

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
15th Day

Tuesday, March 11, 1975

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce through you to the House a group of 44 Grade Seven students from St. James School in Saskatoon. They are sitting in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Brisky and Mr. Bergerman.

I had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to spend an hour with these students yesterday to discuss the procedures in the Legislature and also to get myself acquainted with the students. I will be meeting with them later on outside the House to answer further questions for them. I hope that they have an informative day today and I wish them a safe trip back to Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to this House a group of students from the Wascana Institute. They are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery and are 40 in number. They pursue a course at Scott Collegiate. They are not students of the age that we ordinarily have, they are older students and are here with their instructors, Mrs. Boesch, Mrs. Parisian, Mrs. Terry and Mr. Scheske. They have had a tour of the buildings and will be with us until after the question period. I invite all Members to conduct themselves with decorum during that period. I know that they will enjoy the proceedings and I hope that they will gain some instructions from them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SASKATCHEWAN LAND BANK COMMISSION

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins). The question is, will the Minister of Finance tell the House the number of dollars that have now been advanced by the Provincial Government to the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission? And whether this money was borrowed or whether it came from general tax revenue?

Hon. W.A. Robbins (Minister of Finance): — I can't give you the exact figure at the moment, I can give you an approximate figure. The money is borrowed and it is not advanced in terms of tax money.

Mr. Weatherald: — I take it the money was borrowed but I am sorry that the Minister didn't give the figure. I presume that when you answer a supplementary question you will give us the figure. If the money was borrowed can you give us the approximate rate of interest being paid? And whether any of the advance has actually been paid back by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission?

Mr. Robbins: — I can't give you those figures right now but I can get that information for you.

Mr. Weatherald: — Surely you know if any was paid back and the approximate number of dollars.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Minister has agreed to supply the figures to the Member's question and that is all that the House can insist on.

ENEMY LIST

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question I should like to direct to the Premier. I gather from a recent report in the Leader-Post that in a speech in Saskatoon the Premier recently published and declared what he has called his enemies' list. On that list are members of the Liberal Party and apparently any person in the Province of Saskatchewan who has dared to vote for the Liberal Party is on that enemies' list. As well, all oil companies, as well, all potash companies and I gather from the Premier, as well, the Press. I would like to know at this time from the Premier, Mr. Speaker, whether he would give us the entire content of his enemy list so that the people of Saskatchewan would know whether they could consider themselves an enemy of the Premier or a friend of the Premier?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I invite the people of Saskatchewan to consider that problem and to render their verdict in the way which would most please me and I am sure they will in the next few months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But in the meantime to respond to the particular question, the Hon. Member refers to a press report, a speech which I gave. The speech which I gave was made extemporaneously so I do not have notes that I can table. The report is that which is carried in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, I believe, and you may therefore consult the Star-Phoenix for the list. I am not able to add anything to it, I certainly cannot vouch for its accuracy. I have had occasion to note that in the past. The Hon. Member will have to make do with the Press report which is available to him, accurate or otherwise, since I am unable to add to it.

Mr. Malone: — A supplementary question then, if the Premier won't divulge who else he considers to be enemies of his Party and of himself, perhaps he could tell us at this time his list of friends?

March 11, 1975

Now I am sure this list would include Dunskey Advertising, Service Printers and the breweries. Perhaps there are some others he could tell us about today.

Mr. Blakeney: . . . I'd be delighted. I just happen to have with me here a list of memberships and I am looking at a constituency — I'll pick one at random here — Prince Albert, Duck Lake . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: . . . 570 paid-up members

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: I don't know if I need any other witness or need to make any other comment on the number of friends, but they are legion and I know that they will wish to emphasize their friendship on the appropriate occasion and in the appropriate manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — On a Point of Order. I think it has always been the practice that whenever a Minister of the Crown or any Member reads from a piece of paper that it will be tabled in the Legislature. I wonder if the Premier will table that list of memberships from which he read.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The Premier may laugh, but it has always been the custom that whenever a Member of the Opposition or the Government, if he makes reference to something he has in his hand, a piece of paper, he has been asked to table that. I think you should rule on this particular request.

Mr. Speaker: — The rulings are clear that if a Member is reading from a letter he can take full responsibility for it and he doesn't have to table it if he takes full responsibility. If a Minister of the Crown is reading from a government document . . .

Mr. Guy: — That's what it is.

Mr. Speaker: . . . and quoting the document then it must be tabled. They can refer to the document if they are not quoting from it. With a private document they have the same privilege as Private Members if they take responsibility for what they are giving.

TEN LOST YEARS

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — I was just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if a list of civil servants isn't a government document.

I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). There was an article in the Leader-Post the other day saying, "School Board Gets an Apology," where members of the Department of Education had requested that school

boards show "Ten Lost Years" and recommend it as educational for students. It contained some obscenities and apparently other objectionable portions and I was wondering if the Minister of Education could explain first of all how the Department of Education could ever recommend for students the opportunity of viewing such a program? Second, could he indicate to Members of the House what kind of a screening process goes on in the Department of Education on television programs, booklets, films and so forth that are recommended for school boards and who is responsible for the standards by which these recommendations are made? This is a pretty serious matter and particularly when it required an apology from the Department itself.

Mr. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member, it is a serious matter and in my mind I do not have all of the details to reply to the questions raised. I would ask the Member to place that question on the Order Paper so I can, in fact, answer it properly.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Just a supplementary question. Can the Minister give the Members of the House and I would suggest the school boards in the province, the assurance that the Department of Education will assume the responsibility for an adequate screening process so that recommendations of this kind do not go out to school boards, schools and students in the province in the future?

Mr. MacMurchy: — I can give the assurance that the Department will do its best to screen all materials that they take responsibility for.

HOW MANY FARMERS IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

Mr. Speaker: — There have been three questions. Will the House permit a fourth question? Agreed.

Mr. Richards: — The question is relatively straightforward. There appears to be very little information which is readily available on precisely how many farmers there are in the Province of Saskatchewan. Given that farming is the most important industry in the province one would feel that this was a statistical item which should be readily available. You've got the 1971 census; there are the people in statistics talking about there being approximately a two per cent decline per year in the number of farms. Does the Minister have something more precise he can say on what has been the change in the number of farms since 1971 when there were 76,000 commercial farms?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — As the Member knows it is difficult to try and establish in any current way the actual number of farmers. It is not unlike urban communities whether or not the population is growing or decreasing. Due to the significance of the

Government's activities in relation to fortifying and increasing farm numbers with programs such as FarmStart and Land Bank, we suspect that there are in fact additions taking place in regard to farming numbers in Saskatchewan. Rather than rely on federal census information we are undertaking to find a means on an annual basis of having some better information available in relation to the number of farms and I hope in the not too distant future I shall be able to provide to the Member some information that the Department has compiled in regard to the trends that are taking place in the province.

Mr. Richards: — The Minister is stating that he feels that the decline is being reversed. What I was really wanting to derive from the supplementary was to ask the Minister whether he asked the politicians that he has filmed on the front of his FarmStart Report whether they authorized their pictures to be included on the cover of the annual FarmStart Report?

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 2

MR. J.G. RICHARDS (Saskatoon University) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 2 showing:

(1) The total amount of forest revenue received by the Government of Saskatchewan during each of the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, and if available 1973-74, by way of dues, fees, royalties, penalties, interest charges, levies, and rentals. (2) The total expenditures by the Government of Saskatchewan during each of the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, and if available 1973-74 on (a) forest fire suppression, (b) fire protection, (c) forestry inventory and management, (d) silviculture and extension services, (e) forestry branch central services, (f) roads used specifically for forestry operations, and (g) the costs of public highways and grid roads attributable to forest operations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think this a relatively simple and straightforward matter. The Speaker will be glad to know that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has agreed to second the motion and therefore the debate is in order.

The thrust of the motion is to secure information as to what obviously are the incoming revenues to the provincial government and the outflowing expenditures attributable to the forest industry. The 1974 annual report of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, for example, does give some information on this subject, stating that there was revenue received of \$1.99 — in effect, \$2 million, from the forest industry. Almost 50 per cent of that came from Simpson Timber. But the question that has to be asked — apart from the fact that \$2 million constitutes a very small percentage of total value added in the forest industry — is how much of that is immediately turned around and expended on services for the forest industry. Here the information becomes a good deal more skimpy. In the 1973 annual report of the Department of Natural Resources, information was provided that \$561,000 had been expended on fire suppression. The Public Accounts state that the total forestry branch expended — and it is not of course specified as to what

functions — \$850,000 in 1973. I estimate the amount expended for road construction by the Government for the forest industry in the North at \$400,000. Apparently the cost of direct services to the forest industry, in the form of fire suppression, road construction, reforestation, other technical services provided to the forest companies equals virtually the entire amount which is received from the forest industry in the form of stumpage fees, other dues and rentals. This is obviously an area which demands better public accounting and increased taxation. I would be interested in the comments from the Minister on this Motion for Return.

Hon. J.R. Kowalchuk (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the Hon. gentlemen that what he asks for will be coming forth in an answer to the questions asked. I also want to inform him that we are proceeding to negotiate a better agreement with these companies he is talking about, Simpson Timber, Papco, so that in the future better benefits will accrue to the people of Saskatchewan.

However, I want to move an amendment to the motion that was brought in by the Member, seconded by Mr. Baker:

That the word 'public' in clause (g) be deleted and the word 'provincial' substituted therefor.

The section will then read "(g) the costs of provincial highways and grid roads attributable to forest operations."

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to use the word 'public.' This would involve a whole lot of people, a lot of roads, and it would be impossible for us to get the figures that he desires for them.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 3

MR. A.R. GUY: (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 3 showing:

All payments made to the newspaper, the "Commonwealth" by the Government, or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations from November 1, 1973 to October 30, 1974.

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment to the motion that is before us. We want to be able to provide more information than is requested by the motion. Consequently we are prepared to move the following amendment, seconded by my seatmate the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy:

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

All payments made for advertisements by the Government or any of its agencies or Crown Corporations from March 26, 1974 to date to: (a) each Saskatchewan newspaper having greater than 10,000 circulation and (b) all other newspapers having a circulation of 10,000 or less.

I think you will see, Mr. Speaker, that this clearly provides the information that the Member requests plus additional information.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, that certainly is changing the intent. First of all, we have never really admitted that the Commonwealth is a newspaper in that sense of the word. It is hard to know exactly what the circulation of the Commonwealth is. It is a paid circulation, you have to pay in order to get it, of course.

What is being missed of course is the point that no one in the province is concerned about how much advertising goes to the Leader-Post or to the Saskatchewan Valley News or any of those papers. The people of Saskatchewan are very concerned about the amount of public funds that is going into a newspaper owned by a political party to be used in the forthcoming election campaign. This is the concern of the people of Saskatchewan. We debated this in the House over the past number of years. Members opposite have no conscience when it comes to using the taxpayers' money for their own political purposes. However, it is in respect to the intelligence of our voters in Saskatchewan that they certainly want to know the exact dollar figure that is taken from the public purse and is put into the NDP, the political party that owns the Commonwealth and puts it out to help to pay for their own political campaign expenditures.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment should be defeated. I don't know what the point of it is. We have asked a very straightforward question. How much money is this Government giving to their own — I wouldn't call it a newspaper — it is their own party organ in which they put out their propaganda. It is no different in a sense than (except it is not as honest) the Saskatchewan Liberal. It is not a newspaper by a far stretch of the imagination. We have asked a very direct question. I think the people have a right to know. I think any advertising given to the Commonwealth is a disgrace. I think it is in exactly the same context and exactly the same moral level as the Government opposite continuing, as I am sure they are, to give printing business to their political party, to the people who print the Commonwealth, to Service Printers owned by the NDP. This is exactly the same thing as them putting their hand in the taxpayers' pocket and taking money out to run their own political machine.

I think this is attempting to deny information to the public. I think it should be defeated. I have never heard anyone claim that the Commonwealth was a newspaper. Why give us this information? If we want this information we'll ask for it in another question. we want to know very clearly and directly how much money that Government is funneling into their own political pockets.

An Hon. Member: — Zero.

Mr. Steuart: — Zero, he says. You better go and take a look, your sense of arithmetic is about as good as your sense of morality.

I think the House should defeat this, but they won't over there. Any sense of decency or ethics that they had, the likes

of the Saskatoon Member at the back talking and the Minister from Kindersley, when they came into this House has long since disappeared when they can support this kind of nonsense, this kind of immoral situation where they take money from the public purse and hand it over to their political party through Service Printing and the Commonwealth. They don't even have the courage to admit publicly what they are doing — I don't blame them for trying to hide it — I think it stinks to high heaven. I think if they have any morals at all the ex-teachers and the ex-ministers should vote against this amendment because it is wrong, it denies proper information. It is another cover-up. That is exactly what it is, an attempt to cover up an illegal — I think it is illegal, if it isn't it should be — and a very immoral act.

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS
Messieurs

Dyck	Meakes	Messer
Snyder	Bowerman	Kramer
Thibault	Larson	Baker
Kowalchuk	Brockelbank	MacMurchy
Pepper	Michayluk	Byers
Thorson	Whelan	Kwasnica
Carlson	Engel	Cody
Robbins	Tchorzewski	Cowley
Taylor	Matsalla	Faris
Owens	Mostoway	Feduniak
Comer	Rolfes	Lange
Hanson	Oliver	Feschuk
Flasch		

NAYS
Messieurs

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

RETURN NO. 4

MR. GUY moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 4 showing:

With respect to the Piper Navaho aircraft (CF-SPX) owned by the government: (a) the number of flights made from November 15, 1973 to November 15, 1974; (b) the date, origin, intermediate stops and final destination of each such flight; and (c) the names and position with the government, if applicable, of all passengers on each such flight.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment in view of the circumstances here. I notice that the same member is asking a similar question with regard to aircrafts CF-SPG and CF-SPM in item number eight. I am combining the two motions into the same motion in the following form.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I don't think the Member can take another motion and try to combine it with a previous one, and do away with the second one. They are two different motions on the Order Paper, and must be dealt with in their turn.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I agree with your ruling. I only made reference to the latter motion because I intend to ask the Hon. Member to either drop the latter motion or have the House defeat it. I think this will answer the question. That is the only reason I alluded to it.

The amendment that I offer, seconded by Hon. Mr. MacMurchy, Mr. Speaker, would be as follows:

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

With respect to aircraft CF-SPX, CF-SPG and CF-SPM: (a) the number of flights other than for air ambulance service, from November 30, 1973; (b) the date, origin, intermediate stops and final destination of each such flight; and (c) the names and position with the government, if applicable, of all passengers on each such flight.

Mr. Speaker: — From looking over this amendment it includes part of Order for Return No. 8 of the SPG and the SPM. The Minister is assuming that Motion for Return No. 8 will be dropped. No Member has a right to assume that another Motion can be dropped or defeated by including it in a previous Motion. Therefore, I would have to rule this amendment out of order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak on a Point of Order?

Mr. Speaker: — You may speak on a Point of Order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I assume that the amendment I offered would have been in order had I not made reference to the other motion.

I made reference to the other motion merely as a matter of courtesy to the Member who has it on the Order Paper, and it has nothing to do with my particular amendment. My amendment is intended to be all inclusive to cover all of the aircraft that might be used for the purposes which apparently the Member is searching for in Item No. 4. Consequently I move it solely in relation to Item No. 4, and I mentioned the other Item solely as a courtesy to the Member.

Mr. Guy: — On the Point of Order, if I might speak to it. Of course, I have no particular objection to the amendment but I understand that under our rules and under our system that No. 8 (whether the Member knows it or not) comes after No. 4 and, therefore, I can't ask to have No. 8 dropped until it's called before the Legislature. So I am afraid my hands are tied as far as saying at this particular time that I would drop No. 8. I think that we should proceed with the Motions as they have appeared on the Order Paper. I don't think we have any alternative because of the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister would have been well within order had he asked leave to adjourn the debate on this and when No. 8 came have had a discussion with the Member concerned, No. 8 would be dropped and then when this came up on adjourned debates it could have been included at that time. At this stage of the game the Chair has no right to assume that any Member is going to drop something that he has placed on the Order Paper. Therefore, under our rules I have to declare the amendment out of order.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 6

MR. GUY moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 6 showing:

(1) All printing contracts with their values, given to Service Printing Company, from September 30, 1973 to September 30, 1974 by all Departments, Boards, Agencies, or Crown Corporations, of the Provincial Government. (2) (a) With respect to the above, the contracts that were tendered, and whether the low tender was accepted in each case; (b) in the case where the low tender was not accepted, if any, the name of the low tender, and the reasons that it was not accepted; (c) with respect to the above, the contracts that were not awarded by tender.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment to this Resolution and the amendment is as follows:

Delete all the words after “showing” and substitute the following:

Total dollar value of all contracts given by the Queen’s Printer to Regina Printing firms from March 5, 1974 to date showing. (1) (a) The total amount allotted in each period; (b) the total amount entered in each period. (2) (a) All instances where low tender was not accepted; (b) if any, the reasons why low tender was not accepted.

This amendment is seconded by the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy).

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this particular motion.

At the conclusion of the last legislative session I decided at that time to examine how government printing was handled in other provinces. Since the Members of the Opposition were so vocal in support of the manner in which the Liberal Government might handle government printing, I thought it might be well to check with another province having a Liberal Government, to see how printing was handled there. Necessarily you will understand, Mr. Speaker, you have to go quite a ways in Canada to find a Liberal Provincial Government. However, an examination of the Quebec scene indicated the following. Apparently Montreal’s LaPress disclosed last March that more than \$1 million in provincial government business had flowed to Paragon Business Forms Limited, a company largely owned by the Premier’s in-laws, including his wife Andree and her brother Claude Simard of the

Simard ship-building family. You will understand, of course, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Simard is also Quebec's Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game.

Mr. Speaker, having looked at the Liberal practices in the Province of Quebec I decided to get some information about how the Federal Liberal Government handled printing.

I received information that a recent large printing order had gone to Systems Equipment Limited. I am still in the process of attempting to determine how or why they obtained that business. By the way, Mr. Speaker, Systems Equipment Limited is one of the companies in the James Richardson and Sons Limited conglomerate. You will all know, of course, that the Hon. James Richardson is the Minister of National Defence in the Federal Liberal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is rather slow getting information out of the House of Commons. I have been unable at this point to determine how strong the connections are between the Hon. James Richardson, Minister of National Defence and James Richardson and Sons Limited.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Order. The Minister stands up here and says he doesn't know what kind of connection there is, he hasn't been able to obtain the information and yet he deliberately stands up here and smears somebody. This is the kind of an action that the Minister has been particularly adequate at over the years. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Hon. Member, I don't think it's a Point of Order, it's part of the debate and I think the Hon. Member will have the opportunity to debate the statements made.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Members of the House that I will be attempting to get more information on this particular topic.

Having exhausted the possibilities in the East I returned my thoughts to Regina and the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. I find that at no time, no time between June, 1964 and June, 1971 were the "whites and blues" (these papers we have on our desk) tendered for printing by the Liberal Government. Never. Never tendered by the Liberal Government. During that period of time, Mr. Speaker, the work was consistently awarded to Commercial Printers, without tender.

I have a copy here, Mr. Speaker, of The Saskatchewan Liberal, the house organ of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. I know that it was printed by Commercial Printers Limited, Regina.

We, in the New Democratic Party, have gone on record as favoring a policy of providing as near as practical an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan printing companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation, provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis, under a fair wage and working conditions. That, Mr. Speaker, is a sound and sensibly policy.

We do not intend to establish a “black list” as the Liberal Party did with regard to weekly newspapers in Saskatchewan and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this House, that Commercial Printers, even though they have printed The Saskatchewan Liberal, will continue to receive Government of Saskatchewan business.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I have initiated a new general policy with regard to printing tender by the Queen’s Printer. It is this: All printing jobs estimated to cost \$15,000 or more will be tendered.

The Members of this Assembly may be interested in knowing that this policy has already been put into effect. With regard to “the whites and blues” to which I referred earlier, an individual tender (better known in the trade as ‘Enquiry for Prices’) was issued to three firms with the capability of performing this job, since the job was estimated to be in excess of \$15,000. The Enquiry for Prices was issued to Commercial Printers, Centax of Canada Limited and Service Printers Limited. Each of the printing firms responded, Mr. Speaker. The House will be interested in knowing that the contract was awarded to Service Printers Limited on the basis of low tender.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Enquiry for Prices formed was identical to each firm. It was issued on November 15 and closed on November 25, 1974 at 11 o’clock Central Standard Time.

I am informed that the prices quoted by Service Printing on the competitive tender basis was about 5 1/2 per cent higher than last year when they were awarded this same work on the basis of the Queen’s Printer price list. Therefore, it is safe to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the price paid for that work last year was fair and reasonable. I therefore feel, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment offered at this time to the Resolution before us will give the information desired for all Regina printing firms and I am sure the Members of the House will be pleased to receive that information.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I’ve heard that Minister over there talk a lot of sheer nonsense, but today he reached a new high, or a new low. Let me tell him that by digging up something that may or may not have happened in the Province of Quebec, that a Liberal Government in the Province of Quebec may or may not have given some printing to a firm that’s owned by the Premier or his wife, or his kids or anybody else, is of no concern to this House or the people of this province. That’s of concern, I presume, to the people of Quebec.

What he really says is this. Because we have our hand in the taxpayer’s pocket, because the NDP Party is literally stealing money from the taxpayer and handing it over to Service Printers, of which he happens to be (or his father happens to be) on the board of directors and is one of the shareholders, he says because I can find that in Ottawa they give some printing business to a firm that’s owned by a company which one of the

Ministers is associated with, that makes our immoral act fine. If Mr. James Richardson or any of his relatives have got their hands in the public purse let the Press and the people of Canada deal with that and more power to them. If the people of Quebec want to find out that they've got a Premier that's a crook or they've got anybody else that is, that is their business and let them find out about it. But I am saying here in the Province of Saskatchewan you can play all your funny, silly little games about saying you are going to ask for tenders. Oh! I can see this tender performance now. You know, the Premier says to Mr. Brockelbank, it's getting a bit embarrassing. Well, it hasn't really been raised too often lately but there are a few people in our Party who have a few moral standards left and it is a bit embarrassing every year (the Opposition brings it up) that we are still handing business to Service Printers. See if you can make it smell a little bit better. So he says, we'll call for tenders. So he calls for tenders with Commercial Printers (who incidentally don't print The Saskatchewan Liberal), calls for tenders from another firm, sees the prices . . .

An Hon. Member: — They printed the . . .

Mr. Steuart: — They might have printed that one — they don't print it now. Well anyway, whether they did or whether they didn't, they didn't belong to us, we put our paper out and let anybody print it that's got the best price.

However, he hands it out and then he comes in and says, now look what good boys we are, we have handed out our printing to Service Printers, but we went through some charade of calling for tenders. Who was in the office when you opened those tenders? Who decided that you would give the business literally to yourselves? You are trying to tell this House, the public of this province, that after you have handed business for years with no tender to a company that belongs to your political party, upon which I am sure they made a very healthy profit, and that profit goes to help re-elect you and the Premier and all those Members over there (and that's exactly what it does), you use that money to perpetuate yourselves in office and no one can argue that. You can't argue it and now you play a funny little game and behind closed doors you say 'but we're bidding.' Public tender with you in control. Sheer nonsense. I am sure that Service Printers knew the price before they ever put the bid in. Even beside that there should be no way that any company owned by a political party should be able to do business with a government, especially with that government of the same persuasion, the same philosophy, the same political party. It is an immoral act and you can cover it up by saying in Quebec . . . I don't care if every politician in Quebec is as crooked as a dog's hind leg, that's their business. It doesn't make you smell any better. It doesn't make you smell a bit better.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What you are doing smells to high heaven. Don't try to come in here and put on the nonsense that you have put out tenders. All you are doing now is cloaking the stealing of public money for your own political party by making Centax some kind of an innocent party to the little game you are playing. It doesn't impress us, it won't impress anybody who has one spark of morals in his whole fibre. I am amazed that the

Members on that side can sit there and the ex-clergyman (the dog man) can sit there and smirk and yet go out and stand up and say, look at our hands how clean they are, when they are into the public purse up to there with Service Printers. It's public knowledge and then they come in and try to put some kind of a face to it, and says, "But look, in Quebec we think they are even bigger crooks. Of course, they are not stealing for the political party, maybe the Premier is in on the take. Or look what they do in Ottawa, maybe James Richardson or his brother or somebody is in on the take so that makes what we are doing somehow right."

Well I tell you, you've got a strange sense of what's right and proper and a very strange sense of what's moral and ethical. Again I would hope the Members would defeat this so-called amendment and give us the information we want. But what I would really hope is you would take a look at what you are doing and stop it altogether.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Debate continues on the Motion as amended.

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I think it's quite important that we get this information on all companies in Regina because I have a return here indicating the amount of printing that was given to Dunskey Advertising in 1973, to Struthers and to Service Printers, also in 1972. My reason for bringing this up is that in the federal election last year there was a candidate in my constituency by the name of Wiley Simmonds and there was an article in my local paper that indicated that Mr. Simmonds might be somehow connected with the Government at some time and I have a copy of Mr. Simmonds reply from the Moosomin Spectator which I won't read but which very carefully denies any connection. I also have a copy here of a company that was incorporated in July, 1971 which you will note is very conveniently just a few days after the provincial election in this province. This is J.A.C. Struthers and Associates Limited, and we note that the people involved in this with the shares are a Mr. J.A.C. Struthers with 52 common shares.

Mr. Brockelbank: — On a Point of Order. If I understand you correctly, Mr. Speaker, the Motion before the House is the amendment which is the printing given by the Queen's Printer to Regina printing firms. I don't believe the Member has alluded to that once yet and he is referring to something that has no connection with the Queen's Printer giving printing to Regina firms, which is the subject before the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate before the House is the Motion for Return No. 6 as amended, which by the amendment struck out all the words of the previous one and for the benefit of Members who do not have the privilege of having a copy before them, the amendment reads:

Total dollar value of all contracts given by the Queen's Printer to Regina printing firms from March 5, 1974 to date showing 1 (a) the total amount allotted in each period (b) the total amount tendered in each period; 2 (a) all instances where low tender was not accepted (b) if any, the reasons why low tender was not accepted.

So the debate, while the amendment has been carried, the Motion as amended is now before the House so the debate continues on the Motion as amended.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly talking about printing and advertising firms in Regina and I was mentioning the fact that J.A.C. Struthers and Associates have been incorporated July, 1971 and the people apparently involved in this were Mr. Struthers, the Executive, 52 common shares, Mr. Bradish, Ralph Bradish, is Executive, 24 common shares and Mr. Wiley L. Simmonds, Executive with 24 common shares.

Now it's fairly obvious that Mr. Wiley Simmonds is then connected with J.A.C. Struthers or certainly was at that time and from the 1972 and 1973 public accounts I have a list of advertising that was given to J.A.C. Struthers by the Government. I could go over these but they include Agriculture, Education, Executive Council, Highways, Legislation, Saskatchewan Hospitalization Fund. In 1972 some \$80,372. In addition, I have 1973 public accounts which indicates again the advertising given to Struthers and again it includes such things as Education \$37,000; Environment \$20,000; Executive Council \$55,000; Labour \$29,000; Municipal Affairs \$64,000; making a total in 1973 of over \$308,000 to J.A.C. Struthers and as I mentioned Mr. Wiley Simmonds is a partner.

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Point of Order is that the Member is not speaking about the Motion before the House. He's talking about an advertising firm as I understand it and the Motion is about printing. The Motion whether it's in the original form is about printing contracts and the amendment offered is about printing contracts with printing firms and the Queen's Printer. The Member has with skill, which is easy to see given his ability, has stayed clearly away from the subject. He has not talked about the subject yet, because he's talking about an advertising firm. Nothing to do with printing.

Mr. Speaker: — When the Minister rose in this debate on the Order for Return No. 6, the Minister introduced an amendment. The debate then was on both the Motion and the amendment. The Minister was discussing some printing contracts or something that was done in Quebec or other places which was not in the Motion. Statements made by the Minister either on the Motion or on the amendment is open for debate at this time before it's the Motion as amended. While some of the names referred to by the Member for Moosomin are not mentioned in either the Motion or the amendment, neither were the other companies included, either in other previous debate, so I would say that the Member is in order and can continue as long as he sticks to printing.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it's all related. I have the sheets here and I would be glad to supply copies to the Minister, although I am sure he has them and as an example I have them headed, Dunskey, Struthers, and Service Printing. For example in 1973 public accounts it indicated that Legislature advertising was \$43,900 awarded to Dunskey, \$8,000 to Struthers, \$33,800 to Service Printing. These are just examples. There is quite a number here that only give material to Struthers such as Municipal Affairs in 1973, \$64,300.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is the conflict of interest that we're concerned about in the original resolution and again here where you have a person who is obviously associated with the party, who ran federally for this party, who is listed here by their own records as being a part of J.A.C. Struthers Associates at that time at least, Mr. Wiley L. Simmonds, who ran federally in the Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain constituency and who when associated with Struthers, Struthers received a great deal of advertising and material from the Government's various departments. I might add at this time that I understand some of the biggest accounts are the Crown corporations which I don't have here, but I'm sure that we can compile these too. I believe the telephone connection was one of the largest that Struthers handle and I just want to point this out. I think it's important as far as this debate is concerned. The conflict of interest both with Service Printers and with Struthers who had people incorporated with their company who are connected with this Government and it's very obviously a conflict of interest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended carried.

RETURN NO. 7

MR. GUY moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 7 showing:

(1) The number of Public Service positions over \$6,000 per year that were filled from October 1, 1973 to October 31, 1974. (2) (a) The number of these positions that were not advertised publicly; (b) the number of these positions that were not advertised within the service. (3) The name of the candidate who filled each position, including the person's qualifications and salary.

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Public Service Commission): Mr. Speaker, we certainly want to provide the information for the Hon. Member. I am going to propose an amendment which will provide him, I think, with the information he wants. The question as it is worded, or the Return as it is worded, would take considerable time to answer. I'm sure he's not interested in in-line transfers such as a social worker, for example, moving from Regina to Swift Current or Saskatoon or wherever it might be. He is concerned primarily about employees coming in and how they were hired. The amendment which I am proposing will do precisely that. The other difficulty with the Return the way it's presently worded is that it could also affect where maybe only the name of the position was changed, it's the same person but it is in effect a transfer. So I am going to propose an amendment, moved by myself and seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) that Return No. 7 be amended by striking out clause 1 and replacing with the following:

The number of probationary appointments made by the Public Service Commission to positions having salaries of over \$6,000 per year, that were filled from October 1, 1973 to October 31, 1974.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, this amendment of course is not satisfactory. It doesn't provide the information. He's talking about a very narrow group of probationary appointments. He admits himself that he had taken out of the question all the transfers and the information on transfers is as important to us as the appointments because we like to keep track of those who have moved up the NDP ladder at a somewhat higher or faster pace than maybe some of the civil servants that have been there for a great number of years and are deserving of such transfer and promotion. I think the question that we have asked for is legitimate information. The Minister is trying to whitewash the House by providing very limited information and I would ask the Members to turn down the amendment and proceed with the Resolution that I moved in the first place, because I think we are in a better position to know what information we require and what we want than the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I should like a ruling on this — whether it's out of order or not. The amendment denies the very information we want. In the first place it says probationary positions. We don't want that information, we didn't ask for it. It means that we'll be denied all the information in the original question. I'd like your ruling as to whether this amendment is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Leader of the Opposition will realize that the amendment only proposes to strike out Clause 1. It leaves in Clause 2 and 3. This just changes Clause 1 and while it may supply different information or maybe not some of the information that Members initially asked for, it is in order for another Member to change it and the debate continues accordingly. So the amendment is in order, but it doesn't strike out Clause 2 and 3. It just strikes out Clause 1 of the original motion.

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the question on a Point of Privilege? The Hon. Member opposite suggested that we would not provide information in terms of people moving up the job ladder. I made it perfectly clear that the only things that would be excluded in terms of transfer were in-line transfers where a worker may have moved from one point to another doing the same job at the same salary. Any promotions will, of course, be included.

Motion as amended carried.

RETURN NO. 20

MR. H.E. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 20 showing:

With respect to each Opposition Member of the Legislature who made use of government aircraft from January 1, 1974 to the present date: (a) the total number of flights by each Member; (b) his name; and (c) the dates of each flight.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, since this information is provided by

a previous question on the Order Paper that will be answered, I ask the Members to defeat the question.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question. Would the Minister tell us where or what Order for Return gives us this information?

Mr. Speaker: — Is this House ready for the question?

Mr. Steuart: — You know, he has asked the House to defeat the question because he said that this information will be provided in a question or a return before. Just as a courtesy, could he tell us which one? If it is, then I agree that we should defeat it. Which Order for Return gives us the information we ask here?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to speak again? I don't want to break the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member asked you a question before you took your seat. We will allow you to answer the question.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well essentially the information is provided in Return No. 4 and Return No. 8 and the Member will be aware of the fact that I tried to facilitate the answering of these questions and they were unwilling to accept it and consequently accept it in the form in which we are going to provide it in those other two questions.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 21

MR. D.F. MACDONALD (Moose Jaw North) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 21 showing:

- (1) The projections of the Government of Saskatchewan of anticipated occupational opportunities of Saskatchewan residents in all trades and professions for the next five years, together with the anticipated earnings, as well as training and qualification material to be required, in each of the various trades and professions.
- (2) The reference to the sources of material for such projections.

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the Motion on the Order Paper asks for projections of the Government of Saskatchewan of anticipated occupational opportunities of Saskatchewan residents in all trades and professions for the next five years, together with the anticipated earnings, as well as training and qualification material to be required in each of the various trades and professions, and the reference to the sources of material for such projections.

I feel badly about this, Mr. Speaker, but I think we will have to disappoint the Member for Moose Jaw North because it is

going to be somewhat difficult to anticipate what veterinarians, for example, will be earning in the year 1980. I think the demand for particular occupations and their accompanying wage rates, even in the short term of five years, is dependent upon so many variables that I am certain everyone will agree that they can't be forecast very accurately. The rate of inflation, the level of interest rates, the anticipated tempo of construction, the rate of technological change — the possible elimination of road block to Saskatchewan development such as the federal transportation policies, the availability of scarce resources, the change in people's tastes or preferences are just a few of the factors that will probably influence the answer to the question that is being asked by the Member. Now I think that any response could undoubtedly be misleading and probably be so inaccurate that it would likely be held up to ridicule by Members opposite in a matter of five years.

I wonder if any of the Members opposite, who were in the House in 1970, would like to speculate for a moment about how accurate a five year projection which they might have made in 1970 would have been for the year 1975.

I think we are talking about research capabilities, Mr. Speaker, and I think you just have to remember that under the previous Liberal Government, the Department of Labour was unable to provide us accurate figures about matters as fundamental and as routine as the number of trade unionists in the Saskatchewan labour force in the Province of Saskatchewan. They were able to provide us statistics regarding the number of hogs in the province, but they didn't know how many trade unionists there were in the province.

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it would be wise nor prudent for us to make public any projections which I think, by necessity, would have to be based on assumptions which may or may not be accurate. I would be inclined to believe that many of the assumptions that would have to be made would be inaccurate. Accordingly, I think the Assembly should assume a responsible position on this question and vote down the Motion for the reasons that I think will be obvious to most Members.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 45

MR. G.B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 45 showing:

A copy of the Venture Capital Study prepared by Hickling, Johnston for the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, this study was commissioned and the consultants, Hickling, Johnston and Company, were given to understand that it would be for internal use only and it was never intended that this would be a public document. It was intended to identify policy options and for the consideration of the staff and the Board of SEDCO only. For that reason alone I would invite the House to defeat the Motion. I add this one further comment, that the study was conducted by reviewing not

only what other agencies, public and private, were doing in the way of venture investments but also by interviewing the various people who had previous experience in this field. Those who were interviewed were given to understand that the statements they made would be kept confidential and not be made public. I think that was important in order to get a candid and full and frank expression of view from those people who were interviewed. That is another reason why I would invite the House to defeat the Motion.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Minister has asked the House to defeat this Motion. I think all studies of this sort have a certain amount of interest to the public and I would strongly advise the Minister to be careful in the future about this kind of an endeavor. I am sure anything I say is not going to change his recommendation to the Members opposite, but I think the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what developed from this type of a study because it is pretty important to the policy and program of SEDCO. As I say, I regret very much that they are not prepared to release it because if it is a good report I am sure it will be adopted, the best features will be, and we on this side of the House are particularly interested and I am sure the Members opposite are equally interested in what information would be forthcoming from the report. Even though they vote against it they are going to have their tongues in their cheeks because it is information that they would have appreciated having.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 51

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 51 showing:

During the 1974 hunting season in Moose Mountain Provincial Park: (1) The number of moose licences issued; (2) The number of moose reported shot; (3) The number of elk licences issued; (4) The number of elk reported shot; (5) The number of deer estimated shot in Moose Mountain Park during the years 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974.

Hon. J.R. Kowalchuk (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — I want to make an amendment to that in two areas. In one I want to delete that portion of 1974. We haven't got the figures available for any of the deer shot in the 1974 season and they won't be available for quite a while as yet. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, along with that I also want to say that it wouldn't be possible to supply the deer estimated shot in Moose Mountain Park. There is no way that deer shooting or moose shooting can be estimated on that specific area. In other words we have to include the whole zone No. 2 area, which is much larger. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, seconded by the Member for Wascana (Mr. Baker):

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

(1) The number of moose licences issued; (2) The number of moose reported shot; (3) The number of elk licences issued; (4) The number of elk reported shot; (5) The

number of white-tailed deer estimated shot in game management zone No. 2 which includes the Moose Mountain Provincial Park for the years 1971, 1972, 1973.

Amendment agreed to.

The debate continued on the Motion as amended.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are going to get the information on (1), (2), (3) and (4). I am a little disappointed that the Minister didn't see fit to give us some information even in the larger area for the number of deer shot in 1974. I am sure the reason he doesn't want to provide this is because due to their management practices in previous years there were hardly any deer left in 1974 to be shot and the figures would be very low. I am sure that the Minister doesn't want to provide these although he must have these from aerial surveys and reports during last fall's hunting season, so I am rather disappointed that we didn't get the figures for 1974.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 52

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

Up to November 1, 1974, the number of people that had leases with the Saskatchewan Land Bank who previously farmed; (1) one-half section of land or less; (2) one-quarter section of land or less; (3) no land.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we hear from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and various sources of other information and propaganda put out by the Government that there is an increase in the number of farmers in Saskatchewan. Now by all statistical data that is being produced by Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and other relevant write-ups that we see come out in the daily papers, I think there was one approximately a week or so ago, indicating very seriously an extremely high drop in the rural population in the rural municipalities throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that the people of Saskatchewan who live in rural Saskatchewan know full well that it is sheer propaganda when the Government tells us that they are increasing the number of farms in the last three years because it is obvious they haven't. The SHSP statistics show an extremely sharp drop in the number of farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan which in itself indicates that the Land Bank has not been doing the job that the Government intended it to do. I think that this Return, Mr. Speaker, will indicate to us precisely the number of farms that they have started because the Return asks for the number of farmers who were previously farming a half section who have got land from the Land Bank. It also asks for those who had a quarter section of land who got land from the Land Bank and it indicates the number of farmers who previously had no land who have got land from the Land Bank. Now these three categories are all groups that would customarily be called by most statistics relatively small farmers. I think that the allocations will indicate how many small farmers that land has gone to and improved their economic situation as far as the family farm is concerned.

Now I rather suspect, and I have no valid reason, but I am very, very suspicious and will predict that the Government isn't going to produce this information. Because the information is going to prove that they have not increased the number of farms in Saskatchewan but that the number of farms have been decreasing in the Province of Saskatchewan. So, Mr. Speaker, I do now move this Return.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, we are I think going to surprise the Member for Cannington in that we are going to provide the information. I want to make a few short remarks. It's been necessary to amend the Resolution in order to provide him with the information because as it is now worded, it's ridiculous and tells nothing really and would cause, I think, some tremendous researching in order to provide any kind of accurate ultimate form of information. I therefore ask the Assembly to support an amendment so that the Return No. 52 be amended by:

Adding after the word 'had' in the first line the words 'long term' and that the Return be further amended by striking the word 'previously' in the second line and inserting the words 'at the time of receiving the lease,' and that the Return be further amended by reversing the order of subsections (1), (2) and (3) as follows: (1) no land; (2) some land, but not more than one-quarter section; (3) more than one-quarter section but not more than one-half section of land.

Mr. Speaker, the reason in asking the House to support this amendment is so that we can give the information that the Member for Cannington is seeking.

First, the amendment reads 'long term' rather than simply 'lease' because on some occasions where land is purchased by the Land Bank Commission late in the spring, May or June perhaps, it's obvious that we cannot legitimately post the land and expect interested farmers, either established or potential farmers to make application for the land and submit the application and farm the land in that given year, because they haven't been given enough time to establish their operations. So that there are some parcels of land that are purchased late in the year which are unable to be allocated, we will sign a short term lease, one or two years, with a person to lease the land so that we could wait until a more appropriate time to post it and have all interested participants make application for the land.

The reason for the second amendment is that we have no means of finding out, sorting out information in regard to whether or not a Land Bank recipient of land in 1973 has added to his farm during the period of time from the point of allocation up to November 1, 1974, unless we were to undertake a very detailed enquiry. So that I think it more legitimate simply to provide to the Member for Cannington and the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, information in relation to the size of farms on the date of the lease that has been allocated by the Land Bank Commission. So that in effect, Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides, I think, in a more legitimate and in a more reasonable way the information that the Members of the Opposition are seeking.

But I do want to make just two very brief comments in regard to the remarks that were made by the Member for Cannington

in regard to the decrease in the number of farms in Saskatchewan. I don't think that there is anybody at present who can, with accuracy, define what the present farming situation is in relation to numbers of farmers in the province. Most of the statistics that we have, the ones that I think all Members assume to be the most legitimate, are provided by the federal census. The last statistics that we have in that regard are 1971 and I know that there have been some recent publications in regard to the 1971 census. In fact, the provinces' economic review, the last economic review that was issued was based in fact on the 1971 federal census and it showed at that time that there is a decreasing number of farms in Saskatchewan. Now you may have some suspicions that those decreasing numbers have continued through 1972, 1973 and 1974 and on into 1975. If they have it certainly hasn't been because of the lack of endeavor or effort of the Provincial Government to try to reverse that trend. It would probably have more to do with the buoyancy of the farm economy and the desire of established farmers to extend their operations into larger units.

What we have been able to do I think is increase the category, increase the opportunity for farmers who up until 1971 did not have the opportunity to expand their farms or establish a farming operation and I'm sure that when and if we are able to compile accurate statistics they will show that those small farmers who were unable to expand prior to 1971 have had opportunities to expand since 1971 and those farmers, younger farmers, potential farmers, who wanted to farm but could not establish a land base to do so, have been able, under the Land Bank Commission, to establish themselves in farming operations. We may have in many regions of the province had farmers retiring, but I think we would have been able to compensate for those retiring farmers by having their land go either to farmers who were not able to acquire an adequate land base in order to continue farming or have it passed to potential farmers who did not have the opportunity prior to 1971.

Mr. Speaker, having made this short comment, I ask the Legislature to support the amendment which will provide accurate information that the Members wants.

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point regarding this and in the last two or three years we've had a number of occasions where we've tried to get the number of farmers in the province from the Minister and if he doesn't want to provide us with them, that's fine, we'll accept it. But, I would really prefer that he would just say that he doesn't want to give them to us rather than saying he doesn't know, because it's very obvious that his department must know very, very accurately how many farmers there are and if they don't they can very soon get it. The farmers who are in the grain business, as he well knows, have permit books; in the hog business, they register with the Hog Marketing Commission. I'm sure he sent out to every farmer in this province a little booklet talking about his Farm Fuel Rebate and he didn't send those to people who weren't in the farming business. He knows how many of those were sent out, he knows whom he sent it to. He sent a number of letters out on many other occasions to farmers in the province on a great variety of subjects, his provincial Feed Grain Commission and many others. There's no doubt in the world that the Minister knows within a very close number the number of farmers in this province. They are, of course, decreasing and this is

his reason for wanting to withhold this information as much as he can. He's got many people working in his department who are familiar with statistics and these people could very soon give him an accurate figure on the number of farmers. It's obvious that he doesn't want to supply us with this.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I think that's a pretty sad commentary on the Government opposite. Agriculture our main industry and we don't even know, according to the Minister of Agriculture's statement, whether there are more farmers in Saskatchewan than there were say five or six years ago or whether there are less.

Now we got a speech from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) saying the Department of Labour kept no statistics, so I suggest that he send a copy to the Minister of Agriculture, because our main industry, one of the main subjects in this whole Assembly is on agriculture and the farm population in the Province of Saskatchewan and we are told that they have no way, the Government has no way of knowing whether there are less farmers or more farmers. Now I think that's just about hitting rock bottom as far as administration by the government offices is concerned.

Mr. Messer: — What were you able to tell us between 1964 and 1971?

Mr. Weatherald: — Well we could tell you whether there were more or less anyway.

Mr. Messer: — You could not.

Mr. Weatherald: — Oh yes we could. Well, I'll answer you because here's a publication. The truth of the matter is you don't want to tell us. You know, but you don't want to tell us. I'm going to tell you.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Weatherald: — First of all he sends out letters to every farmer in Saskatchewan. He could tell us whether that's got to be more in the last three years or less.

Secondly, there's SHSP which keeps people's occupations separated and not long ago they had a publication indicating there were many less farmers in Saskatchewan now than there were three years ago.

There are wheat board permits. This is a source that can be used as far as farmers are concerned, the number of people holding wheat board permits, permit books in the Province of Saskatchewan. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, there are the RM statistics because every rural municipality in Saskatchewan keeps a record of tax collections from farmers for the land which they own in all the rural municipalities of the Province of Saskatchewan. So there are lots of sources of statistics if the Minister of Agriculture wants to use them. He could take a little of the money that he's been spending mostly for propaganda purposes and get these statistics.

March 11, 1975

Now I want to tell him because apparently, well he does know but he just doesn't want to provide them. But I want to read him a piece which came out in the Leader-Post very recently. The heading is "They Keep Leaving Farm for the Big City Lights."

The movement of Saskatchewan people to cities continued in 1973 according to the just released annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Now the Department of Municipal Affairs can tell where the people are and what they are doing, but the Minister of Agriculture can't. I want to go on and quote:

Heaviest population loss was in rural municipalities where excluding resident farmers, the estimated population in 1973 was 255,300, down over 5,000 from the 1972 estimate of 260,643, and down almost 17,000 from the 1971 federal census count of 272,125. The drop occurred as the total acreage of rural municipalities increased by over 100,000 acres to 69.4 million acres.

The estimate, Mr. Speaker, and the word estimate from the Department of Municipal Affairs is:

The estimate of resident farmers fell to 66,980 in 1973 from 69,295 in 1972.

And the Minister of Agriculture can't even tell us how many farmers there are in the Province of Saskatchewan despite the fact the Department of Municipal Affairs publishes right down to the very last number of farmers there are. Right down from 69,295 in 1972 and 66,980 in 1973.

So what the Government is attempting to do is cover up their failure. They know they have been a failure in keeping more farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan. They know the answer to the question. They don't want to provide it because the answer to that question will show that they have not been successful in keeping rural population in our rural municipalities and keeping people on farms in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Motion as amended carried.

RETURN NO. 60

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 60 showing:

Whether any defeated federal NDP candidates are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan in any capacity and, if so: (a) the number; (b) their names; (c) the positions they hold; (d) their salaries.

Hon. H.A. Taylor (Minister of Public Service Commission): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't given a lot of consideration to this one. I find a few points in it rather interesting. I will have to present an amendment at a later date. There are no dates in it for example, and I don't know if they want us to go back to 1901 or just when. It's also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that they expect us to keep records in the Public Service Commission of who are candidates. The only people who really . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Maybe they did do that, we don't. The only person who has the record of who was a candidate in any particular election federally, is the Chief Electoral Officer in Ottawa. We shall have to check with him and see what names are available. I also find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the only candidates they ask for are the New Democratic candidates. That could be for one of two reasons I suppose; either they don't want to admit how many Liberal candidates were defeated in the last few years, or they felt that none of their candidates had the intelligence to pass an entrance exam in the Public Service. So that we can have an opportunity to see how it is possible to answer the question, particularly with the problem of getting information from the Chief Electoral Officer, I would ask leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 – LIVE TELEVISION BROADCAST OF LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview) moved, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern):

That this Assembly forthwith take all necessary proceedings to permit and facilitate, at no expense to the Government of Saskatchewan, the live television broadcasting of all debates and proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan commencing with the 1975 portion of the Fifth Session of the Seventeenth Legislature.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I wish to express my regret that this Resolution did not come before the fall sitting of the Legislature, so that the matter could have been debated and by now resolved in favor of permitting the televising of at least a portion of the proceedings of this spring Session of the Seventeenth Legislature. It is of course possible that this could be done, however, it would require the co-operation of all the Members. I would hope that this co-operation would be forthcoming, as I consider it very important that the voters of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to observe their duly elected representatives in this Legislature and judge their capabilities during this an election year.

Since introducing this Resolution, I have had many discussions with Members of the Assembly and with members of the general public at large as to the desirability of having television cameras record the events of this body and the debates and proceedings of the Members during the session. I have found that most of the Members I have spoken to are hesitant and reluctant to give their permission and in some cases their reservations may be well founded.

I shall later in my remarks discuss some of the reasons for not permitting televising of the proceedings herein and hopefully meet some of the arguments that have been raised and persuade those Members to change their minds in favor of at least allowing some portion or portions of our deliberations to be televised on a trial basis.

However, in speaking to members of the general public, I have found the reaction to be almost unanimously in favor of permitting television coverage and many have remarked to me that this should have been allowed many years ago. I think the subject can be dealt with not so much on the basis as to why the proceedings of this Assembly should not be televised but as to why they should be. There are many reasons for allowing this to be done, some of which are as follows:

1. The people of Saskatchewan have as a matter of right the opportunity to see their duly elected representatives in the Legislature and to judge for themselves the value of the contributions made by those Members when the issues of the day are debated.

It is relatively easy for the residents of the city of Regina and the surrounding district to avail themselves of the public galleries and to come in person and see the Legislature in action. Most recently this was done during the Special Session of this Legislature when legislation was required to force the striking members of the IBEW back to work. The galleries at that time were full of interested parties, both members of the union and otherwise. The reason that they were here was to see how the Government and Opposition Members reacted to the situation that had arisen. That is, they were not prepared to rely on short radio and television clips nor the reports of the newspapers to determine how the individual Members responded and how much better it could have been if the whole province had been allowed the choice of watching those events in their own homes on the television sets and coming to their own independent decisions after seeing and hearing all of the debates concerning the Bill in question.

2. I feel, Mr. Speaker, there would be a better understanding of the procedure and processes of the Legislature, not only by the voters of Saskatchewan, but by the young people who are the future voters who could actually see and hear the processes taken which result in laws being enacted.

I doubt whether many people in this province fully appreciate the democratic and legislative process that is involved in the passage of any single piece of legislation. I feel many do not actually understand or really know what their representative does once he is elected to represent them. I feel that the coverage by the other media because of the limitations those media have does not help the situation a great deal.

3. The public would be able to better decide on current issues if they had an opportunity of seeing and hearing those issues being debated in full by their duly elected representatives to understand what is behind the issue and the point of view expressed by the parties in general and the Members as individuals on any particular item.

Many issues of the day are over-simplified when reported to the public and in most cases this works to the disadvantage of the public if they do not know all of the arguments involved both for and against any particular matter. Perhaps more important the point of view taken by their representative.

4. The public would not have to rely on short newspaper reports and even shorter radio and TV clips to inform themselves.

Unfortunately many of these reports that I have referred to are of course based on the judgment of a single person as to whether he or she feels the matter to be of sufficient importance to warrant coverage. In the past, radio and TV, although limited because of the time available to them on any individual report have been generally fair in their coverage.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I feel I cannot make the same comment about the coverage of the Legislature by the Regina Leader-Post. This is only my personal opinion and does not represent the opinion of my colleagues in the Opposition or the Liberal Party. I feel the paper does not provide the proper in-depth coverage that it should nor does it put proper emphasis on the issues that are substantive when it does provide coverage. At a later date I may have something to say about this publication but suffice it to say at this time, in my opinion, the paper does not provide the service that it could and that it should. Perhaps if it was forced to compete with television for in-depth coverage of the events of this Assembly its political reporting would improve.

A further result may also be to encourage Members to conduct themselves during the proceedings with more decorum. I am not suggesting that the Members have not done this in past or am I suggesting that they should be inhibited in any way. The cameras should show the Members, warts and all. However, the attendance record of the Members may very well improve if the Members know that all of their constituents will be able to determine whether they are at their desks and doing their jobs by simply turning on the television set at night.

The arguments against the televising of the proceedings are several. However, I feel that they are more than over-compensated by the benefits that would flow therefrom. I should like to discuss a few of them at this time. Some of these arguments are as follows:

1. The cameras and required lighting would be distracting to the Members.

This I feel is a valid criticism, however, at the same time, I feel that after an initial period of becoming used to the equipment the Members would simply carry on as usual and would not be hindered in their activities in any way.

2. There is some concern as to the decision as to what parts of the proceedings should be shown on television at a later time and the results of any editing of film that is taken.

In this regard I feel that the Legislature must put some faith and trust in the fairness of the representatives of the media and that hopefully their coverage would be proper and appropriate and would not be abused. Should there be any abuse through improper editing or the failure of the media to give any Member proper coverage, while over-emphasizing the activities of another Member, this could be remedied by certain disciplinary action being taken and if necessary the privilege of the individual reporter for the media being withdrawn.

3. Concern has also been expressed as well that many of the Members would play to the cameras rather than conduct themselves as legislators.

This again I feel may be a valid criticism, however, surely the voters of Saskatchewan would recognize pretty quickly any Member who did this and make their displeasure known in the appropriate manner at the next election.

4. It is possible as well that there could be a certain amount of physical discomfort for the Members if the equipment and lighting that is required becomes too cumbersome.

This is probably the most valid argument for not having the proceedings televised. However, I understand that this has not been the case in the Province of Alberta where television is allowed. If all the parties concerned co-operated, I feel that the discomfort would be kept to a minimum and not interfere with the day to day business of the Assembly.

5. There would also be some initial difficulty in setting up the ground rules as to what part of the debates could be covered and in what manner.

However, I would suggest that a committee of the Legislature could be easily established just as has been done for radio broadcasting and these rules be set up and approved by the Legislature.

There are, of course, other problems that could arise, however, I believe the ones that I have outlined are the major ones which we have to concern ourselves with at this time. I believe that in Alberta where television is permitted in the Assembly that all of these problems have been overcome and the procedure is now functioning smoothly.

Furthermore with the advent of cable television and educational channels on the horizon, it would appear to me that this would be an obvious type of programming for such organizations; that is, one of the public services that such groups could provide could very well be full coverage of the Legislature when it is in session. Furthermore this could be a source of income to these organizations if they made arrangements with the CBC and private stations to sell clips from the film that is taken.

I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, by the local manager of CKCK Television that at this time his company does not have proper facilities to give the required coverage. However, the CBC apparently is in a somewhat different position and could with difficulty arrange for some coverage this Session.

In view of this, I would recommend to the Legislature that a committee be formed consisting of the House Leaders, Whips, Clerk of the Legislature together with the Speaker to consider and draft rules for the approval of the Legislature as a whole for the permitting of television broadcasting from this Chamber. Furthermore, I would hope that such a committee could be established quickly so that during this very important Session, prior to an election, that at least some television coverage could be provided and I would suggest that as a trial run the question period for a given week be televised.

Accordingly I move this Resolution.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this Resolution and I intend to move an adjournment. I want to say to my hon. friend that it is not that I am trying to put it off. I have some sympathy with the motion that has been moved by the Hon. Member for Lakeview.

We know that in Ottawa there have been experiments going on. I agree with him, it might well improve the attendance and the decorum of the House, all around, sometimes one side and sometimes the other. I have a reservation to establishing a precedent now because of the ending of the current Seventeenth Legislature.

Without thinking it through, and I haven't thought it through, I think this kind of a thing would be better to start with a new legislature with the new Members coming in. I certainly agree with the Member that if we're to do it in this Session, we would have to set up a committee. In the setting up of a committee, I just don't know whether a committee in a short time can look at all the problems that might face us.

We have another Private Members' day coming this week so I would move adjournment of this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 – AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION POLICY

MR. M. FESCHUK (Prince Albert East) moved, seconded by Mr. Oliver (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly request the Federal Government to recognize the urgency of the problems confronting livestock producers in Canada and that the Federal Government immediately join with the provinces in developing a comprehensive long-term agricultural stabilization policy which will allow for the development of national stabilization programs for the grains, poultry and livestock sectors of our agricultural economy; and further, that this Assembly request such programs not distort natural production advantages and that they relate to true regional production costs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak to this Resolution requesting the Federal Government to recognize the problems of livestock producers and joining with the provinces to develop comprehensive agricultural stabilization programs, the urgency of the matter is clear.

The problems facing our farmers are particularly severe in certain sectors of the livestock industry. Let us examine the situation which confronts the cattle producers of our province. Cattle production is a significant industry in this province and Statistics Canada has estimated that on January 1, 1975 there were 2,655,000 cattle in Saskatchewan. An increase of five per cent over the same period, one year ago. Of this number, about 1.4 million head are breeding beef cows and heifers. This figure represents about 26 per cent of the beef-breeding herd in Canada.

During the years of 1967-71 Saskatchewan farmers realized farm cash receipts averaging about \$154 million from the sale of cattle and calves. This represented \$1.50 out of every \$5 returned to agriculture in this province. In 1972, receipts from sales of cattle and calves in Saskatchewan increased to over \$223 million. In 1974 farmers realized only \$213 million from the sale of cattle and calves, a drop of 20 per cent from the previous year. A further decrease may occur in 1975.

During the same period producers faced traumatic increases in the cost of inputs required for beef production. From the first quarter of 1973 to the first quarter of 1974, feed grain prices in western Canada increased about 80 per cent according to the Statistics Canada Review of farm input prices. Data collected by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture shows that local elevator price of No. 1 feed barley purchased in Saskatchewan was \$2.20 per bushel on June 11, 1974. On October 18 the price was increased to \$2.75 per bushel.

Other costs increased dramatically as well. Prices of baler twine have almost tripled in the last year. The cost of barbed wire has increased by about 75 per cent. Farm water and sewer systems cost 35 to 40 per cent more than a year ago. The list of input cost increases could go on and on.

Since the beginning of 1975, prices for cattle have declined even further. During the first week in January A1 and A2 steers were quoted at \$43 to \$44.50 per hundredweight in Saskatoon. On February 19 the price had declined from \$35.25 to \$33.25. Feeder steers over 700 pounds, average \$37.25 per hundredweight at Saskatoon, the first week in January. On February 19th the price was only \$32.50 per hundredweight and prices have changed little since then.

Let us consider the federal stabilization program currently in place for slaughter cattle. This program was announced last August by the Federal Government to replace the unfinished beef quality premium program announced in March of 1974. You will recall that the intention of the beef Quality Premium Program when introduced was to pay a quality premium of \$7 per hundredweight on certain Grade A grades of slaughter cattle by the Federal Government. And in their wisdom the Federal Government paid the premium to meat packers and requested them to kindly pass the money along to beef producers. It soon became obvious even to the Federal Government that the approach wouldn't work because the packers kept most of the premium to themselves. It is no wonder that some farmers expressed skepticism about stabilization programs after their experience with the Beef Quality Premium Program. What kind of stabilization is this, they ask, that caused the market for finished cattle to drop \$4 or \$5 per hundredweight or more over a weekend? What kind of stabilization program is this, they asked, when introduced so disrupted the market that for several days they could not even get a price quotation on their finished cattle? And what kind of stabilization program results in market cattle which have previously been satisfactory for slaughter suddenly becoming "short keep" feeders on which someone else recently received the quality premium? Some beef producers in this province claimed and I believe with justification, that the Beef Quality Premium Program cost them money instead of improving their position.

The Federal Government dropped the Quality Premium Program and introduced its present program to cover the period from August 12, 1974 to August 11, 1975. The plan is a price support plan, presumably designed to prevent a disastrous reduction in beef production. The support price of \$45.42 is to be related to a weighted average price for A1 and 2 steers and heifers at the Toronto, Winnipeg and Calgary markets. If the average price for the year falls below \$45.42 per hundredweight, the Federal Government will pay a deficiency payment on all slaughter cattle marketed over the period which grade A, B or C. Let us look at this plan and examine what it can and cannot accomplish.

First, the plan is, as the Federal Government has admitted, a short term stop-loss program. We must seriously question whether this kind of an approach has a stabilizing or unstabilizing effect on the livestock industry. After reviewing all the recent actions of the governments of Canada and the United States to intervene in the marketing of cattle with the intention of stabilizing the market one can only conclude that many cattle producers have deduced that short term and ad hoc programs will very likely contribute to instability rather than stability. Mr. Whelan has announced continuation of a beef stabilization program beyond August 11, 1975. Cattle producers, at this point, can only hope that the continued program will be changed and improved to represent a comprehensive, long term stabilization program, which will provide a true measure of price stability upon which long term production decisions reflecting wise agricultural resource use, can be made. This Government must urge action in that direction at every opportunity and must be prepared to join in a meaningful program which will meet those objectives.

A second shortcoming of the current federal plan is that all producers receive the same payment. This means that a producer who marketed steers during November in Toronto for \$56 per hundredweight will receive the same payment as one who marketed in Saskatoon in February for \$30 per hundredweight. This kind of approach to stabilization, which apparently was made to allow the market place to indicate to producers the current demand for beef, must be rejected. A program which pretends to be a stabilization program but which may not pay a dollar more to the producer who markets finished cattle this week and which will bring \$20 or more per hundredweight less than the cost of producing those cattle, cannot be tolerated. This Government must join with farmers in demanding better stabilization programs from Ottawa.

I am pleased to report that since the Resolution before us was placed on the Orders of the Day of this Assembly, the Federal Government has made some progress towards developing a comprehensive long term agricultural stabilization program. Bill C 50 which will soon become law does make provision for provinces and producers or both to make agreements with the Agricultural Stabilization Board for stabilization programs which will provide increased price support for producers.

However, legislation alone is not enough. Meaningful programs must be developed and put into place. This province is showing leadership in the development of such programs. The Minister of Agriculture tells me that a meeting has already been arranged with Mr. Whelan and other provinces to begin the development of a comprehensive long term stabilization program for hog producers. It is my hope that this program will be

developed quickly. It is also my hope that such programs can be developed for other agricultural commodities. The Resolution before us requests long term effective stabilization programs for grains, poultry and livestock sectors of the agricultural economy. The Resolution also requests that such programs do not distort the natural production advantages of the various regions of Canada. I will now address some remarks to that section of that Resolution.

Saskatchewan has tremendous agricultural potential. Over 40 per cent of the improved farm land in Canada is located in Saskatchewan. Our farmers have a world-wide reputation as efficient producers of cereal grains and oilseeds. Since livestock are consumers of grains as well as forage the only logical conclusion can be that Saskatchewan possesses a true production advantage for the production of both grains and livestock.

Let us examine the situation. We have in Saskatchewan about one head of cattle for every 25 acres of farm land. The average of all of Canada is one head per 13 acres of farm land. In Quebec there is one head for every six acres of farm land. In Ontario, one head per five acres and in Alberta one head per 13 acres of land. In Saskatchewan there is one hog per 56 acres of farm land compared to one hog per 21 acres for Canada as a whole. Ontario has one hog per seven acres, Quebec one hog per eight acres, and Alberta one hog per 27 acres. The story is the same for other livestock and poultry commodities.

Significant programs, notably FarmStart, have been introduced by this Government to develop the livestock industry of this province to achieve the potential of which it is capable. The farmers of this province could triple hog production, increase beef cattle production by 60 to 70 per cent and make similar gains in production of other livestock and poultry commodities. But to do this, they would have to be assured stable markets which will provide an adequate return for their labor and investment. Farmers must be assured that inequities will be removed in such areas as the freight rate structure for livestock products compared with feed grains, which receive continued federal freight subsidization. The farmers must be assured that new inequities will not be built into stabilization programs to further frustrate their efforts to make a reasonable return from livestock production in this province.

In conclusion, let me reiterate. The problems facing livestock producers are urgent. The Federal Government must move quickly to develop a joint program which would provide meaningful stabilization programs and the programs must not further distort natural production advantages. Mr. Speaker, I move that this Assembly request the Federal Government to recognize the urgency of the problems confronting livestock producers in Canada and that the Federal Government immediately join with the provinces in developing a comprehensive long term agricultural stabilization policy which will allow for the development of national stabilization programs for the grain, poultry and livestock sectors of our agricultural economy, and further that this Assembly requests such programs not distort natural production advantages and that they relate to the true regional production costs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — A few brief remarks to the Resolution as it was presented. Of course, I suppose that all farmers and the public in general basically support a stabilization program if it can be put forward in a successful and proper manner. I think, unfortunately, the Member, in his speech contradicted himself on several occasions.

First of all, he argued the case that we have programs that will not distort the natural production advantages. Just previous to that he had argued the case that the price for cattle should be the same for the producer regardless of when he sold them. Now it's impossible to have it both ways because if you're going to guarantee the producer the very same price per pound for beef on July first, as August first, and so on throughout the year, then producers are naturally going to produce that quantity of beef that fits into their program and is easiest for them to carry out. Therefore, if a stabilization program is not put together so that there will be fluctuating prices throughout the year, you are going to have periods of the year when you are going to have extremely high production and when you have practically no production at all. So I just want to point out that the speaker is advocating a common price for twelve months of the year for every day for the product which he did as far as livestock is concerned. In actual fact he was arguing against his original idea of taking into account the natural production advantages.

Now, I want to say a few words about the Provincial Government's record in this regard because I think it is well known to farmers and I think many farmers are very displeased with that particular record. First of all, I'm absolutely convinced, Mr. Speaker, as are many other farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan that much of the emphasis for the expansion of the livestock industry in Saskatchewan has come from the government office, not because it was good for the farmers, but because they thought it was good for the government. Essentially, they thought it was a good way to create jobs and industry in the Province of Saskatchewan and had no regard whatsoever for the price the producer would actually get for his product. They encouraged livestock production in this province because it would be good for Intercontinental Packers, because it would be good for jobs, Mr. Speaker. And if you read the Premier's announcement many times over, you could see that the advocacy of an increased livestock production in Saskatchewan was because it would create jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, this is a good objective, to create jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan, but it is not a good objective if it is being done with no consideration as far as farmers are concerned in regard to what they are going to get for their product and this is essentially what has happened over the past number of years. And in this regard, the Provincial Government is to be strongly condemned for not providing information to farmers in a factual manner in regard to forecasting the livestock industry. In particular, this is the case with cattle production because I have a whole file that's probably that thick by now of announcements by the Minister of Agriculture in the last three years suggesting farmers should get into cattle. He has told farmers constantly that cattle were the thing to get into, we could have a terrible shortage by 1980 or 1978 or 1979, whichever year you wish to pick, we could have a terrible

shortage. I have a file that thick from your department. Your department has constantly issued directives through local papers that the livestock industry was the thing to get into but the problem is that they didn't have any consideration as to what the price would be for the farmer. They told him that he should go out and get into cattle, he should increase his livestock production. But not once did they take a look at the world situation and see if the farmer was going to get a fair return for that production. And so much of the responsibility of poor livestock forecasting, which got producers into the situation they are in today, rests directly with our own Provincial Department of Agriculture because they cannot convince me, they cannot convince me that with the statistics that are available, they could not have shown the massive buildup in livestock production, particularly in cattle, that has occurred throughout the world and not once have I ever seen a word from this Provincial Government indicating to the farmers that they should go a little bit slow in building up cattle numbers because there was a world wide surplus.

What farmers want and would like to have from this Provincial Government is accurate information regarding livestock population and production and accurate information regarding prices. And they have not got that and I suspect the reason they have not got that, Mr. Speaker, the reason that producers have not got the accurate information is because the Government of Saskatchewan was more interested in other things not involving livestock. They were more interested in jobs that were created, they were more interested in the processing part of it, they're interested in a lot of the other aspects other than how the producer of that livestock was going to fare.

Now I want to say a few other things, Mr. Speaker, about the freight rate removal. I want to say a few words about the freight rate removal regarding feed grains. And I've noticed that the Minister of Agriculture has advocated as various other politicians advocated the removal of the freight rate assistance on feed grain going to eastern Canada. And usually it's cited by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture that if we take off the freight rate assistance, more cattle will stay in Saskatchewan for finishing and once again we come back to the jobs being created. But I think that it's an absolute certainty that if we take off the freight rate assistance, Mr. Speaker, that's going to increase the cost to the eastern feeder and that eastern feeder who is presently buying calves in Saskatchewan is going to come out here and just pay that much less. He's going to pay that much less because his costs rise. He's also promising to take it off at your urging, Mr. Minister. At your urging. Certainly he's going to take it off, because you have been advocating that he should take it off for a long time.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the point is that you will find announcement after announcement by this Provincial Government advocating that feed freight assistance come off. The Member for Prince Albert East who just spoke said this, we should have the assistance on feed freight assistance taken off. The Member who just spoke said that in his speech, we should take away the assistance on feed grain going east so that the cattle would stay here. Well, I want to tell that Member that as soon as we take off that assistance for cattle going east, those cattle will stay in Saskatchewan, all right, because nobody else is going to pay enough money in Ontario to be able to take them out and the producer of that calf is going to get less money. And

that's the side of the story that you have not been telling anyone because, once again, you're orienting the policy to create jobs here. You want cattle to stay here, not particularly to do the farmer any good, but because it's going to create more jobs in Saskatchewan.

Well, you're trying to represent two interests and doing a very bad job as far as livestock farmers are concerned. The amount of money when you increase the cost to the eastern feeder, the amount of money he will pay for calves here will be less and you're going to put that responsibility and the lower return for calves right back on the cattle producer in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say another word about the stabilization approach by this Government. I don't think there is any doubt whatsoever the stabilization approach advocated by them is incorporated in the Natural Products Marketing Act, and that will include a marketing board for virtually every product without the producer being given the chance to vote. I don't think there is any question but that the Government supports a marketing board for cattle and that would be a fundamental part of their stabilization program, a marketing board for livestock. They have one for hogs, there's no reason to think that they wouldn't want one for cattle, and in fact they have it on the books so that they can incorporate one for cattle at any moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't share their view that we should have a National Marketing Board for cattle without a vote from the producer and I rather suspect that this is their main approach to agricultural stabilization. They have advocated other products should be under the Wheat Board with no vote of the producer whether he wanted it or not. They advocate a marketing board for practically every agricultural product and apparently firmly believe that a vote isn't required. And I think this very, very much fits into their concept of stabilization of agriculture. Basically their approach is that once a farmer is finished producing it, he should just turn it over to the government and let the government look after that for that particular time. I think that's a view not shared by many farmers but I believe that's one certainly held by this Government.

Now I want to say one last word about marketing boards and that is that one of the strongest indications of the opposite party's desire to have a marketing board for cattle was the speech made by Mr. Broadbent, their parliamentary leader. When he came to Saskatchewan, I have the press clipping in which he advocated that we should have a national marketing board for livestock so I think that puts your national party on record as far as cattle is concerned and certainly I think the provincial party basically follows the national party. An NDP is an NDP as they say and I think that would once again fit into that category. I have Mr. Broadbent's statement and intend to show all the cattle producers in my area, which I think they've probably already seen. Ah, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments and because I wish to say more on this Resolution, I should like to adjourn for the day.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.