

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature
16th Day

Wednesday, March 12, 1975

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. R. Gross (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. David Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough), who is away today, I should like to introduce to you and to Members of this Assembly, 28 Grade Seven to Twelve students from Kayville. They are accompanied today by their teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Sanders. I understand they plan to take a tour around 3:00 o'clock this afternoon. I should like to meet with them on behalf of Mr. Lange and extend our welcome in attending the Session today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce 25 Grade Nine to Twelve students from Dalmeny, Saskatchewan. They are here with their teachers, Mrs. Simon and Mr. Berge. I am sure all Members will wish them a pleasant stay here in Regina. I hope to meet with them later on at 3:15 o'clock.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS
CROWN CORPORATIONS

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to beg leave of the House to introduce a very simple procedural motion, the effect of which would be to permit the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations to review the activities of that Crown corporation during the entire calendar year 1974 as opposed to merely the fiscal year which terminated on March 30th, which is fully 12 months from our present date. I should like leave, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple procedural motion to introduce and to pass it at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: — Leave is not granted.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION TO SETTLE GRAIN STRIKE

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, if I may rise. I am sorry that happened, John, I would agree with you — very democratic move.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier, or to the Attorney General, or the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Labour but they are not here. So I will

direct it to the Minister in labor, the Minister of Health. I wonder now, if he is prepared today (after the SARM have asked the Federal Government to take legislative action to settle these strikes) to send a message to Ottawa to get the grain moving. All the farm organizations have done the same thing. The Premier was on the radio today, he got up to the verge but he backed away. He evidently now says he hoped the Federal Government would address themselves to this problem. Will you join us, will you talk to your colleagues and join us in a telegram or a phone call or some sort of direct immediate representation to Jean Chretien and the Federal Government asking them to take legislative action to put these people back to work and get the grain moving and end this strike.

I want to say this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — I just want to preface this question.

Mr. Speaker: — We can't preface questions, please ask your question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I can see I should have said it before. I'll preface the next question.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, the House did consider the matter on Monday last. The Leader of the Opposition said that he was sending a telegram, the Government sent a telegram to the Government of Canada as the Leader of the Opposition very well knows. Those disputes come under federal jurisdiction not provincial jurisdiction. And it seems to me that the best place to direct the problem to is the Federal Government and specifically to the Federal Minister of Labour, who is apparently much more in labor than I am, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Not only is he in labor, he is also in some harbor difficulties these days. Mr. Speaker, it is a federal matter. And certainly we as a Government are deeply concerned about the movement of grain and we have now referred our request to the Federal Government, we hope that they will listen and that they will take appropriate actions to resolve the disputes and get the people back to work and to get the grain moving.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It is interesting that half this Order Paper is the NDP Government whining to Ottawa, so don't tell us that you are not willing to talk to Ottawa, you do that most of the time.

An Hon. Member: — What's your question?

Mr. Steuart: — My supplementary question is this; while we recognize and I am asking you if you recognize it is not the workers' fault, the Federal Government involved themselves in a grain handlers strike, now they should expect to involve themselves in this one and give the same kind of settlement to these workers that they gave the grain handlers. But will you now . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will you ask the supplementary question please?

Mr. Steuart: — I will get to it immediately, first thing. Is the Minister aware that the SARM have asked for this; Unifarm, the Wheat Pool of Alberta, is he aware that the Wheat Pool of Manitoba have asked for it; is he aware that the only people who can settle this is the Federal Government to face their responsibility and end this strike immediately? Is he aware that the people of this province are expecting that kind of leadership? They are totally dissatisfied with the lack of courage and leadership your Government is showing, and in view of that will he take some action to ask those missing Cabinet Ministers whenever they get back from wherever they are, to show some leadership and ask the Federal Government to settle this immediately?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the difficulties. This Legislature did consider the matter on Monday. The Leader of the Opposition was here. What he is trying to do is catch some newspaper story, that is his main concern. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and we have taken action that we thought was appropriate. We have made representations to Ottawa. And in case the Leader of the Opposition is questioning where some of my colleagues are, the Premier is at the SARM convention today, they have invited him, he is speaking at 3:00 o'clock this afternoon. Also the Minister of Agriculture is attending the SARM convention. The Attorney General is presently in Ottawa attending the convention of the Attorneys General in Ottawa. The Minister of Labour had to attend a funeral at Moose Jaw. If he wants to check the name of the person whose funeral he is attending, I will be glad to provide him with that.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is a matter of concern to us. We have made representations as I said earlier. We hope that the Federal Government will get off their butt and do something about it. As he has said it is not the workers that are to blame, it is the industry and others.

Mr. Steuart: — Are you asking them to take legislative action to end the strike, to get off their butt, are you asking that?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't have a debate on it. We have had some discussions.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN REGINA

Mr. E.C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Education, to congratulate him for being here as one of the few Cabinet Ministers in attendance today.

The question is this, Mr. Speaker: I believe you are of course aware that there are plans underway to have a community college established in the city of Regina. I believe in conjunction with those plans a series of meetings have been held in Regina at local high schools where interested parties have been invited to attend and give their opinions and views as to the desirability of the community college in this city. It is my information that at those meetings, the consensus of opinion by all those who attend was that a community college was not necessary in Regina because of the existing facilities, such as the University of Saskatchewan Extension program, Board of Education program, YMCA and YWCA and so on. In view of these meetings and in view of the fact that the people who attended these meetings by your invitation apparently do not feel a community college is required are you intending on still proceeding with the development of a community college in this city?

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, we have got more Cabinet Ministers here than they have Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the question from the Member for Lakeview, we do in fact plan to proceed. The series of meetings in the high schools were part of just a series, we plan to hold further meetings throughout this city in terms of talking about the community college program. The fact that we have run into some concern in both the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon should not be surprising since there has been a very broad adult education program being offered but its delivery has certainly not been under the philosophy of the community colleges which is not only to deliver programs but to concern itself with development of community. One can look at Regina and see the opportunities for community development along with an additional educational delivery system. Our plans as I said are to proceed, in fact we hope to appoint the college board early in April.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question, I believe these colleges have been very successful in the rural areas. The Minister has also referred to more meetings being held. May I ask the Minister if at those meetings as well as the meetings that have already been held and that the opinion of the people attending is that the college is not required, how he can justify going ahead with the plans for the college. Because obviously the people whom he has consulted through his Department don't want the college. So why proceed with it if it is against their wishes?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, as we were to discover in the successes as you talk about in the community college program in rural

Saskatchewan, that they were reaching all kinds of people that were not reached previously under adult education programs, I say and I say emphatically that this is also true in Regina and it is also true in Saskatoon. Once the program is underway we shall see the additional opportunities being available to a broad section of Regina people, including many of the Métis and native people and ethnic people who simply have not organized themselves into any kind of educational programs.

Mr. Malone: — A second supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, what is the projected cost of the college in Regina, Mr. Minister?

Mr. MacMurchy: — The projected costs are difficult to estimate because the costs are related to the delivery of the program and that is all. It is not like the program of the Liberal Party which we inherited when we came into office . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Allow me to finish, Mr. Speaker, which was a centralized, institutionalized type of approach. So we cannot estimate accurately the costs in the city of Regina. You can estimate it in terms of what the costs are now in delivery of an adult education program which will be carried on. But one cannot estimate very accurately the response to the college program beyond what is presently being offered unless one relates it to rural Saskatchewan and that would be difficult.

HAS GOVERNMENT INCREASED INVESTMENT IN INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS

Mr. T. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). Approximately two years ago the Government invested \$10.2 million in Intercontinental Packers, at that time the Government had an option with Mr. Mendel to further buy shares in the company of Intercontinental Packers. The question I should like to ask is: has the Government exercised any option or increased their investment in Intercontinental Packers since that time?

Mr. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. Weatherald: — A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Now that the company has been in operation for this length of time is the Government going to be prepared at this Session to file a financial statement of Intercontinental Packers to the Assembly so that we may discuss how the public's 45 per cent interest in the company is faring?

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, there is a proposed Resolution on the Order Paper on that subject and I suggest we deal with it in due course.

FOURTH QUESTION NOT PERMITTED

Mr. D. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. We have had three questions; is the House prepared to permit a further one?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: — We have had three questions as has been requested.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have a . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House prepared to permit another question?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: — The House says no. I heard several no's.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Health, he wasn't here yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: — I have no control over that. The House has refused any further questions, so we must continue on the Order Paper.

Mr. MacDonald: — I wonder if the Minister of Health wouldn't mind answering one more question, as I say he wasn't here yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: — I shall ask the Members again, is the House prepared to permit another question?

Some Hon. Members: No!

Mr. Speaker: — They say no. There are a number of no's. You will have to speak to the Minister privately or else reserve it for tomorrow. I am sorry.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, are you directing that I may not ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, because the House refuses to do so. It was not the Speaker, but the House that refuses to permit another question.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: — The House has refused any further questions. I am sorry.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, surely to heavens at a time like this with the Session two months old we should have an opportunity to catch up on the negligence of that Government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the Government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Chair cannot facilitate those requests because the tradition of the House does not permit it. The House has decided that it will not permit another question at this time. So there is nothing the Chair can do about it. We have to abide by the decision of the House.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend the Election Act, 1971, be now read a second time.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I'm only going to speak for a few minutes on this Act and then I'm going to ask leave to adjourn it because I want to discuss it with the Attorney General. Members on both sides of the House, I presume, certainly those on this side of the House, are agreeable and support the principle of making it possible in some cases and making it easier in other cases for handicapped people to vote in subsequent elections. We all received the brief and the representation asking that this be considered. I applaud the Government for the spirit behind what they're trying to do, however we are concerned that they may have opened up the Election Act to a tremendous number of abuses. And these abuses can happen to anybody. When you open up an election act to abuses, they can occur by any group or by any individual. Now surely the purpose of an election is to get as wide an expression of opinion from as wide a group in the community or in the province or in the nation as possible. The idea of a universal franchise is an old one, a sacred one, and is in many ways the bedrock and foundation of our democratic parliamentary system. However, I think it is possible to go only so far in an effort to make absolutely positive that no one, under any circumstances, misses their vote before the electoral process is abused and possibly set the stage so that the will of the majority is not expressed.

I'm going to use an example. Between 1960 and 1964 the CCF Government (the Bill was piloted by the Attorney General of the day) made tremendous changes in the Election Act and they made it possible for the people to vote on election day, regardless of where they were in the province; they didn't have a transferable ballot but they had an absentee ballot and I well remember the problems that followed the 1964 Election. It was a very, very difficult thing to sort everything out. I sat in on election counts and I talked to many Returning Officers, and they were Returning Officers who had been appointed by the CCF Government, and we discussed the problems inherent in that Election Act and I think it was almost universally agreed that the Act needed to be tightened up. And so, while there were many things that we might have done to the Election Act that were controversial and that the Opposition didn't agree with, certainly when we took out some of the amendments that had been put in before 1964, there was no opposition from the CCF or NDP who sat in the Opposition. Because it was recognized that in an honest

and sincere effort not to disenfranchise anyone, even though they have to get away from their place of residence in the time of an election, we had made the election machinery so cumbersome that, as a matter of fact, it was almost 24 days before the government of the day was prepared to hand over the reins of government to the new administration. And they held on for, I think, a very sound reason — that we didn't know the results of that election. We didn't know because there were thousands and thousands of people who were in Regina, who lived in Prince Albert or Saskatoon, people who were all over the province, who had voted outside of their constituencies because they had not bothered to take advantage of the advance polls. Those votes had to be held for seven days, then had to be transferred to the constituency where they belonged and then you had to proceed with the counting. They held up the envelope and they stated the name on the envelope, you could challenge that envelope, the individual, if you had any reason, there wasn't much information, then the envelope was opened and the votes were put in. It was by common consent, recognized that in an effort to give everyone the opportunity to vote with ease that we went too far. As I say, we, in the broadest sense of the Legislative Assembly. And so changes were made. Now I don't say we've gone that far in these amendments but I note the Member for Lakeview pointed those out when he spoke on this Bill in the first reading before the Session adjourned for Christmas and the month of January.

So I should like to discuss this very seriously. I'm going to suggest this be referred to the Law Amendments Committee. I think before we make this move, and I say this most sincerely, we should take a second look at what we're doing because we all may regret it. Most of us are standing for re-election and if there is one thing that I think we should have in any electoral process that is a straightforward way to vote, enfranchising as many people as possible, and making it as easy as possible for people to vote. We can find some way to allow handicapped people to vote. The suggestion was made that we have in each constituency a sort of mobile poll. I was told by Mr. Romanow when we discussed this that they had looked at this and the difficulties of it in the rural seats were almost insurmountable and I take his word for it. I presume they were. However, there may be another way of doing it or we may be able to do it particularly the way it was suggested here, just tightening up some of the loopholes. I hope Members believe me when I say that I want to see the handicapped people accommodated and I want to see, as much as anyone else, that their ability to vote in subsequent provincial elections should not be impaired. But I have a real fear of what we're doing here.

I hope that the Attorney General returns before we have this Act under discussion, while we're considering that we also look at the limitations placed on the spending by political parties. There has been some discussion that this may be raised and I know from discussions that there are other problems inherent in the changes that have been proposed or passed. There have been some second thoughts about some of them and so I hope we do not give this second reading even though I recognize that you can make amendments in committee. We shouldn't give it second reading until we've had a chance to see the whole picture and I would then hope that it may be referred to one of the standing committees that we have, that that committee could be convened with all possible haste, have them take a hard look at this, call witnesses if necessary and then, if they're satisfied,

bring it back. If they think some changes should be made to do what we want to do and still protect one of the basic principles of an election, which is to make the election as ironclad as possible so that as little tampering can take place as possible, then I think we will better serve the interests of the people that we represent in the next election. So with these words, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Married Women's Property Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word about Bill No. 5. I want to go on record as opposing this Bill in principle. I believe it is just another link to the chain that will make it easier for family break-up and I'm sure that we have enough links in that chain as it is. I just want to make that point that I'm opposed to this Bill in principle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Tchorzewski (Minister of Culture and Youth): — I just want to make a few comments on this Bill but first of all say that I don't agree with the Member for Rosthern. I respect his right to have his opinion, of course, but I don't agree with what he says in that, in his view, it will further lead to family breakdown. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that in today's society as it is, problems in the area that he speaks of, in the area of family breakdown and I, as I'm sure every Member in this House, views that with some concern. But I don't think that this legislation, which will provide equality between men and women and make the law on matrimonial property or lead to the making of the law on matrimonial property fairer is going to lead to that, in fact it will help in situations where there is family breakdown. What we need to do is look at those kinds of situations, whether it be because of family breakdown or whether it be because of death or whatever the circumstances. We have to consider the situation of both parties to a marriage to see that they are both dealt with or treated equally in those kinds of circumstances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every Member who has spoken on this Bill has stressed or most of the Members who have spoken on this Bill have stressed the great importance of the issue that is before us. And I, too, want to spend a little while this afternoon to indicate that in my view this a very important Bill which deals in a temporary way with a very serious shortcoming in matrimonial property laws that exist today. I'm not saying that it is by any means the final solution. We have made that very clear. The Government is not looking upon it as the final solution. The proposals before us are an interim measure only until we are ready to proceed with legislation arising from and acceptance of the final recommendations of the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan. But nevertheless, until the final recommendation, until those final recommendations, the Government feels that there is a need to give the court the power to make a fair and equitable division of matrimonial property in this province. The present law in the division of matrimonial property is unfair because it does not allow the recognition of a

wife's role in the earning of money or the acquisition of property through her work as a homemaker or as a mother. And the Government asked the Law Reform Commission to give this matter top priority to research thoroughly into the law as it relates to matrimonial property. And in my view that Commission has done an excellent job in the period of time that it a very short period of time compared to similar work done by other law reform commissions in this country.

It has produced a number of working papers that have outlined proposals for the consideration of the public. The Law Reform Commission has held public hearings. All those, whatever their point of view might be, have had an opportunity to present their points of view on their ideas to the Law Reform Commission to assist it in making its final recommendations. And so the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan has been consulting with anyone interested. And there have been many who have been presenting their views to it. In this way the Government Law Reform Commission has undertaken to review the law in the area of the distribution of matrimonial property upon the ending of a marriage, whether it is by separation or whether it is by divorce or whether in fact it is by death. And I think that by using this approach it will have benefited from the views of many people and, therefore, these recommendations will be of that much more value.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency at times that I know we all as legislators . . . and I know of people in general who feel that a problem such as the one that has been highlighted by the Murdock and Rathwell cases can be dealt with immediately. But I think we have to watch ourselves when we tend to do that or we tend to think that way, because often in many or most cases or in a lot of cases there is a great deal more involved. The law as it is now is not only unfair but it is also very complex, and if this Government or any government were to jump into amendments very quickly without giving full consideration to the implications as is being done by having it referred to the Law Reform Commission, there are certainly the chances that new problems would be created that might be of greater magnitude than the problem that we have before us right now. And as the Attorney General mentioned when he introduced this Bill he has been advised by Mr. Grossman, the chairman of the Law Reform Commission, that there could be as many as 20 bills that will be affected by the recommendations. And until all of those things have been considered and considered carefully it is necessary to provide this interim measure that is encompassed in the Bill that we have before us.

So while all of this is being thoroughly researched, our Government has felt that there is a great need for at least this temporary measure. It has been recommended by the Law Reform Commission and I just want to quote to you a statement issued by the Commission. The Commission said in its third working paper on the division of matrimonial property that marriage is a partnership of equals and that division of property ought to reflect that partnership. Therefore, the Commission is proposing that legislation providing for the exercise of judicial discretion be passed immediately to apply to property in any marriage solemnized prior to the adoption of any possible different participation scheme. In other words the Law Reform Commission has said that there needs to be this temporary measure while it is proceeding to put together its final recommendations and our Government is acting on that recommendation. This has been supported by the advisory council on the Status

of Women and by other organizations throughout the Province. In a submission presented to me in Saskatoon on December 5 at the Public Library by the Saskatoon Co-ordinating Committee on the Status of Women it was stated that they commend the Government of Saskatchewan on their proposed amendment to the Married Women's Property Act. And they support the Government's proposal of immediate legislation to amend this Act so as to leave to the discretion of a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench the division of property between spouses on a marriage breakdown.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any doubt and I am sure that most of the Members opposite will also agree that there is support for this particular Bill throughout Saskatchewan on the part of most people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women was made in 1968 there are a large number of very significant achievements that have happened in this area nationally and provincially. But that is not to say that all is done and that legislators or industry or unions can reduce the priority that this matter of the status of women in our society deserves, because although a lot of achievements have come about, I think we all have to recognize that to some extent in some areas there is still a significant degree of inequality of opportunity that does exist. This amendment is one more step in finally achieving equality of opportunity for all people in society. It is International Women's Year, it is a time for reassessing where we are at, it is a time for establishing the new emphasis or the new priorities that we must be looking at into the future. I think in that light it is very appropriate that in 1975 this Bill should be introduced and passed. With this the Government is providing necessary temporary provision for judiciary discretion but it is also reaffirming our commitment to bring about the required changes to legislation, the policies that are needed and to policies to bring about equal status for men and women.

Mr. Speaker, with these words I will support the Bill and at this time, and because I know there are other Members who wish to speak on it, I wish to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski that Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Department of Culture and Youth Act, 1972 be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had, as mentioned by the Member opposite, a great deal to say on this Bill the other day and therefore I shall not be taking a great deal of time today because I did say the things that I wanted to say which I think were worth saying. I think there are many accomplishments that this Government has had throughout these years since June 1971 and I outlined only those accomplishments that were involved in the area for which the Department of Culture and Youth is responsible. Because there are so many accomplishments even in one department it took me a great deal of time to say that, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad I was able to have the opportunity to do so.

Now, I was a little surprised at the sensitivity of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) when he rose and made his

comments. I didn't think I was being controversial in my remarks. I certainly was not being critical of the Opposition in my remarks, I was just stating the facts as they were and putting them on the record of those achievements and really I was quite amazed at his sensitivity when he got up and made his remarks. I don't know why he is so sensitive, except that maybe he's feeling a little bad that in the years from 1964 to 1971 the Members of the Opposition who were then on the Treasury Benches never thought of or never really cared to undertake implementing many of the things that have happened in the last three and a half or so years.

But I want to make one or two short comments on the remarks of the Member who spoke at that time. He said that we did away with the Provincial Youth Agency, Mr. Speaker. Well, I never denied in my remarks that we did away with the Provincial Youth Agency.

Mr. Steuart: — His father was a priest.

Hon. E. Tchorzewski: — That's quite interesting. It's too bad his influence did not help the son.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, we did away with the Provincial Youth Agency and in fact made it not an agency but a provincial department of government which tended to provide a new emphasis, as we were committed to do in the field of cultural, recreational and amateur sport development in the province. We're proud of having done that and because we did that there are certain results that I think are evident to everyone.

Now, he also mentioned a number of other things. He referred to, and I will quote from his remarks:

The real thanks for cultural development in this province is to Mr. Ross Thatcher. He took the Arts Board to which the NDP at that time were giving a mere \$100,000 or so and made it a real and viable operation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to Mr. Thatcher, the Member for Milestone did. Neither did I say that during the time of the Liberal Government there were no funds provided for the Saskatchewan Arts Board. I'm glad that there were and so there should have been. What I want to say is that there was a considerable difference in the amount of funding that was increased from 1964 to 1971 and the amount of increased funding to the Saskatchewan Arts Board that was provided from 1971 to the present time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the increasing funding for the Arts to the Saskatchewan Arts Board under our term of Government since 1971 will increase in 1975 by over 100 per cent, which I think is very significant and is a clear indication of the priority which we have put in the development of the Arts in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, it is very well for the Member for Milestone to say that their Government during that day did a great deal for the Arts. As I said earlier, I am not saying they did not provide additional funding, they did. But they did nothing, they did nothing to provide cultural opportunities to all communities

throughout Saskatchewan who wished on their initiative to do something to make those opportunities possible to all residents in their communities. Our Government did that through the department. It did that with the community cultural project grant program which is now in existence for two years.

Mr. Speaker, mention was made about the doing away with the Provincial Youth Agency which our Government incorporated in the Department of Culture and Youth with all the activities that it was carrying out, but I think it might be worthwhile to place on the record that between 1966 and 1971, '66 being the year when the Liberal Government of the day established the Provincial Youth Agency and '71 being the day when things in this Province changed for the better with the election of an NDP Government, that between that period of time, the amount of funding for the Provincial Youth Agency increased from \$426,000 to \$682,000, an increase of \$250,000 in five years. Well, that may be fine and good except I think along with that it's worthwhile noting that the funding in the Department of Culture and Youth in its first year, 1972-73, was \$1,500,000.

So I think there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that it was worthwhile speaking of the things which I spoke of the other day because they are very major achievements.

I just want to touch on one other point, Mr. Speaker, before I close the debate and take my seat and that is the matter of the opportunities for participation from the point of view of the games that are in existence nationally. Now the Member for Milestone in his remarks talked of the first Canada Summer Games which were held in 1968 in Saskatchewan. Well, I have looked and searched and read and really scrambled around and I am unable to find when there were Canada Summer Games that were held in Saskatchewan in 1968.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, that's what you said, Mr. Member. I don't know, maybe I should have a chat with him later and he may find them, but there are no records of them anywhere included in the records of the old Youth Agency as it existed at that time.

I must say that in 1968 there were events that took place such as a lacrosse tournament in North Battleford and that was good, and a basketball tournament in Yorkton and that was excellent, and there were other sports in communities throughout the province and I do not deny that that was a good thing. But those kinds of events, Mr. Speaker, are still continuing today, in fact, are better because our sports organizations are stronger, they have larger memberships and they have better funding, not only from government, Mr. Speaker, but because of the strong volunteer help and the dedication that exists in those organizations that are able to raise other funds such as the Western Canada Lottery which SaskSport is now an agent of from the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I think besides that other things happened and those things that have happened have increased the opportunity for people to participate in the activity of their choice. Because not only are there now the National Young

Canada Games every four years, there are also the Saskatchewan Summer and Winter Games every four years in between and there is also a further extension of that, regional games that are being held in various regions in the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think once again I am indicating a great number of significant things that have occurred and that have benefited a lot of people in this province and made greater opportunities for people to take part in activities of their choice, whether it be in amateur sports or whether it be in cultural activities or what not, but they certainly have significantly increased.

Now I don't think I want to say a great deal more. I tried to make a comment on some of the remarks of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). As I said I was a little surprised at how sensitive he was. I certainly was not at any time critical of some of the achievements of the youth agency, as small and few as they might have been, but there were some.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I once again want to say that I move second reading and I will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipal Elections Act, 1968.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short amendment to The Urban Municipal Elections Act. Under the present Section it stipulates that the number of persons voting in a poll cannot exceed 400. The cities have found this a little difficult to handle because sometimes there are only one or two persons over the 400, then it turns out it is an illegal poll and the whole process has to be withdrawn. They have requested that the wording be changed to "approximately 400" which would make the situation much easier for the city officials to handle.

I thereby move that this amendment to the Urban Municipal Elections Act be given second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — FREEZE ON RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

MR. E. KAEDING (Saltcoats) moved, seconded by Mr. Oliver (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to extend the freeze on rail line abandonment due to expire on January 1, 1975; and that it not be lifted on any branch line without due study and consultation with those affected and without the express consent of the Government of Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Resolution I make note of the fact that a number of circumstances have changed since the notice of motion was given in December. You will note that the Resolution urges the Government of Canada to extend the freeze on rail line abandonment past the January 1975 deadline. As you will know that date has now passed and the total freeze on rail line abandonment has been replaced by a new directive which extends the freeze on 12,413 miles of line in western Canada which are classified as protected lines until the year 2000. A further 6,300 miles are temporarily frozen until January 1st, 1976 and 525 miles became eligible for immediate abandonment. Of these miles approximately 4,900 are in the first category, 3,500 miles in the second and 167 miles in the third category are in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, if you don't mind.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Is this not Private Members' business?

Mr. Speaker: — It rules on Private Members' day, if we go through Private Members motions you go the Government business. On Government day if once you've gone through the Government paper, you can come to Private Members' business. If Private Members are prepared to go ahead, they may, if they don't wish to they can ask you to stand until Private Members' day comes up. If this normally comes on the head of the paper on Private Members' day it comes on the latter half of the paper on what is known as Government day so that the debate is in order but it follows Government business first. The Government would have to have leave of the House to revert back now to Government business.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order if I might. I accept your ruling. I find it very strange that at 4:30 there is no Government business and none of the Members on this side of the House have been informed or instructed that we're going into Private Members' business which is normally Friday and Tuesday. Today is Wednesday and most of the private Members are — were unaware that this was going to happen and I find this very strange proceeding and as another indication why what we're doing here and why hasn't the Government got some Government business on the table that we can turn around and proceed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Further to the Point, I believe the debate is in order. If a Member is not here or hasn't been aware of it he doesn't have to proceed. If some other Member is prepared to proceed and other Members wish to speak too, it can be adjourned and held over until it does come up again.

Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, since this Resolution does not deal with those lines only that are temporarily frozen to January 1st, 1975, one of my colleagues will be introducing an amendment to change the date on line two to read January 1st, 1976.

To the extent that this new directive clarifies the future of the protected lines for at least 25 years, it will now be possible for the grain companies and the communities on those lines to proceed with some confidence in planning for the future. The 167 miles which are now slated — have been slated for immediate abandonment have been for all intents and purposes already abandoned and do not constitute any real problem.

This Government is seriously concerned however, with the undue haste which seems to be apparent in determining the time frame in which the decision to abandon or protect the balance of the system has been set. It is totally unrealistic to believe that the in-depth studies which are required to make such a determination could be completed by January 1976. The stakes in these decisions are far too high to allow them to be forced on rural Saskatchewan until all possible alternatives are examined. A railroad abandoned now will in all likelihood never be replaced and the community and economic repercussions related to such closures will be irreversible.

It must be recognized however, that it is imperative that a decision be made soon with regard to our entire transportation network to prevent further piecemeal deterioration in the rural areas. We are presently suffering from the deterioration of rail lines and elevator facilities because of the uncertainty which surrounds the future of those lines. We are also confronted with a serious depletion of rolling stock and motive power for the hauling of grain, deliberately brought about by the railway companies in their attempt to force rationalization of the network and removal of the Crow's Nest rates for grain.

We have a rail system which has through the years managed to move large volumes of grain to export markets and as recently as 1972-73 moved close to one billion bushels in spite of snow slides, labor disputes, shortage of cars and the inefficiencies resulting from back-hauls and slow turn-arounds at ports. Given any kind of a reasonable chance there is little doubt that the country collection system could do the job for many years to come.

However, because of rapidly increased operating costs it has become apparent to the elevator companies that some reduction in their overall system is necessary to remain financially solvent. It is also obvious that, because of the neglect of maintenance on many rail branch lines, either a major job of upgrading must soon take place or these lines will become inoperable.

Because of these factors there is some urgency to expediting the rationalization process. However, this rationalization must take into consideration more than just the lowest cost of handling and moving grains for the railways and elevator companies, but must also be very cognizant of the economic and social problems which would be faced by the farmers in increased trucking and handling costs and rural communities through loss of revenues and population.

We are being asked to believe that the railways are losing large amounts of money on the hauling of grain. They have supplied the Canadian Transport Commission with documentation showing what their losses are. However, at no time have they been required to disclose their full financial statements so that those losses could be identified and verified. The losses we have are those supplied by the companies with no proper breakdown as to

the source of their loss. In view of this it is interesting to note that a graph I have here compiled from statistics taken by Statistics Canada shows that over a period of 20 years, from 1951 to 1972, the net operating revenues of the railways have very closely coincided with the volume of grain handled. In years when grain handlings were down, net revenues are down and you can see that on the graph here and in years when grain handlings were high, net revenues increased correspondingly. The relation of one to the other is too consistent to be accidental. There is, therefore, an urgent need for a full disclosure of railway costs before any major decisions are made in changing the system.

The Federal Government under the direction of Otto Lang, Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, has set up a series of proposals for rationalization of the system.

1. Substantial rail line abandonment.
2. Flexible tariff for handling grain.
3. Use of inland terminals.
4. Removal of Crow's Nest rates.

The key to the rationalization process as envisaged by Mr. Lang appears to be the flexible tariff approach, which would free elevator companies of government restrictions on what they could charge for handling grain at any given delivery point. The initial action to bring this about was taken last year when maximum tariffs were increased from four and one-half to ten and one-half cents per bushel, in the hope that elevator companies would use this lever to discourage service at low volume points by applying the maximum tariffs and on the other hand reducing the tariffs at preferred points to attract additional deliveries.

This kind of rationalization, if it can be classed as such, would have fitted well with the promise of Mr. Lang that no points would be abandoned as long as farmers chose to deliver to that point. However, it is quite obvious that as a differential is applied, the farmers on low volume lines would eventually be forced to abandon them in favor of the more distant points with a more favorable rate.

However, because the bulk of the elevators in western Canada are farmer owned and controlled, the producers through their local representatives very quickly assessed the implications of such a proposal and chose rather to apply an across the board increase of eight and three-quarter cents at most points in the province.

More recently Mr. Lang has been proposing that the Crow's Nest rates for grain should be removed and that the railways should be free to charge whatever rates they required to meet the full costs of moving grain in the western provinces without subsidy. This again he suggests would also lead to "rationalization," since the railways would be free to set their rates at any given point to encourage or discourage deliveries to specific points.

No real choice is open to the producer in such a system since even a small differential in freight rates between points on a line or between one branch line and another adjacent line would lead many borderline farmers to choose the cheaper point. As a result the higher cost point would become progressively more uneconomic until the producers there would have no choice

but to change delivery points, which would certainly mean much longer hauls and much higher costs to many of them.

Certainly these two proposals would lead to a reduction in the number of branch lines and delivery points. Unfortunately however, it would leave the "rationalization" process in the hands of the railway companies and to some extent the elevator companies, based only on their economics without regard to the increased trucking costs of farmers or the effects it would have on the communities involved or on the costs to municipalities and the provincial governments to provide the necessary roads.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into a long debate at this time with respect to the removal of the Crow's Nest rates as proposed by Mr. Lang, since this is already a subject of a Government Motion before the House.

I should, however, like to make some observations which I believe are relevant to this Motion. Based on information supplied by the railways, it would appear that if the Crow's Nest rates were removed, the costs of moving grain to export positions would be in the neighbourhood of 50 to 60 cents per bushel as compared to the present rate of 12.5 cents. Because farmers on the prairies must remain competitive on the export market, this would mean that the full increase would have to be borne by the producers, which would be an intolerable burden. In return he has suggested that this difference could be made up by some hazy, unspecified direct payments to producers. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what simpler way could he find to put this money into farmers' hands than by the method now employed by subsidizing the Crow's Nest rates?

Mr. Lang would have us believe that this would result in major improvements in the rail system, in equipment and improved performance in grain movement.

An Hon. Member: — Is that our Otto Lang?

Mr. Kaeding: — Yes, that's our Otto Lang. However, experience based on performance in the United States where rates are four to five times higher than the Crow's Nest rates do not indicate that this would necessarily be the case. In fact even with those high rates their rail system appears to be experiencing many of the same problems that we are in western Canada. Necessary rationalization has not taken place and their turn-around time even with unit trains has not been satisfactory. It would appear that on the contrary any savings or profits which might accrue would be siphoned off instead into subsidizing other non-related hauls or in duplication of unnecessary facilities.

In addition to the above proposals made by the Federal Government through Mr. Lang, there continues to be a subtle but unrelenting pressure being exerted by the Liberals to facilitate the move to inland terminals on the prairies. There can be little doubt that the move to build an inland terminal at Weyburn has been proceeding with the full co-operation of the federal Liberals, first in financing the feasibility studies and later in setting up the financing through DREE.

Because of the high capital cost involved in building these terminals and the large volumes of grain which would be required to make them economically feasible, it would be necessary for them to draw grain from a wide area. In most cases the

required volumes would be such that all the grain produced within a 60 mile radius would be required to maintain an economic operation.

Under normal circumstances it is highly unlikely that farmers would be willing to move their grain for these distances unless some external economic pressures were applied. Here, of course, the strategy of flexible tariffs at the local elevator and variable rail rates at individual shipping points would really become a tool for diverting deliveries to whatever point the railways wished.

Once again one is led to suspect that there is more behind this proposal for removal of Crow's Nest rates than just to assist the railways. The move by Cargill and Continental into western Canada and the move by the federal Government to return the marketing of feed grains to the commodity exchange system all point to a concerted effort by the federal Liberals to bring the entire grain marketing system back under the domination of the open market. The international grain traders, as exemplified by Cargill and Continental, can only thrive properly when operating in a speculative climate where their profits are made, not so much by their return from the handling of grain physically as from the manipulation of the market place.

There is little doubt that if the move to inland terminals were to gain ground, that these international companies would be in a favourable position because of their worldwide activities to become owners of a substantial number of them. With added pressure applied through flexible tariffs on handling and railway rates, the farmers in the sphere of each of these terminals would soon become captive to them and the farmer owned system they have so painstakingly built over the years would be in jeopardy and any control they now have over the handling system would be lost for all time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article which appeared in the *Prairie Messenger* recently dealing with this subject which states the situation admirably:

In the North American food industry, at either end of it, transportation is the name of the game. A small number of giant food chains have all of North America locked into one continental marketing system. They can control it mainly because they have the resources of money and equipment to transport products around at will. Their centralization of the system is either taken off the price the producer gets for his product or added to the price the consumer pays either one or both.

Far more important than efficiency is the strict control and utter predictability of every link in the grain food chain. Since transportation has been made such a big link, only those who have the resources to indulge in transportation at will can survive in the industry.

It is quite irrelevant that Mrs. Beryl Plumptre and her Food Prices Review Board have found no great individual rip-offs in the food industry. It is the planned inefficiency of the system which is the villain.

In spite of that inefficiency, in spite of the fact that it requires huge capital resources and consumes huge

quantities of petroleum products, the system has been adopted because it lends itself admirably to what John Kenneth Galbraith would describe as "The Planning System".

The complete integration of the North American industry into one centralized system has only one major hold-out.

To the chagrin of the United States based multinationals the gathering system for gains in western Canada is largely in the hands of Canadians and much of it still under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. The powers of that Board are being steadily eroded, from within and from without, but the Board is still there.

To the further chagrin of the American corporations, the Crow's Nest freight rates enable the Canadian farmer to move his grain to export position in Canada much cheaper than if it were integrated into a continental gathering system.

This unfair advantage of the Canadian farmer, it is felt, will soon have to be remedied. All that stands in the way are the Crow's Nest rates, the railway branch lines and the country elevators. The Americans, Cargill and Continental feel that these obstacles can be eliminated just as effectively as Safeway and its cohorts are eliminating the corner grocery and the independent wholesaler.

Cargill and Continental have found Weyburn to be the logical place to start their onslaught. Weyburn is on the Soo Line, a railway which was originally built to bring settlers and products into western Canada, either from the United States or via the United States. Because other rail lines in the area run parallel with the Soo, few points around Weyburn have easy rail access to Weyburn. If the Weyburn inland terminal goes in, branch line abandonment in the Weyburn area has ready access to Weyburn only by road.

The Soo Line gives the added advantage of excellent rail and road connections to the United States. There is already talk of unit trains composed of Continental hopper cars bringing Canadian grain for export to Continental terminals on the Gulf of Mexico. From there, of course, Continental ships will be ready to bring the grain to its final destination.

This is a good economic reason for the unseemly haste with which inland terminals are being pushed. Given the fact, which Canadian proponents of inland terminals try not to see, that it takes some three and a half times as much diesel fuel to move grain by truck than by rail, the inefficient inland terminal system must be rushed in now, before we become more keenly aware of the limits of our energy resources.

Once the inland terminal system is in, it will be too late to push for economy and efficiency. We won't have the capital or the political will to set up or restore an alternative to the Cargill and Continental inland terminals.

More exactly, as Dennis Gruending pointed out on CBK radio on February 4, the shift to inland terminals is irreversible. It can be made to work only if it destroys alternatives. Phrased another way: "Once inland terminals are in the alternatives will shrivel up and go away".

I would recommend to all Members of the House that they get a copy of this series of articles in the Prairie Messenger. They have a real message to all the people in western Canada who are concerned with the survival of the rural community.

And who, Mr. Speaker, do we find out in the country promoting these inland terminals?

Mr. Weatherald: — I'll send you a copy of the Free Press.

Mr. Kaeding: — That's fine. That one is about as irresponsible as one can get.

For the most part they are friends of the Liberal Party opposite, who have for years opposed the orderly marketing system. We see them come out of the woodwork at every inland terminal meeting held throughout the province. Often they come out, not openly as Liberals but as Members of the Palliser Wheat Growers or some other organization, but they are readily recognizable wherever you go.

Even if it were possible to operate inland terminals at a reduced cost, which is unlikely, it is also unlikely that the full additional cost of extra miles of trucking could be fully compensated for in the rate structure alone. However, there are huge additional costs which are implied by any such change in grain movement patterns.

1. Greatly increased hauling distances would encourage the use of larger trucks and the additional ton miles required to be moved over these rural roads would impose an intolerable cost on the rural municipalities.

We now have completed our rural grid road system. A program is well underway to further assist municipalities in an oiling program to further improve that system. Under normal loads and normal traffic the estimated cost of such an oiling program would be in the neighborhood of \$7,000 per mile. To rebuild these roads and provide the kind of surface necessary to carry heavier loads and heavier traffic it would likely cost at least five times that figure. Also visualize if you can a loaded semi-trailer of grain meeting a school bus on a soft road in the spring. I think that would make your hair stand on end.

An indication of the tremendous cost which could be involved is clearly demonstrated by the damage done by large 800 bushel grain trucks used to empty elevators at the Yellowhead and Yellow Creek last summer. Approximately 90,000 bushels were moved over 13 miles of oiled highway in this movement. The additional maintenance and repair cost resulting from this haul amounted to over \$2,000 per mile, or almost 30 cents per bushel of grain hauled. Just try to imagine, Mr. Speaker, that kind of a situation developing all over the province.

2. Of even greater concern to this Government is the fate of the large number of rural communities which would be left without rail service and where the railways were closed down. Many of these small communities have a very fragile taxation base and the loss of tax revenue from the railways' right of way and the elevators would reduce the revenues to a disaster level. In many of these towns there is an elevator, a hotel, a store, a service station, maybe a café and a curling rink. The community revolves around these services. With the loss of the elevators and rail lines, the tax burden will increase and some business will drift away as the trucks haul to larger centres. The local businessmen are caught in a trap. With declining populations the value of their property becomes less and less. In fact, in many cases, there is no salvage value since no one is willing to purchase the property regardless of dollar value. These are the people who will bear the brunt of rail line abandonment.

I have painted a dark picture, Mr. Speaker, but one which could well be repeated over and over again in western Canada if rationalization is left in the hands of the railways.

Those Members of the Legislative Agriculture Committee who visited some areas of North Dakota two years ago will recall rather vividly some of the experiences related to us in the town of Mott, which had just been through such a rationalization process. Surely we can learn from the unfortunate experiences of our southern neighbors.

What then, Mr. Speaker, are the alternatives?

Well, first of all, there is an urgent need and long overdue need for a national transportation policy which recognizes:

1. The need for freight rates which encourage maximum processing of products within areas where they are produced and will protect the interests of producers where no alternative competitive transportation is possible.
2. Maintenance of a rail network adequate to ensure the produce can be transported from those areas.
3. Sufficient rolling stock and motive power to move the required volumes of the various commodities efficiently.
4. A recognition that the railways should be retained as an instrument of national policy to provide adequate transportation, particularly in those areas where competitive opportunities do not exist.

In my own opinion, Mr. Speaker, before such a transportation policy can become a reality it is imperative that the entire western system be directed by one authority. If this can only be achieved by nationalization of the CPR, then this should be done immediately so that a proper rationalization of existing lines can take place. It is totally unrealistic in my opinion to expect that the two major railways will undertake such rationalization if left to their own devices.

A less attractive alternative would be the nationalization of the road beds with the power in the hands of the Canadian Transportation Commission to direct proper integration of lines on the prairies. Under either method it would be possible to eliminate the tremendous inconsistency presently existing in the

system. Situations such as the completely unnecessary cross hauls from Edmonton to Calgary by CPR and from Calgary to Edmonton by CNR, simply to stay on their own lines, is an example. A total of 4.2 million car miles are wasted in this area alone annually. Duplication of trackage from Saskatoon to Macklin add another 160 miles of needless hauling. The cross haul to Churchill is a glaring example of inefficiency where communities only a few hundred miles from that port have their grain shipped out to Vancouver or Thunder Bay because they are on CP lines, while grain from Churchill is drawn from the southern part of the province because they are on CN lines.

Integration of switching yards in several inland areas could lead to greater efficiencies, and a whole series of bottlenecks exist at the terminals at the West coast which could be resolved at least in part by integrating the two railroads. Again I repeat, this kind of rationalization will not likely take place unless there is a complete integration of the two existing railways.

It is quite logical to assume that, if such integration could take place, that there could well be several hundred miles of rail lines that could be abandoned with little real hardship to rural communities. It is absolutely essential however that, before any such abandonment takes place, that full consultation and study take place on a regional basis to ensure that the best possible balance be achieved with the least amount of community disruption.

We, in this Government, are prepared to assist any community affected with all the assistance they need in preparing a defence on the abandonment issue. Our goal will continue to be to resist all rail line abandonment until it can be shown that removal of services is acceptable to the rural communities involved. In such cases where abandonment is deemed to be in the best interest of the community, the Federal Government must be cognizant of its responsibility to financially assist those who might suffer hardship because they have to relocate.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge this Assembly to support me in presenting this Resolution which I now move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, again this afternoon we have witnessed another demonstration of blind, uncontrollable rhetoric from that side of the House, the same kind of rhetoric we have heard in this province for the last three and a half years. The same kind of rhetoric we have heard since 1964 when the Members opposite happened to lose an election.

The Resolution which was just introduced is just an example of that rhetoric. I say (and I might read):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to extend the freeze on rail line abandonment due to expire on January 1, 1975.

For the information of the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) this has already happened.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think that it's supposed to be in the House that when the Member reads that point and points it out that this would be changed. The Member has already specifically stated. I should like to stay on the debate.

Mr. Wiebe: — The Resolution, I understand, that was presented by the Member definitely stated January 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, but I think the Member specifically stated that he had made arrangements for amendment to that section.

Mr. Wiebe: — Well yes, fine, I will take the Member at his word, but we are debating the Resolution which is now before us, there has been no amendment put before us to change that, so until then I must go according to the Resolution as presented before me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution goes on and says that no branch line be abandoned without any due study and consultation with those affected in the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, this has already happened. There have been no branch lines abandoned. Before any branch lines will be abandoned in Saskatchewan full consultation will be held with the people of Saskatchewan through regional hearings. The present freeze does not necessarily mean that it is for only a one year period. Further extensions of one year will apply. It seems to me that here again this speech which we have just heard is another example of what we are going to be witnessing in this Session in the months that follow. It's strictly a political Session. Sixty Members of the Legislature of this Province have sat idle for the last two and a half months, the Government opposite has had ample time to draw up legislation to present to this House, the problems that now face Saskatchewan are just unlimited, we've got people leaving our farms, we've got industry leaving this province. As well, the cattle producers are in dire straits. I see no Resolutions on the Order Paper urging the provincial Government to help the cattle industry in this province. So what has this Government done? We have sat here now for three days, Monday we adjourned early because there wasn't enough business to do; yesterday was Private Members' day, and they at least have been active and have presented Resolutions; today we aren't even supplied with enough Government business to carry on and we have to go back to Private Members' business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, look at our front benches. How many of the Cabinet Members are here? Where is the Premier of the province? What's his concern for the cattle industry of this province? What's his concern for normal debate to take place in this Legislature? Again, it is strictly a political game and they intend to use politics wherever they can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is anyone in this province who wants rail lines abandoned, with the exception of the railway companies and the NDP Members opposite. They are

March 12, 1975

the only ones that want rail lines abandoned in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Everybody knows why the railroads want the lines abandoned. Why do the NDP want them abandoned? Strictly because of politics. All we have to do is go back to 1958-59-60. The only rail lines that were ever abandoned in this province were abandoned when we had a provincial CCF Government and a Conservative Government in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Let's make that point very clear and let's make another point clear. The only government or political party in Canada today that has done anything to protect rail lines has been the Liberal Party and the Federal Liberal Government.

In 1964 it was a Federal Liberal Government that froze rail lines. In 1970 it was a Federal Liberal Government that froze rail lines and in 1975, again, it was a Federal Liberal Government that froze rail lines in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — What have the Members opposite been doing during that period of time? Strictly nothing but politics, but they are certainly prepared to spend money. Just like they have done Friday. Some goodies for each and every person in this province. They are going to try and buy the voters' support in this coming election. I might advise Members opposite that the people of Saskatchewan are much more intelligent than that.

But what have they done in terms of rail line abandonment and this entire issue? They have spent \$260,000 of the taxpayers' money and come up with a book like this that is full of nothing but statistics, no recommendations, no alternatives as to what the transportation system should be in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, I must make a few comments on some of the remarks made by the Member for Saltcoats regarding his comments on inland terminals, and the inland terminal at Weyburn specifically.

He says that it's a Federal Liberal Government and the Saskatchewan Liberal Party that is building the terminal at Weyburn. Where is his proof? Let me point out that it is a group of individual farmers who have got together to try and build an inland terminal (something different). Now, if they condemn that, if the Members opposite condemn that, are they then in the same voice condemning a group of farmers who fifty years ago got together and formed the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, exactly the same way as this is being formed? If they condemn what's happening in Weyburn today, they also condemn what a group of farmers did fifty years ago. And that, Mr. Chairman, was done by a group of individual farmers who thought they had an idea that was good and they were going to explore that idea.

What's happening in Weyburn is being made to happen by a group of farmers who think that they have a good idea. They are going to try and see if that idea works. If that idea doesn't work, who loses? Not the people of this province, not the Provincial NDP or the Federal Liberal Government. The only people who lose are those who invested their time and their money in that inland terminal at Weyburn.

As well, Mr. Speaker, while the Member for Saltcoats was talking about all the terrible things he thought was going on in this province, I didn't hear any of his suggestions as to what he felt should be done. I didn't hear what his position was on rail line abandonment and the transportation system, as well I haven't heard it from the Premier of this province or the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), although that could be explained.

I would at this time like to give the Members of this House, for the record of this Legislature and for the people of Saskatchewan, the position of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party in terms of rail line abandonment in this province.

First of all if the gentlemen will excuse me I should like to read our policy, and I sincerely hope that they will be enlightened by what they are about to hear. Again, Mr. Speaker, the decision regarding rail line abandonment and our entire transportation system, it is a decision that will be made by the National Government in Ottawa. That decision, Mr. Speaker, will affect each and every resident of this province and it will have a direct effect on Saskatchewan much more so than any other province in Canada. A Saskatchewan Liberal Government after June, or whenever the election is called, will work together with rural municipalities, town councils, grain companies and farm organizations to assure that the decision made must be satisfactory to our farmers and help protect our rural way of life. I have yet to hear or to see one offer of co-operation from any Member on that side of the House to any group, organization or to the people of this province, in trying to formulate a recommendation that we could make to Ottawa.

Let's just look at that. I introduced an amendment to the Resolution proposed by the Attorney General asking for the Members opposite to co-operate together to form a legislative committee to listen to the people of this province and to present a united front to Ottawa. What is the response by those Members opposite? No, we don't want to co-operate. No, we don't want to listen to the people of Saskatchewan. A very interesting point I might bring up at this time, that Members opposite might consider when they get around to debating that particular Resolution. About three weeks ago the Member for Gravelbourg and myself were fortunate enough to attend the Wheat Pool Meeting in the town of Herbert. At that meeting in Herbert I proposed much the same resolution. We then had an opportunity to debate that resolution. I of course presented the resolution, I spoke in favor of it. The Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), when he got up to speak, stated that he represented the position of the Provincial Government. He spoke against that resolution. He spoke against that resolution not only once, not only twice, but three times. I might point out that when that resolution came to a vote, that there were three people who voted against the resolution and the majority of the people voted in favor of it and passed it, just about unanimous.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — If that is the position you take, I would reassess my position when it comes to debating that Resolution in this House again.

Going back, Mr. Speaker, to the position which we have taken, let me just continue. There is no doubt that changes will have to be made in our transportation and elevator system. But we must ensure that these changes are beneficial to all people and that before changes are made we will all have a chance to know what the alternatives will be and that everyone has a say as to how those changes will be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Liberal Party believes that the debate on such things as the Crow Rate Agreement, inland terminals, rail line abandonment, high through-put elevators must continue. And full information as to changes, implementation and effects must be aired and made available to all people of the province.

Before any changes are made, full consideration and study must be given to each and every aspect. We believe that one cannot look at the different aspects of the grain handling and transportation system as piecemeal. To be effective it can only be looked at and dealt with as a total package. To be included in that total package the Saskatchewan Liberal Party believes and recommends that no branch lines be abandoned until the railway companies reveal their costs of operating branch lines and also that they reveal the criteria that are used to determine the freight rates that are charged on those branch lines. As well, we believe that no branch lines be abandoned until full expanded regional hearings and full public discussion is held throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, we believe that those branch lines that are not scheduled for abandonment after the hearings are completed be immediately transferred into the permanent network and frozen to the year 2000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, we believe that senior governments, railway companies and grain handling companies be more specific about what they are proposing so that the people can look at the alternatives. We believe, we recommend and we encourage the continuation of branch line subsidies to maintain services on those branch lines which are still uneconomic but considered essential to the well-being, economic and social life of rural Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan Liberal Party as well believes that a national transportation policy is long overdue. And it feels that the Federal Government should provide a comprehensive statement of their transportation policy to include, first; freight rates which encourage maximum processing of products in areas where they are produced. As well, sufficient rolling stock, engines and hopper cars to ensure adequate rail capability

to move anticipated volume. We believe that the Federal Government's responsibility is there for upgrading and maintaining of needed railway road beds in this province.

We believe and recommend the integration of railway operations to include the exchange of ownership of particular lines between railway companies to reduce back-haul which now exists because of ownership patterns, and also to increase the joint running arrangements by several railway companies over a single track where this would be advantageous.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be general agreement that to maintain the existing network of elevators would be too costly when measured against the services rendered, or the services received. Of course, factors other than operating costs such as development of a road system, location of services such as schools, hospitals, banks and so on have some influence on the grain delivery patterns and in turn the structure of the elevator network. From the grain producer's point of view adequate service is measured in terms of hauling distance and service that he receives at the elevators. It seems evident that a more consolidated network of elevators is required if service is to be kept to a reasonable cost.

The Saskatchewan Liberal Party believes that some of the factors that should be considered in identifying the required elevator network and of course rail lines should be as follows:

1. Producer hauling distance that no farmer should be more than 25 miles from an elevator with an average of 15 miles.
2. As well, road system. In instances where rail lines have been abandoned and as a result have created an increased burden on the rural municipality to maintain road services, senior governments, both provincially and federally, should provide the financial assistance required to maintain those roads.
3. Consideration should be given to the trade service patterns such as medical, educational, social and recreation and these should be given as much priority as to the area served by the farmers themselves.
4. We must consider in this entire program the community settlement patterns to protect settlement patterns based on ethnic, religious and other social groups.

In summing up the policy of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, a provincial Liberal Government after June 18, or 25th, whatever will work with rural municipalities, town councils, grain companies, farm organizations to have the maximum amount of rail lines transferred into the permanent system in this province. As well, we will support a system based on the criteria that no farmer be more than 25 miles from an elevator with an average of 15 miles.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more comments which I should like to make in regard to this Resolution and because of that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 6 — FAMILY INCOME PLAN

MR. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Nutana South) moved, seconded by Mr. Comer (Nipawin):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to follow the leadership of the Province of Saskatchewan in the Family Income Plan, by setting out appropriate work incentives in future income programs without discrimination or the bias of disability or employability.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which is before us, certainly the substance of the Resolution which is before us, is not new to anyone in this House nor I think is it new to people of Saskatchewan or the Canadian people because it has been discussed and debated at length for a number of years.

Before I get into the substance of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to pay tribute to a man whom I certainly got to admire in my few years in politics, the late Hubert Prefontaine.

When I was serving on the Welfare Committee in 1973 I took the occasion to discuss with Hubert the social security programs that were then in existence in Canada. We discussed at that time a guaranteed annual income and also his working with security programs in other parts of Canada. I think Mr. Prefontaine had much to do with getting implemented in Saskatchewan the Family Income program which will stand to his credit and which has been praised by many people who have felt its benefits in the last little while.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, the idea of having one social security program as I have said and the advantages and disadvantages of it have been discussed by church groups, it has been opposed by certain church groups, it has been advocated by others; it has been opposed I believe by Members on this side of the House and Members on the other side of the House. I think it crosses party lines and there is not one solid support for or against the idea of one security program for all people.

But, Mr. Speaker, it behooves us that we do spend some time examining the present situation in all parts of Canada. There are many people who through no fault of their own but, basically, I believe that because of the economic system in which we live that many people will remain below the poverty line through no fault of their own. They may have come into this world as handicapped people, handicapped physically, emotionally, mentally or whatever way in which they may be handicapped. These people certainly should not suffer throughout their lives either because of the selfishness of certain people in society whereby, for example, in 1971, 43.3 per cent of all income in Canada was taken by 20 per cent of the top echelon in Canada. On the other hand the lowest 20 per cent only received 3.6 per cent of the total income. We find, for example, Mr. Speaker, that these people will not be able to improve their situation because of the economic situation or the standards that we use, these people will relatively become poorer in society. Because today we seem to

reward people almost entirely for their economic contributions that they make, and not for some of the other contributions that they make.

If someone helps to make this place better in which to live, a more humane society, we seem to simply slough it off, and there are no real rewards.

A comment was made in the House earlier today whereby someone said I would question a doctor who would move into an area where he was deprived of the advantages that he would find in urban society, I would question his ability as a doctor. This was mentioned by a Member in this House. I certainly can't agree with that individual. Why shouldn't someone want to go into a deprived area of society for maybe half the salary, half the economic income because he happens to believe that there is more to life than making money, that maybe the goal of an individual should be to improve the lives and conditions of those impoverished groups.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that is before us is a very simple resolution. It does not condemn the Federal Government, it does not condemn any provincial government. It simply urges the Federal Government to take some leadership, more leadership than it has in the past and follow the example of the Saskatchewan Government when we implemented the Family Income Plan. We ask them to implement a program which would set out appropriate work incentives, without discrimination on the basis of disability or employability.

Mr. Speaker, most provinces have taken some initiative to assist impoverished groups, but I believe that unless there is a concerted united effort, spearheaded by the Federal Government, we will once again end up with large disparities among provinces because certain provinces have greater resources at their disposal. They will be able to offer higher financial benefits, improve conditions for the lower income groups than will the less able provinces. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that in a Confederation like Canada, we cannot allow this to happen.

The ideal social security system, in my opinion, must include at a minimum the following three principles. First, the minimum income must be sufficiently high to permit the individual family to live in dignity in the community in which they reside. Secondly, there must be adequate work incentives. Thirdly, it must be based on the invaluable worth of each individual.

Incomes received by individuals or families must be such that they will be able to purchase all the essentials of life without severely jeopardizing their position in the community in which they live. Families should not need to constantly worry about whether there is sufficient money to make ends meet. The level of income must take into account regional disparities in the standard of living and must be based on the cost of living increases.

We know, for example, Mr. Speaker, that on the prairies today it is much cheaper to live than, for example, in Toronto or Montreal. And that really has nothing to do with the type of government I suppose that we have because it is just as cheap to live in Alberta where we have a Conservative government.

But it just so happens that at this time we have a booming economy and we have a fair amount of goods available at our disposal that are needed by the rest of society. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we should take advantage of the situation that we have and improve the conditions of the impoverished groups in Saskatchewan and in this regard I certainly want to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Taylor for acting so quickly on the report that was submitted in 1973, the Special Committee on Welfare Report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Which, Mr. Speaker, for some reason that still amazes me, Members of the Opposition did not support. In being fair, however, to the Members opposite they did state in their reservations that there were many things that they would agree with. Which particular ones they disagreed with I don't think is amply clear in the Report. I would hope that Members opposite would agree with me that we need today some form of social security program. Not just in Saskatchewan, not just in Manitoba, where the Federal Government is experimenting now, not just in British Columbia, but what about Newfoundland where over 17 per cent of the people are unemployed today? I think we need a security program that goes right across this country so that when we have ups and downs in the economy these people will be protected.

Mr. Speaker, the second principle that I should like to see in such a security program is work incentives. The social security system should contain sufficient incentives so that it is truly worthwhile for the individual to seek gainful employment.

Most people who have done any amount of work or research on such a security program recommend that 50 cents of every dollar, beyond a certain basic income, should be retained by the individual. Even this ratio, Mr. Speaker, may not be sufficient to offset some of the expenses incurred by the individual who decides to work rather than draw unemployment insurance or stay on welfare.

The financial gain for working as opposed to not working must be, in my opinion, very substantial, otherwise people will refuse to seek employment and will be prepared to do without the added advantages. In this respect I should like to ask the Provincial Government to continue to monitor the Family Income Plan to determine if the present incentives are sufficient and the level of income sufficiently high.

Mr. Speaker, the third principle, and probably the most important that should be contained in such a social security program, is the invaluable worth of the individual. In today's society where there seems to be such a total disregard for the worth of an individual and such little regard for those people especially who are handicapped, we say — 'well they have nothing to contribute'. I am sure that those of us who believe that way, that we changed our minds just a few weeks ago when we watched a program by Roy Bonisteel on "Man Alive" when he interviewed a young lady who had a severe case of cerebral palsy and who, at many times in her life, had been told that it was not worth it. It was not economically worth it to keep her alive. She struggled to continue to make her contribution and I believe, if I am correct, today she is studying to get her Master's Degree or Doctor's Degree at some university.

There was one point in the interview, Mr. Speaker, that really got to me and that was when she said that every individual, every individual has a right to some kind of enjoyment in life, even if it is just a feeling of the blanket against his skin.

I happen to know also, Mr. Speaker, another individual in Saskatoon who has been bedridden for a number of years. My colleague says 30 years. He has a severe case of arthritis, and can barely dial the telephone, but he is a very, very sharp individual. The first time he phoned me I had a mental picture of what he was like and I said to myself, he must be a very intelligent human being, a very capable human being. I was awestruck when I went to his home and asked for this individual and he said as he lay in his bed and could not move that he was the man I was looking for. I think we so often judge people without really examining first what they are capable of doing.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the depth of the third principle which I should like to discuss, could I call it 5:30?

Mr. Speaker: — You must move your Motion today or otherwise it will have to drop because you are speaking to it doubly if you don't move your Motion.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will do so then and try to wrap it up as quickly as possible.

An Hon. Member: — You'll never make it.

Mr. Rolfes: — I can do it. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1973 the Federal Government put out a working paper on social security in Canada. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between provincial Ministers and the federal Ministers and some progress has been made. I am disappointed, however, that not sufficient progress has been made so that we could announce in 1975 that there would be one social security program across Canada. Especially, Mr. Speaker, when you look at today's disparity in unemployment of 2.6 per cent to over 17 per cent in some parts of Canada. In some areas, I am told that over 50 per cent of the people live below the poverty line. These conditions do have an adverse effect on families and individuals. Such conditions are probably one of the main causes for family breakups, of increased crimes and the increase in the number of alcoholics in this country. With continued increase in inflation and the consequence of erosion of the buying power of the dollar, the living conditions of the low income group is nothing short of being deplorable. It is imperative that an agreement be reached soon between the provinces and the Federal Government so that a unified social security system be implemented for all Canadians, a system which is based on adequate income to meet escalating costs, a system which has good work incentives so that people would seek employment, and lastly a system which truly recognizes the invaluable worth of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Federal Government has done something and moved in this area and I realize that the provincial governments have also done so. But in order that all people will have an equal opportunity I ask this Assembly to support me in the Resolution.

March 12, 1975

I now move this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I want to inform the House that one of the Members on this side will move a slight amendment to this Resolution later on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the Resolution, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:33 o'clock p.m.