Ottawa this week? Is it because the excess profit legislation brought down by the Federal Government has loopholes in it? Obviously that legislation has loopholes and I don't have to go through it clause by clause to know that. But the reforms which were brought in throughout the last 18 months, they all had loopholes and it wasn't because of the loopholes in that legislation that David Lewis finally decided to break with Pierre Trudeau. The reason that he finally broke with Pierre Trudeau was because if he left it any longer Canadian people would begin to realize the integration of these two political parties as they have evolved. People would begin to realize the vacuum that has appeared in the left in Canada, as David Lewis has manoeuvred, cajoled, gotten rid of the socialists of the ideological elements from the NDP.

David Lewis has designed a party which in its essence is indistinguishable from the Federal Liberal Party. David Lewis in Ottawa has no policy to control inflation dissimilar from what Trudeau has. Trudeau is against wage and price controls and so is David Lewis.

The Federal NDP is becoming enmeshed in the politics of survival, enmeshed in the politics in the centre of Canada. The NDP has forgotten the obligations which the CCF took seriously to present a left alternative to the people of Canada, even if the majority of the people of Canada were not prepared, were not ready for it.

In the short run, Mr. Speaker, that may have been the advantageous thing to do, to play the balance of power, to get an extra reform or two out of Trudeau; to act as the left wing ginger group in this informal coalition which existed in Ottawa for these 18 months, but, Mr. Speaker, as time continues the myth evaporates that there is a significant difference, that the NDP is seriously committed to socialism in any way, shape or form. Whether it be in Ottawa or to return to Saskatchewan in Regina, if we return to the resource sector in the potash industry, the Minister of Mineral Resources admitted yesterday, that in 1973 the province got \$8 million in revenue out of the sales revenue of \$195 million, in other words less than the sales tax. With respect to the energy, yes, the Provincial Government finally moved after the Federal Government had moved and for the last eight months there has been haggling between Ottawa and Regina over who is to get the public revenue. Meanwhile all corporate revenues have doubled in the last 12 months between 1972 and 1973 levels and so one can hardly say that either the NDP in Regina or Donald Macdonald in Ottawa, have done a great deal to break corporate power over the resource sectors of this country.

And the NDP has been content in Saskatchewan to play the role of western chauvinists. The NDP in Regina has made no distinction of its policies from those of Lougheed in Alberta. There is no fundamental distinction in the minds of the eastern

May 10, 1974

Canadian, in the minds of the Saskatchewan public, as to what differentiates the resource policies of Peter Lougheed from the resource policies of Allan Blakeney. The Alberta Government is collecting the same kind and order of magnitude of revenue for a barrel of oil as is Saskatchewan. The Alberta Government has as good a Saskoil going in Alberta as Saskatchewan has. In other words virtually nothing is different.

When we come to the forest sector, the NDP are pursuing more rational forest policies in terms of maximizing the revenue per tree, but I would submit there is no basic difference between the policies of large capital intensive projects, which the Liberals pursued with Carl Landegger and what the NDP is prepared to pursue. The NDP as we discussed last night you and your henchman, Mr. Bowerman, you both agreed that if need be you were content to see Carl Landegger develop the hardwood in order that it be developed now and not go to waste.

There is no essential difference between the forest policies which have been pursued to date between the Liberals and the NDP. There are distinctions, but as the Attorney General would say, they are distinctions without a difference, or however that legal phrase goes. And even in the domain of social welfare, of social reform, which is the hallmark of the NDP and the CCF why have we been incapable of any major redistributions of income in three years?

Why are we able, with virtually no debate, to spend up to \$35 million of public funds to keep down the price of gasoline, but it becomes a major program of earth shaking importance for us to budget \$10 million as an income support program for the poor. Mr. Speaker, \$35 million for the ordinary petroleum consuming public, rich and poor, that can go through without a debate. \$10 million for the poor, that is an earth-shaking revolution.

And the idea of implementing the recommendations of the Senior Citizens' Commission Report, which we have all agreed, is very expensive — \$80 million according to the estimate of the Government, that is literally impossible; it is unrealistic unless we have federal cost-sharing, unless the Federal Government does it.

And so in the last two years, Mr. Speaker, I think there has come an end of an era. It is very confused and I don't pretend to know where the evolution of Canadian politics goes, but as the vacuum has opened up on the left in Canadian politics, unless there is a major transformation of the NDP, unless there is a major transformation of that party and in the present leadership of that party, which is content to play the federal-provincial negotiations to haggle with Ottawa over who gets more or less of the tax dollar which has been extracted from the oil industry, unless that major transformation occurs the left in Canada is not going to suspend judgment on the New Democratic Party. And the left in Canada, disorganized yes, small yes, but nonetheless a vital force in defining the future of this country, is going to have to build a new socialist political organization. It may be the Waffle, it may not be the Waffle, it may be some other political organization. I may play a role in it; I may not play a role in it, but politics abhors a vacuum just as much as nature does.

And if the New Democratic Party is not willing to stand up

and fight for the issues which would define an independent socialist Canada, then socialists in Canada will find a new organization, which is prepared to do that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I take my seat.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words as we close this Session of the Legislature.

MR. MacLEOD: — Make it short!

MR. ROMANOW: — I shall make it short. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased to take part in this last debate of the particular session, on the Appropriation Bill, on this Budget, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I am pleased to take part in a debate on a budget that deals effectively with the problems of the Province of Saskatchewan, the problems faced by our people, particularly by those in middle and low-income brackets in this critical inflationary period.

This Budget provides the framework for the balanced development of Saskatchewan now and in the years ahead. The progressive measures in this Budget are made possible because this is a New Democratic Government, Mr. Speaker, a government with the philosophy, the programs and the guts to insist that the resources of this province yield a fair return to the owners of those resources — the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have gone to great lengths in this debate to throw up smoke screens and scatter red herrings in an effort to obscure the facts. It has been typical of this Session, typical of the three years that the Liberal Party has served in Opposition, an Opposition which is resorting to the only tactics they know — the tactics of smoke screens and scattering of red herrings. We saw it again in the debate today, an Opposition of contradictions.

The Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) in his freshman year and he says that the provincial Government should have done something about old age pensions. He condemns the Provincial Government for total inactivity, but not a word, Mr. Speaker, about the inactivity of the Federal Liberal Minister of Finance, John Turner, and his Budget. Not one red cent from the Federal Liberals for senior citizens, not one cent of concern from the Liberals in the Dominion of Canada for senior citizens. That is why the Government fell at Ottawa just two days ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And yet the Member for Lakeview gets up and says there is no concern for old age pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, the Member got up and talks about inflation, he condemns the Provincial Government because we should have done something about inflation. He says that everyone knows that

May 10, 1974

the Provincial Government could have acted to stop inflation. Yet what did Mr. Turner do, in Canada? He went around defending against the Tories saying that inflation is international, he can't control it Canada-wide. Yet the Member for Lakeview says that we should be able to control it provincially. Somehow what we can't do nationally, we should be able to do provincially. That is what the Member for Lakeview would have this House and this province believe.

Mr. Speaker, we see an Opposition which gets up and makes charges, which are absolutely incredible. On the Land Bank, this scare that the Land Bank is attempting to take over the land in the Province of Saskatchewan; this old slogan of Steuart or slavery, that we hear from the Liberals opposite. Like in the old days, Tucker or tyranny, today it is Steuart or slavery!

Mr. Speaker, it didn't work in 1948 and it isn't going to work in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, how incredible can an Opposition be? The Members of the Opposition got up and talked about deterrent fees. The Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) during the course of the Prescription Drugs Bill debate had said that we had installed deterrent fees in the Pharmacy Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody who should not be talking about deterrent fees it is the Liberals opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — If there is anyone who should not be talking about deterrent fees it is the Member for Whitmore Park, the present Whip of the Liberal Party right now, Mr. Grant. All of us in this province remember the \$2.50 that the Liberals opposite put on in deterrent fees in medicare and hospitalization. We ask the Member opposite, why was it that he put on deterrent fees and his answer was because it helps them to participate in their own recovery. That was the position of the Liberals opposite, \$2.50! And year after year when we put in a resolution before this House, urging that the deterrent fees should be removed, year after year the Liberals opposed it and they said that deterrent fees should remain. And now they have the audacity to say that they are against deterrent fees and accuse us of having them in the Prescription Drugs Bill that is before us now.

Mr. Speaker, how incredible can you get? How incredible and irresponsible can you get as an Opposition Party?

I tell the people of Saskatchewan that there is no deterrent fee in the Drugs Act. I want to tell the people that even if there was a deterrent fee, at least this Government has established a Prescription Drugs Act and that is more than the Liberals ever did in their seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, we see an Opposition who get up and

condemn this Government, condemns this Government for having passed Bill No. 42 and then at the same time condemns this Government for not having added more muscle to its negotiations with the Federal Government in the energy crisis. When we moved to enact Bill 42 to give us the muscle to deal with Ottawa they said that that was anti-Canadian. When we came back from Ottawa after having negotiated the deal for Canada, they say that is not good enough for Saskatchewan and that the Bill wasn't strong enough.

Mr. Speaker, you see an Opposition which is straddling the fence; an Opposition who doesn't know where it stands on any important major issues of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Make no mistake about it, the people of this province know that the Liberals are political pragmatists pure and simple, no philosophy, no programs, no alternatives to offer to them and they will remember that in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Session has proven that the Opposition has failed in their tasks to scatter these red herrings; they have failed and they will continue to fail because the facts stand out clearly for all to see, even for the Member for Milestone to see. The Budget summarizes the programs; strengthens our economy; eases the burden of inflation as best as can be; meets the needs of ordinary people and the resources to mount these kinds of programs which come in an increasing measure from our nonrenewable resources — potash and oil to name the key ones.

For the first time these resources are beginning to yield to the public, yield to the people of Saskatchewan, something approaching their true value. And the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) has the gumption to get up in this House and say that it is not a socialist venture.

The Member for University, in his dream that somehow there will be a place in the political spectrum for his point of view, tries to differentiate. I want to tell that Member that for the first time in recent history in the Province of Saskatchewan we have a socialist government which has acted to ensure that the resources of the province belong to the people of the province and not to corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — When we passed The Forest Act amendments was that a sellout to the Liberal Party? When we passed Bill 42 was that a sellout to the corporation party? Absolutely it was not, Mr. Speaker, it was an act of the New Democratic Party and for the people, but he has to play the dream. He has no other alternative sitting as an Independent to the left, as he does, of the Opposition. He has to hope that that position survives. But I tell him that no one is going to be fooled by that position.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind this House, briefly, of some

May 10, 1974

other ways these new revenues are being used to redistribute the wealth in this province. The Minister of Finance has talked about it. Holding the line on gasoline and diesel costs for Saskatchewan consumers. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the price of gasoline at the pumps west of the Ottawa Valley will go up by six to eight cents a gallon but not in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, we are reducing the gas tax to hold the line on prices. For farmers there is a special farm cost reduction program to achieve the same effect. Mr. Speaker, we have shifted the three cents of gas tax to the AAIA, to hold the line on automobile and truck direct insurance costs. We have increased the Property Improvement Grants; we have introduced a new urban package of \$100 million; we have launched a kindergarten program; denticare; a new day care program; providing more housing and more help to homeowners and home buyers; we have announced a major step toward a guaranteed income for working families in the lower income brackets — a Family Income Plan.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few, only a few, of the new and solid accomplishments achieved in this Session in this record Budget for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as this debate comes down to the wire, there is one issue and one issue which overrides all others, this Government, this New Democratic Government, believes firmly that the resources of this province belong to Saskatchewan and not the Federal Government. This Saskatchewan New Democratic Government believes fervently that windfall profits from these resources belong to the people of the province and not to the corporations of eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 42 is grounded in those beliefs, beliefs which are clearly supported by the Canadian Constitution. Bill 42 proclaims Saskatchewan ownership of petroleum resources; it captures windfall profits for the people of this province. Now the Federal Government entered into an agreement with our province at the end of March, which clearly recognized those two basic rights that Saskatchewan owned the natural resources and that the windfall profits should go to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. That was the agreement at the end of March or so we thought, until a few days ago, when the Government which now stands rightly defeated, clearly proposed to tax provincial resources; to renege on their agreement made with the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to go back on their word that they entered into with the Premier and the other Ministers; to invade provincial jurisdiction, and in the process to place the oil and gas industry in an impossible bind.

Mr. Speaker, this is the issue that we are voting on today. This is the issue we will be voting on on July 8th and voting in subsequent elections and the people of Saskatchewan will be watching. They will be watching closely to see how the Members of this House, how the Liberals opposite, how the Member for Saskatoon University cast their ballots. Will they cast their ballots for the province or for federal invasion and the central eastern Canadian Government? Will they cast their ballots for the people of this province or for eastern corporations that they have up until now defended?

Mr. Speaker, that is the issue. I am going to stand for the control of provincial resources, the Province of Saskatchewan, and for the benefit of those resources in the province, to the people of this province by supporting this Appropriation Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing you can say about the Attorney General when he gets up, he hasn't changed his speech since he came into this House in 1968. The same old tired socialist line. This has to be the most amusing windup of any debate I have ever seen, when the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) and the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) start a quarrel. There is no honor among thieves. Who is the worst socialist? Who is the closest to the Communist? Who is nearest to Karl Marx, is it them or is it me?

I want to tell Mr. Richards that there are no Communists in Canada; there are no extreme left wingers, only the John Richards who don't really represent anything. I believe in freedom of speech in this Assembly but some of the time that I have listened to this socialist drivel that comes from the Member for Saskatoon University I begin to challenge and question my own sanity.

Now we get to the Attorney General. He said that the New Democratic Party is the only one that has the guts to get the resource revenues. It doesn't take any guts to confiscate by greed and graft and seizure and drive the little services and all technical workers and all of the service industry of the province right out of this province because you happen to have the power to legislate without negotiation. Without discussion, without anything. Now go down to Estevan and talk about Bill 42, where the companies are leaving day by day. Not Exxon, not Gulf, but the individuals who were born and raised in the Province of Saskatchewan. Does it take guts to take a potash company that has invested \$80 million in the Province of Saskatchewan? It is in place and they can't withdraw the investment and then you turn around and break the agreement of years ago, and then without discussion summon them to Regina and dictate the terms of the new confiscation by taxation. It will have an impact on the mineral development of the Province of Saskatchewan for years, in fact, it is having it now. In a time of unparalleled prosperity in this province, young people are being forced to leave Saskatchewan to find jobs. They go to Alberta and Manitoba, Ontario and British Columbia because of the actions of this Government in driving out private investment and private capital.

The Minister of Finance stood up and talked about the steel agreement. What agreement? The Premier gave us a copy of that agreement, but there is no agreement. The Premier said, "I am optimistic." The only hope there is of a steel industry in Saskatchewan is if the Department of Regional Economic Expansion puts one here and it depends on the \$35 million that the Federal Government will give to this province.

It is very interesting to listen to the Attorney General talking about the old age pensions. Do you know the reason why we are having a federal election in Canada? It is because David Lewis said, those dirty federal Liberals wouldn't give the senior citizens in this country a five-cent piece.

May 10, 1974

Do you know what that Government did? The Federal Government gave a \$3 or \$4 cost of living bonus to the senior citizens in this province and all across Canada to welfare recipients. Do you know Mr. Romanow's Government did? They reduced the welfare payment according to the increased federal grant for welfare.

Mr. Speaker, a Federal NDP Party that brings down a government and causes a federal election and then an NDP hypocritical government in the Province of Saskatchewan that ignores the senior citizens denies that responsibility. The Attorney General says that the welfare of the senior citizens is a federal responsibility. That is not true and the Attorney General knows it.

According to the Constitution of Canada, health and welfare are provincial responsibilities. The only reason that the Federal Government became involved in old age pensions in the Canada Assistance Plan, Medicare, Hospitalization, was to help out the provinces carry their responsibilities and don't deny it. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that the old CCF didn't agree with the Attorney General. They had a supplementary old age pension program with the most vicious Means Test of any government in Canada. How come they had a supplementary pension plan? How come Tommy Douglas realized that the CCF had a responsibility to our senior citizens and the Attorney General has the nerve to stand up and tell every old age senior citizen in the Province of Saskatchewan, that they don't have a responsibility. That is nonsense and the Attorney General knows it and I believe the senior citizens of this province will recognize that it is shallow.

When you listen to the Minister of Finance and what really amused me was that he stood up and said that the criticisms of the Opposition were very shallow. He said that we didn't have any substance to them. You should have seen him a couple of nights ago when the back benchers got at the Finance Minister. It was the most disgraceful performance that I have ever seen in a Minister of Finance. You didn't know how to handle yourself. And when you are putting out figures, like a rotating machine and had to answer with a little common sense, Mr. Minister, those new Members behind me made you look like a child of 15 years of age, and then you talk about substance. In fact, Mr. Speaker, these are three or four things that really stand out about this Budget.

The first one, is the complete and absolute incompetence of some of the Ministers opposite in handling their departments in these Estimates. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you because I don't want to name them personally. The Press knows and the back benchers know, they talk in the hall, they are ashamed of some of the Ministers and their performance that went on in this House and don't underestimate it. Mr. Speaker, compare it to that back bench behind me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Compare them to some of those Ministers. There is no question of comparative ability.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you why. I want to tell you why! It's because it's the bureaucracy that's

running Saskatchewan. You people have become slaves to the socialist planners. You know the best example is the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan; a scandal and a disgrace in the administration of government funds never before seen in Saskatchewan. Never before! You know, it's not only because of an incompetent Minister and an incompetent Department, an incompetent Deputy, incompetent civil servants, it's because of the socialist planners. They turn around and had a one-agency concept, a great socialist dream but when it came to a practical application they didn't have the resource and the backup of a central office and the experience and know-how of senior civil servants and that one-agency concept has been a complete and absolute failure. And the Government had better realize it, or that Minister is going to continue to be in trouble as long as he is here. Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is only an indication of the complete collapse and incompetence of the majority of the Ministers sitting opposite and the way in which they handled their Estimates. It's kind of interesting, I've been in this House about 14, 13 sessions, never, never have I seen a group of people ferret out more information, do a better job in Estimates, and the Attorney General and the Minister of Finance know it, and so do all the Ministers. The civil servants were telling us stories about the Ministers scared to come to the House . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — . . . because of the incompetence of their department.

The second thing that stands out about this Budget, Mr. Speaker, is the waste and extravagance. And, you the Government will stand accountable to the people of Saskatchewan for the waste and extravagance. It starts on July 8th. It will be the first test and I suggest to you that though there may not be too many Liberals, my colleague, the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) will be one of them, Otto Lang will be another elected. There may be some Conservatives, but there are not going to be very many NDP Members. Because after \$900 million, to increase the civil servants to 1,120 in one year, 3,500 since you became the Government, you've got to build, according to the Minister of Government Services two new government office buildings, just to house civil servants. There isn't a private company or corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan that can get a foot of office space in Regina, they are filled with civil servants. You know at 5:00 o'clock it's like a stampede getting out of those buildings, you've got to stand aside or the civil servants can trample you to death. The only time when they may be absent, the only time it may be safe is during the federal election because you'll have given half of them a leave of absence. Mr. Speaker.

You know, when you turn around and take \$29 million spent in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I'd like to see the Minister take that half a million dollars out of the boxes and the shoe boxes and spend it properly. That's what I should like to see. Two and a half years ago this Government, the Province of Saskatchewan spent \$42 million in welfare, on the total welfare costs. This year it's \$105 million. Now, just ask me that. From \$42 million to \$105 million in welfare costs in two and a half years. I think if the public of Saskatchewan knew that they would consider it a scandal, Mr. Speaker. And despite

May 10, 1974

that, all that money, \$900 million, that waste and extravagance still isn't doing the job. There's no pollution cleanup in the Qu'Appelle Valley. The Minister says we can't do it until the Federal Government gives us money.

You know, there are no jobs in development. There hasn't been one new industry come into the province of Saskatchewan since 1971. Not one. We see the planners for, maybe Mr. Landegger, the terrible American, is going to put an extension, a hardwood line in the Prince Albert pulp mill. Oh, and maybe the Federal Government will get a steel industry in Saskatchewan, but you fellow haven't been successful in attracting a single industry of any consequence and it's simply because of the policies that you people have implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance talked about education. You know, it made me a little ill because we must have missed the Estimates in the Department of Education. He talked about every year the increase in grants. There has been an increase in school grants every year since the Department of Education was formed. Not only that, the Minister should have turned around and taken a look. Ask the Member for Nutana (Mr. Rolfes) just about every single school unit in the Province of Saskatchewan has been forced to raise mill rates — Regina almost two mills Saskatoon three mills. Some of the RMs ten mills, one school unit three mills three years in a row, and the reason is school costs have gone up 12 per cent and all you fellows would give them was 8 percent. Oh, you gave them the most money. Of course you did, because costs are going up and every school system is spending more money, but you were cheap and niggardly with the school systems of the Province of Saskatchewan and it's what you've done.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, who stands up very proudly, oh, very, very proudly, my denticare program, my drug program, pharmacare program, and yet you know he's squeezing the hospital budget so hard and so tight that the nursing profession for the first time, has to go on a strike and he stands up and criticizes them, while the Minister of Labour sits idly by and the construction industry is going into its seventh week, and you know why? Because he is squeezing and refusing to give the hospitals enough money to operate. And you know something, the nursing profession are going to react to that. They'll never forget it. They'll never forget it, Mr. Speaker, and despite that, imagine this is the great labour man in the NDP. He was one of the labour representatives. What was he? What do you call those fellows? The representatives? And he sold out because for the first time one agency that he had a responsibility to provide for them, and no group in the province of Saskatchewan deserves an increase any more than the nurses, because he squeezed.

Mr. Speaker, I hear about the deterrent fees. Why didn't you take some of that money from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, give it to those poor people that you are forcing to pay deterrent fees to get their drugs. You know, isn't that a tragedy. Who uses the drugs in Saskatchewan? Well, 50, 60 per cent are used by the senior citizens. Every time they have to go and get a prescription they pay the terrible \$2 deterrent fee, Mr. Speaker.

The third thing about this Budget, I don't want to take too long, Mr. Minister, because I know we've had a long Session,

is the continual grab for power and the reason I want to talk about this, is because the Attorney General talks about the resource industry. Mr. Speaker, there is one way that the Province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan can get revenues from the resource industry and that's through the taxation system. That's not the NDP approach. No that's not the Minister of Mineral Resources. Bill 42 has driven every oil company out of the Province of Saskatchewan, has completely stopped drilling, has affected every little Saskatchewan company that services them. They confiscated the mineral leases, on top of that they froze profits and took 100 percent of all the profits over a moderate one they turned around and increased the mineral tax from 20 to 50 cents in order to confiscate by taxation whether or not they have received any profit or not. Then they got into the potash industry. Nobody, nobody is going to question you for taxing the potash industry according to its revenues, but to turn around and get into the production business to set up a competing marketing agency and force them to pay in kind is going to remove and put a question in the mind of every mining company in the Dominion of Canada and in the North American continent. We needed a northern Saskatchewan department and that Minister of DNS is never going to get people off welfare. Mr. Speaker, it's disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing about this Budget is what it didn't contain, what it didn't contain., Mr. Speaker, after \$900 million, there is not an honest effort to help the old age pensioner, there's not an honest effort to help the cattle industry. The Minister of Agriculture got up this afternoon and talked about the feed grains situation and yet the cattle industry is dying in Saskatchewan, because of the poor prices, because of the high feed grains cost and he didn't do one single thing to help them in that Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I suppose you've assumed by the remarks that I'm not going to support this Appropriation Bill. I think it's got misplaced priorities, I think it's got waste and it's got extravagance, I think it's a dishonest Budget, it doesn't even include all the revenues in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will not support it, I do not believe it solves the problems facing the people of Saskatchewan in 1974.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — I'll be brief, Mr. Speaker. The Members of the Opposition in their general criticisms of the Budget remind me generally of the hawker in the midway who was peddling snake bit remedy. The only difference is they haven't quite as credible a product.

The Member who just took his seat, really doesn't merit much comment on his remarks in this debate. I can readily understand now why his seatmate is seeking the federal nomination.

I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac). I very much regret his decision to seek the federal nomination. I am sure we will miss him in this House. I had the opportunity a couple of years ago of attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Charlottetown and I think most of the Members are aware of the fact that the Hon. Member for Wilkie came from that part of Canada. I had occasion to talk to a goodly number of people who

May 10, 1974

knew Mr. McIsaac pretty well and they spoke very highly of him. If I paid much attention to the remarks by a former colleague, the Hon. Member for University (Mr. Richards) I suppose I could accept on the basis of his contention that New Democrats and Liberals are one and the same thing, that I should go to the Liberal nominating convention for the Battlefords-Kindersley and work for the opponent of Mr. McIsaac to ensure that he would come back to this House.

Really most of the criticisms have been gone over so many times in this debate there isn't much point in saying much about them any more and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude my remarks by saying we should end this debate and get on with the business of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on division, and Bill read a second and third time.

MOTION

MEMBER OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RIGHTS BOARD APPOINTED

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, now that we've finished, I take it we are finished with the Appropriation Bill, I should like to move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) by leave that:

Mr. Myron Kuziak of Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, be appointed the Member of the Public and Private Rights Board under Section 6 of The Expropriation Procedure Act, 1968, being Chapter 21 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1968, as amended by Chapter 36 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1973.

Just a very brief word to say that this Bill requires a resolution of the House to appoint a person, Mr. David Keith was the first appointee and his appointment expired. It's not, a full time job, it's a part-time job of one day a month or so, and the honorarium is on a per diem basis. There is an individual by the name of Mr. Fred Delath who is doing really an excellent job for us as secretary, but I think we need to appoint someone in order to validate the proceedings of the Public and Private Rights Board and therefore the need to appoint this individual

I have contacted Mr. Kuziak and I've spoken to my colleague, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) on this matter. I don't think it should be too controversial and I so move.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment. I'm not going to oppose the Motion of the Attorney General, he's been very co-operative today in everything. I just want to say that if there is anybody in the province of Saskatchewan who deserves to be appointed by an NDP Government to an NDP Board, it's the son of Mr. Kuziak. He certainly earned his spurs, his father sat on the Cabinet side of the House for many years, I certainly wouldn't suggest he's a political hack, but it's certainly a political payoff.

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, just for the edification of the Member who has taken his seat, the appointee is a paid-up member of the Saskatchewan Waffle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 10:12 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to deliver the following speech:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you on the work you have done.

At this Fourth Session of the Seventeenth Legislature you have dealt with more than 130 bills and have set directions in government policy which will have a profound and positive effect upon the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan.

Among the important steps taken, you have initiated progressive moves to make health services more readily available to all the people of Saskatchewan. You have abolished all premiums for medical care and hospital insurance; and you have initiated a pioneering program which will make prescription drugs available at greatly reduced cost.

You have also approved the recommendations of an independent Constituency Boundaries Commission.

Another important series of measures have been taken to bring oil and gas reserves in Saskatchewan under ownership and control of the province and to provide the people of Saskatchewan with the full economic and social benefits from the ownership of that resource. You have also taken steps to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan gain the full benefits from the exploitation of other mineral reserves, such as potash.

In education, you have approved the establishment of a Universities Commission, and two independent universities in Regina and Saskatoon.

In the field of municipal government, you have passed a series of measures which will enable municipalities, towns, villages and rural municipalities to receive substantial new grants of money to carry out projects of their own choosing. You have approved further increases in Property Improvement Grants to homeowners.

You have approved measures which will decrease substantially the taxes on gasoline and other fuels.

You have approved measures to grant compensation to

May 10, 1974

individuals, small business and municipalities suffering the effects of 1974 floods.

You have approved the Family Income Plan, which will enable working people on modest incomes to supplement their incomes to a level considerably above the compensation they would receive under social assistance.

You have revised the system of Workmen's Compensation to provide greatly improved benefits to people who are disabled in the course of their employment.

You have approved a legal aid system to assist people who would not otherwise be able to afford it.

And among a great number of other new measures, you have passed legislation which will ensure that the ownership and control of farm land in Saskatchewan remains basically with the people who live in Saskatchewan.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the Public Service and I assure you that this sum of money will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the full bless of Providence.

The Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski, Provincial Secretary, then said:

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases his Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.