

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**25th Day**

**Tuesday, March 25, 1975.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. A. THIBAUT:** (Melfort-Kinistino) Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislature a fine group of high school students from the Birch Hills High School. They are led here by their teachers, Mr. Dick Trew, Mr. Grant Getz and their bus driver, Mr. John Overland.

I hope that their trip here will be a very educational one. Birch Hills High School has been sending students here ever since I have been a Member of this Legislature some 16 years ago. I am sure that their trip here today is going to be educational and I am sure that the Members of the Legislature will demonstrate democratic government so that they can take home pleasant memories of what they have seen here today. I also want to wish them a very safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. J. E. BROCKLEBANK:** (Saskatoon Mayfair) Mr. speaker, I want to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House, a group of 25 students situated in the west gallery from St. Edwards School in the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. I want to take this opportunity to welcome them to the Chamber and hope they enjoy the proceedings this afternoon. I'd like also to take this opportunity to inform them that they are in the famous Brocklebank bulge in Mayfair constituency. It has been referred to previously in this House as a gerrymander by the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. Unfortunately I won't be able to represent them in the next Legislature since I will be representing Saskatoon Westmount right next to Saskatoon Mayfair.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. A. PEPPER:** (Weyburn) Mr. Speaker, again today I should like to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of this House the other half of the class of Graded Eight students which visited us yesterday from the Weyburn Junior High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Jim Nedelcov and Mr. Gordon Little. This is Mr. Nedelcov's sixteenth visit to the Legislature accompanying students from the Weyburn Junior High, somewhat of a record I believe, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Little has been a teacher of some 21 years in the city of Weyburn. Both these young men have made a great contribution to the field of education. I am sure that we as Members welcome the teachers and the students here this afternoon and hope that their visit is beneficial to them and as usual, we wish them a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** (Saskatoon Riversdale) I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, the students in the Speaker's Gallery. They are from Thornton School and there are 30 of them – there is somebody here who is making this difficult . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** . . . Grade Seven and Grade Eight students and they are accompanied by teachers, Rod Mier and Tony Allan. Thornton School is one of the older and very respected public schools in the city of Saskatoon around the Lorne Avenue area, and I welcome the students here. I hope to meet with them around 3:15 this afternoon and hope they have a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **CLERK PROUD FATHER OF NEW DAUGHTER**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before calling Orders of the Day I would like to remind Members that this is Private Members day and I would ask you to be easy on our Clerk because last night he became the proud father of a new daughter.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **COPY OF WRITTEN AWARD BY JUDGE MOORE – IBEW**

**HON. K. THORSON:** (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to inform the House that I have obtained a copy of the written award made by His Honour Judge Benjamin Moore as a result of the arbitration involving the recent contract dispute between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, Local 2067. Mr. Speaker, I should like to lay on the table a copy of that written award. Members will remember that in January of this year when we passed The Maintenance of Operations of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Act, Judge Moore of Swift Current was appointed to arbitrate the dispute. Yesterday he made known to the Union and to the management of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation the results of his arbitration. They are, in the main points, as follows: A reduction in the hours of work: that is for office employees presently working 36 1/4 hours per week, the new work week will be 35 hours. For field staff who are now working a 40 hour week, the new work week will be 37 1/3 hours. There will be a general wage increase of 16 1/4 per cent for all trades and technical classifications and seven per cent for the very few clerical and stenographic employees in that classification with the IBEW Local. The new contract is for a one year period beginning January 1, 1975.

There have also been some hourly wage adjustments in rates of pay for certain select classifications. In addition a cost of living adjustment formula which was a feature of the last bargaining agreement is to be continued in the 1975 agreement. It is calculated twice yearly and is based upon the Regina—Saskatoon

March 25, 1975

cost of living index.

All of the awards, Mr. Speaker, are retroactive to January 1, 1975 with the exception of hours of work and those are to be in effect not less than two months from the date of signing a new collective bargaining agreement pursuant to the award made by Judge Moore.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### STRUTHERS ADVERTISING AGENCY

**MR. D. G. STEUART:** (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). In the face of the accusations made by Mr. Glen Knight about political patronage and other things going on in his Department and in the Government, the Minister of Social Services was quoted in the Leader-Post of March 21st as saying:

It could be they (referring to Struthers Advertising Agency) were on the rotation list.

My question is, who is on this rotation list of advertising agencies?

**HON. A. TAYLOR:** (Minister of Social Services) Mr. Speaker, the question was in answer, as the Leader of the Opposition says, to the use of a particular agency. I said there may have been a number of reasons for that agency, it could have been that they were on a rotation list. I have no idea who might be on such a list. I said that was one possibility, the other is because they had done the work for the Family Income Plan last year. I did not try to give an answer that I know why Struthers in that particular case was being used.

**MR. STEUART:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that the firm of Struthers was not even incorporated until July 31, 1971, a month after the NDP Government assumed office in this province? Is he further aware that Mr. Wylie Simmonds is one of the three people mentioned in that corporation, one of the senior officers of that company? Is he aware that Mr. Wylie Simmonds is a defeated NDP candidate? Is he also aware that the Struthers Advertising Agency is one of the advertising agencies for the NDP political party? Is he also aware that Mr. Knight made the statement and I understand gave an affidavit to the effect that there was in fact a serious rip off by Struthers with the collusion of the Members of the NDP Government or an executive assistant? Now, in face of these statements, these known facts, the affidavit statement by this individual who seems to have the whole power of the Government now turned against him, is he now still prepared to deny that none of this happened and that in his opinion there is no political patronage handed to the Struthers Advertising Agency?

**MR. TAYLOR:** Mr. Speaker, there was a whole host of questions there, I will try to answer them. No, I was not aware of when

they were incorporated. I quite frankly don't watch the incorporation documents of any company. I am very much aware of the good work which they have done for our Department in the past just as I am of some other agencies that are being used by my Department. I am aware that Mr. Simmonds was a defeated candidate. I was not necessarily aware of his involvement with the Struthers Agency but I certainly know he ran as a candidate. As far as an affidavit is concerned I have seen no affidavit, none has been handed to me.

**MR. STEUART:** Are you denying there was any patronage or business given to Struthers?

**MR. TAYLOR:** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question. I said of course business was given to Stuthers and it was given to them because they were capable of doing the job.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GLEN KNIGHT**

**MR. J. G. LANE:** (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. As a result of your statements in the House yesterday, a man has been fired, first of all, from a government position and now Mr. Knight has been forced to leave the 2M Company. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Knight is presently unemployed, his reputation has been besmirched by the Minister and he has in fact been called a liar because of the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! I think the Hon. Member is well aware of the fact that Members must ask questions and seek information, not attempt to give it. You must ask for information.

**MR. LANE:** Did you or did your executive assistant ask Mr. Glen Knight to travel with you to an NDP political meeting at Kerrobert?

**MR. TAYLOR:** No.

**MR. LAME:** Did you or your executive assistant request or order or suggest to Mr. Glen Knight a public servant, that he join the Regina Region New Democratic Party Publicity Committee?

**MR. TAYLOR:** No.

**MR. HOWARD GOWAN**

**MR. J. G. RICHARDS:** (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), in connection with the statement made to the Moran Commission by Mr. Howard Gowan. There was a lengthy story on this issue in the Saturday issue of the Leader-Post. The matter referred to something in 1967 admittedly before – Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to get a question across with the hub-bub on this side of the House.

March 25, 1975

**AN HON. MEMBER:** What about the other side?

**MR. RICHARDS:** The question is, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister whether he can report to the House what action the Department of Health took with respect to the inquiries and correspondence that Mr. Gowan says he made to the Provincial Health Department about the unfortunate situation in which he was incarcerated involuntarily in the Weyburn Psychiatric Institution in 1967?

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK:** (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, I am really not familiar with the story that the Hon. Member is referring to. I would be glad to investigate the matter and give us full a report as I can but I investigate the member and give us a full a report as I can but I am not aware of the situation he refers to, a situation back in 1967, I am not aware of it but I will be glad to look into it.

**MR. RICHARDS:** The story had a good deal of prominence, in fact it was virtually a half-page story on the third page of the Saturday Leader-Post. Mr. Gowan stated that he had correspondence at the time with the Health Department as well as other provincial and federal government agencies. Can I take it that the Minister will report back to the House and will he be prepared to table to the House, given that Mr. Gowan has already made documents on the situation public, will he be prepared to make public the correspondence and relevant reports written within the Health Department at that time?

**MR. SMISHEK:** Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to give an undertaking I will be prepared to file correspondence or particular documents, they may be the kind of documents that aren't in the public interest, but I am prepared to examine them and give the Hon. Member a report.

#### **MR. GLEN KNIGHT**

**MR. E.C. MALONE:** (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Social Services.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is the House Prepared to permit another question?

**MR. MALONE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor). In view of the publicity that this Knight case is getting and in view of the concern that has been expressed by the Members on this side of the House, is the Minister prepared to table all the written directions that were given by him or his executive assistant to Mr. Knight in connection with his employment at the Department?

**MR. TAYLOR:** Mr. Speaker, I can only say I will take that under advisement at this time.

**MR. MALONE:** By way of supplementary question, as the Minister is aware, one of the problems that was raised by Mr. Knight was

the ad for the Family Income Plan. My question to the Minister is, what, if anything, did the Struthers Agency have to do with the preparation of that advertisement? I am not speaking about placing it with the media and so on, it is the preparation aspect that I am concerned about?

**MR. TAYLOR:** Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I would be glad to report that to the Member, I will need to check. My present understanding is that it was simply a placement, but I will certainly find out and I don't mind sharing that information with you.

## **STATEMENT**

### **NDP POLITICAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS TELECAST - ORIGIN OF FILM**

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY:** (Premier) Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. C.P. MacDonald) yesterday asked me a number of questions and at the end of one of my answers I told him that I would check and, having done so, I would make a statement in the House. He referred to an NDP political public affairs telecast of March 22, 1975 and he asked about the origin of the film used. I am able to advise that all the film used on the telecast showing me during the summer bus tour was taken in the summer of 1974. It was filmed by Mr. Bob Howard, a freelance cinematographer, under contract arrangements with a Regina advertising agency. Mr. Howard used his own equipment exclusively. He did not travel with me on the bus but he met our party at several locations using transportation arranged with the agency and not with the Government. All cost associated with the film including Mr. Howard's fees and expenses were billed to the agency and, I am advised, paid by the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party. I can assure you they were not paid by the Government of Saskatchewan.

**MR. STEUART:** Can you tell me what agency?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** I can tell you that it was not the Struthers agency.

**MR. STEUART:** Which one of the Gold Dust Twins was it?

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

### **RETURN NO. 61**

**MR. E. F. GARDNER** (Moosomin) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 61 showing:

As of March 1, 1975, the conversion factors that are used by the Land Bank Commission to convert assessed value of land to purchase price.

**HON. J. R. MESSER:** (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, in regard to Return No. 61 I would ask that the Legislature give consideration to and support an amendment:

That all the words after "1975" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

March 25, 1975

the average gross conversion factors that were used by the Land Bank Commission during the past year to convert assessed value of land to purchase price.

My request or reasoning for so amending, Mr. Speaker, is that each parcel of land that is purchased in the Province of Saskatchewan has its own conversion factor. The reason is that the Commission takes into consideration three major evaluations of the land in arriving at a price for any given parcel that is offered for sale.

The first is municipal assessed value and the multiple factor that is used in that region of the province to arrive at what we consider a rule of thumb price for land that is being offered for sale, and I'm sure that the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) knows that there are regions in the Province of Saskatchewan where rough and ready evaluations of land can be established by relating to the municipal assessed value and using the multiple factor for that area. That's one factor that we used in establishing the offer price for a parcel of land.

The second is to evaluate sale prices of land within the immediate area, the immediate areas where land is being offered to the Land Bank Commission. Generally speaking we go back three or four years, record the sales of land within an eight mile radius of the parcel in question, compensate for different soil classifications and cultivated acreage, and arrive at what we think is a realistic offered price in relation to past sales of land in that region for the past three or four years.

The third factor we take into consideration is an actual appraisal by a Land Bank appraiser of the land being offered for sale. The basis of the appraised price relates to the productive capacity of that land and then converts that or relates that to average returns for the commodities that can be grown on that land, not necessarily current sales prices so that we have a more realistic price in relation to the productive capacity of that land.

After arriving at those three factors we then take the average of the three and submit an offer to the potential seller. Now I think the Members opposite will agree that when we do this each and every parcel of land that is purchased in the province stands to have a different average gross conversion factor and the only way we can realistically answer this question is to take the average because we are purchasing some hundreds of parcels of land. It would be most difficult for us to try and I think arrive at the conversion factor for each and every one but we can take the average of the year's purchases and give to the Members opposite, the Member for Moosomin in particular, the average gross conversion factor that is used by the Land Bank and I hope that that will satisfy him and provide him with the information that he is looking for. So for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I move the amendment, seconded by my seatmate, Mr. Snyder.

**MR. GARDNER:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we'll get what we had in mind with the question and perhaps we'll have to accept the answer and as a result submit other questions in this regard. I think the Minister is probably aware of what we had in mind, the fact that the conversion factor has probably been changing quite rapidly as the price of land changes. The assessed value, of course, is certainly the best indication of the value of a parcel

of land and the assessed value by its very nature of course takes to the fact very, very many factors such as soil type and other things that the Minister mentioned. The conversion factor from the assessed value should at any particular time be fairly consistent throughout the province if they're being consistent in the amount of money that they are paying for land. If they are using the assessed value which takes into account the various factors that were mentioned and then applied the conversion factors, we should get a pretty good idea of what they are willing to pay or the kind of offer they're going to make.

Now if he is saying in effect that they're ignoring the assessed value and they're bidding against other people where there may be some other factor besides the assessed value which is largely used to determine the value of the land, then this is what we'd like to know. If basically they are using a conversion factor that is relatively constant for a period of time and I agree, of course, it can change, it was probably something different on August 1 last year than it was on December 1 or on March 1 this year. The factor generally would change but they should be using a relatively consistent factor to multiply by the assessed value to make some kind of offer. If they're not doing that, if they're just going out and saying, well, the neighbors are willing to pay \$50,000 for this regardless of what it's assessed at, we're going to have to bid 52 or we don't get it. This is the type of thing we would like to know and it appears to us that there should be some consistency and to give us an average I hope that we're not getting an average conversion factor that's used over the past year because, of course, this would be meaningless. But if we could get even some type of conversion factor that's used so that we would have some basis of deciding about what the Commission is paying. We realize there are other factors involved but certainly feel that the assessed value times a particular conversion factor should be the major way of determining the value of a parcel of land.

**MR. MESSER:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member would allow another observation for further clarification to him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister cannot close the debate on an amendment. He has spoken.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## RETURN NO. 62

MR. GARDNER moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 62 showing:

- (1) During 1974 whether trips were made to destinations outside of Saskatchewan by employees of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture.
- (2) The destination and the names of employees involved in each case.
- (3) The reason for each trip.
- (4) The expense of each trip.

**MR. MESSER:** Mr. Speaker, this question asks for a considerable amount of information. I have not had the opportunity to discuss the content with officials of my Department as we have a series

March 25, 1975

of regional meetings in the province at this time and both my deputy and associate deputy minister have not been in Regina for all that long a period of time over the last three or four days.

I assume, though, that there would be literally hundreds of trips involved in the 1974 year. I do not know whether it has, in fact, been government practice over the past to designate the names of the employees involved in each case and the reason for each case and in each case the expense of that trip.

I should like, therefore, to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with my officials and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RETURN NO. 63**

MR. GARDNER moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 63 showing:

(1) The price that was paid by the Land Bank Commission for the parcel of land known as the Matador Co-op farm. (2) The number of acres of land that were included in this parcel.

**MR. MESSER:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin is asking for the price paid by the Land Bank Commission for the parcel of land known as the Matador Co-op farm, and the number of acres of land that were included in this parcel.

The Member for Moosomin and his colleagues know that it has not been the practice of the Land Bank Commission to state the money paid for a particular or specific parcels of land until the annual report is tabled. Subsequently that information will be made available to the Members and to all people in Saskatchewan in due course when the annual report is tabled. The Land Bank Commission's annual reports for the last two years have the prices paid for each and every parcel.

I do not in this particular case have any objection to answering the order as it is now worded. I depart from the position or the policy of the Government in this case because it is not an individual who is selling the land and there is no, what I think would appear to be, a relevant way, realistic way of relating to the total price and what the individual retiring members from the Matador Co-op were really paid for their farming operations. But I should like to be allowed the courtesy of first contacting either the members of the Matador Co-op or a spokesman for the Matador Co-op to convey to him that I intend to answer the order as it is now worded, so that I am not asking for time for an amendment of the order but simply to convey to the members of the Matador Co-op that we will be tabling the information so that they do, in fact, have some advance warning.

In order to do that I, therefore, ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 9 - INFLATION

**MR. A. W. ENGEL** (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that full co-operation be given to a national effort to overcome the serious and urgent problem of inflation which is international in scope, and further that such a national effort should include: (a) development of policies and programs to increase food production; (b) establishment of a permanent Prices Review Board with jurisdiction to review all prices and power to set selective price controls; (c) implementation and enforcement of effective controls to curb monopoly power; (d) extension of the two-price system, which presently applies to wheat and oil, to all basic commodities, including iron ore, steel and lumber.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks today I shall move Resolution No. 9 as we have it under Item 3 of the Order Paper here today.

For 30 to 40 per cent of the people in Canada – people earning the minimum wage or a little more, retired people, the unemployed, the number one problem today still is the escalating cost of living. During the 12-month period ending in March, Canada suffered a rate of inflation of approximately 10.4 per cent. For the first time in recent years, our prices rose faster than those in the United States. So we are not only importing inflation - although that is a big part of it - we are also adding to it ourselves here in Canada.

There are no easy answers to inflation and anyone claiming to have a foolproof formula is either naive or dishonest. But certainly one thing to do - and the first thing to do - is to soften the impact of rising prices on those it hurts most.

Mr. Speaker, because of our limited jurisdiction and financial strength, the province should, out of necessity be selective in the types of measures we develop to counter inflation. By this I mean that our efforts should:

1. Focus on groups within the province suffering most from inflation; and
2. Direct efforts at inflationary forces generated within the province.

With respect to No. 1, it is generally recognized that the groups most adversely affected by inflation are the aged, those on fixed incomes, working families on low incomes and disadvantaged groups. Under inflationary circumstances, they have no recourse but to pay the going price on basic essentials. Senior citizens, approximately 100,000 here in Saskatchewan, 98,937 in March 1974, of whom close to 62 per cent are in receipt of full or partial guaranteed income supplements. These people are very highly vulnerable.

With respect to No. 2, it has been estimated that over 50

March 25, 1975

per cent of Saskatchewan's inflation is imported either from the rest of Canada or from abroad. This means that provincial action by itself must focus on less than half of the factors generating inflation within the province.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is not about to tell the Federal Government to take action without first leading the way ourselves. When taking office in 1971 the people that were hurting the most from inflation, those that I mentioned in my opening paragraph - nearly half the people of this province those earning the minimum wage or close to it, those who are retired, the thousands that were unemployed. We had a clear cut plan of action - a blueprint people could follow and keep tab on this Government's progress and we followed the blueprint.

One of the first and most meaningful actions taken by this Government to relieve inflation was the removal of the deterrent fees, the tax on sick. The former administration is sitting opposite in such a small, inconspicuous group because they taxed the sick and oppressed. They added to their already painful situation. I could mention many programs that relieved the pain of inflation since we've taken office; hearing aids at greatly reduced prices, medicare premiums removed, dental care for children was introduced, the provincial share of income tax is going to be lower this year by \$100 per taxpayer, increased home improvement grants from \$70 to a maximum of \$330. These programs Mr. Speaker, were designed to help the people that were hurting badly, hurting badly because of a result of seven Liberal lean years.

Added to this we designed and introduced programs that helped stabilize our rural area in such areas that otherwise would have been in a chaotic mess had the activity been left to chance. I am talking about the transfer of land. The program? The Land Bank. Without this program, Mr. Speaker, the pressure brought to bear on some of our senior citizens and smaller farmers that were on small operations would have led to desperation. Hopes that were built up through years of farming to pass the farm on to their children were dashed to pieces by crushing inflation. Where would their sons or daughters raise funds to purchase land, sell they must. This program of the Land Bank was the answer to that problem.

The high cost of modernizing farms and buildings and building farm shelters, etc. to expand existing operations or to diversify so that sufficient income could be earned to provide an adequate living was out of the question prior to '71. The millions of dollars made available to young people through FarmStart was our answer to that inflationary problem.

When the oil companies raised the price on fuel, the Saskatchewan Government reduced the price of auto gas by seven cents a gallon and are making a rebate of seven cents on farm fuels as well.

Speaking about fuels, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to mention a major program this Government launched to make sure that we have sufficient electrical energy four or five years down the road. We make use of an inexpensive fuel found in large amounts in the southern part of my constituency. The Poplar River project will convert coal to needed electrical energy.

Mr. Speaker, part; (a) of the Resolution urges; the Federal Government to develop policies and programs to increase food production. At the very outset I said that we are not; about to tell the Federal Government to take action without first leading the way.

Mr. Speaker, programs that we have implemented are leading the way. The FarmStart program is the implementation of a policy that does increase food production. In the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, 60 applications have been approved under the FarmStart program. Mr. Speaker, over one and a half million dollars has been made available to these 60 young farmers to strengthen their operation and in some cases, to start new programs and new operations. That will finish more cattle and more hogs right here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, each of these 60 received an average of approximately \$5,000. These 60 farmers were helped to get into a position where they were better equipped to raise more food, for a total amount of \$305,000. In the province, a total of 844 farmers received over \$22.5 million.

To this impressive list, Mr. Speaker, we have to add the Hog Stabilization program, where we kept the hog producers in business. In that same constituency Assiniboia-Gravelbourg 363, producers received a total amount of \$264,000 to aid them in staying in production. In the province, Mr. Speaker, over 14,000 hog production units received slightly over \$14 million during the period from October 1973 to August 1974.

These figures aptly indicate that Saskatchewan has done its part, more than our share of shoring up prices to the producers, and supplying a product at lower prices to the consumer. We can and we will do more. What I am saying is that this Assembly urge the Federal Government to do its share to help those who are hurting by inflation.

Mr. Speaker, may I also take a moment to say what the senior government has done in Ottawa to relieve the pressure on inflation, particularly food costs. In fact it would take less than a moment, one word would suffice, and I'll let you guess what that word is.

What has the Federal Government done to curb inflation? Someone over there in the Opposition said, everything. Well, I'll list what they've done, Mr. Speaker. For example, since 1965, Ottawa has established seven commissions and committees to inquire into the cost of living. In 1965, it commissioned a study through the Economic Council of Canada to examine foreign expenditures with income policy. In 1967, a report on consumer credit and the cost of living by the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons. In 1968, a report of the Royal Commission on Price Spreads of Food Products. The fourth one was set up in 1969, a Prices and Incomes Commission, reported on inflation, unemployment and income policies. In 1971, a Standing Senate Committee on National Finance. In 1973, a special Commons Committee to Investigate Food Prices. In 1973, the famous Food Prices Review Board. They've done a lot of study, Mr. Speaker, but taken no action.

The Food Prices Review Board has been just one more ineffective attempt to deal with inflation. It has been suggested on numerous occasions that, to be effective, the Board must be

March 25, 1975

able to look not only at food prices, but also at the prices of other commodities. It must have the power to demand justification for price increases in certain products and to roll back prices where increases are unjustified.

Saskatchewan has done much to offset the disastrous effects of inflation on those who are least able to bear the burden of rising costs. But in the long run, what is needed is effective action at the federal level to deal with the root causes of inflation and to cure the problem.

Action can be taken by the Federal Government on several fronts. I suggest:

- 1) Effective measures to end corporate profiteering.
- 2) A prices review board with the teeth necessary to investigate price increases and roll them back where necessary.
- (3) An extension of the two-price system to other commodities - one price for exports, one price for domestic sales.
- (4) Extend subsidies on essential food items.
- (5) Take effective action to curb the monopoly power of the corporate giants.
- (6) Impose effective controls and deterrents on the dollars spent on packaging and advertising of basic foodstuffs.

There must be effective action taken immediately on the federal level to curb inflation and Saskatchewan stands ready to co-operate with any federal moves which will effectively curb spiralling costs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch briefly on Section "C" of the Resolution:

That we in Saskatchewan give full co-operation and urge the Federal Government to put some teeth into a program of implementation and enforcement of effective controls to curb monopoly power.

What is a corporate involvement, Mr. Speaker? Wages and salaries as a proportion of the total value of production in Canada have been declining since 1971, corporate profits in 1974 were up on an average of 35 per cent overall over the previous year. The latest available figures compare 1972 to 1973. Maple Leaf Flour Mills, for example, their profits are up 149 per cent. George Weston Ltd., profits up 86 per cent. Canada Packers Ltd., profits up 40 per cent. Corporations are generally quite able to cope with inflation and in many instances, Mr. Speaker, they take advantage of it. They are able to pass on their increased costs to the consumers by charging higher prices. There is a large degree of concentration and vertical integration in industries which supply the essentials of life. The market is effectively dominated by a few very large corporations, the most notable are those which are foreign controlled. Such is the state of oligopoly in the retail food market in Saskatchewan. The three major chains of Safeway, Loblaws and the Economy group and Dominion account for three-quarters of the grocery sales. The big reason for this is fancy packaging and extensive advertising added to the costs of products as well.

What impact does inflation have on the purchasing power,

Mr. Speaker? Since high rates of price change are likely to persist, the need to protect the real living standards of particular groups continues. The consumer price index is inadequate to the extent that it does not accurately reflect the impact of price increases on the real living standards of various income groups. Instead it provides a measure of average impact. There are distinct differences in the incidence of price inflation confronting different income classes. Lower income families spend relatively more of their incomes on food. Price indexing based on income levels reveals that lower income families suffer a greater loss of general purchasing power and this loss continues to grow. Large increases in the prices of basic necessities have created serious difficulties for most Canadians. The burden has fallen most heavily on those on low and fixed incomes, the unemployed, those earning the minimum wage and the senior citizens. These people compose, as I said before, over 40 per cent of our population and almost 60 per cent here in Saskatchewan. They are traditionally unable to cope with the effects of inflation. They are unable to pass along cost increases in goods and services since they are at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to outline some of the reasons why we should urge the Federal Government to act and act now. I am sure that Members from both sides of this House will support this Resolution. I so move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. G. LANE:** (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, another death bed repentance by a backbencher of the New Democratic Party. The Member opposite is somewhat hypocritical when he talks about a food price review board or prices review board, when he talks about selective 81 price controls and what the party opposite is doing or what should be done about inflation.

It is interesting to note that prior to the election in 1971, the party opposite promised a prices review board for the Province of Saskatchewan because of the high cost of farm machinery. They failed to do anything about it. As soon as they got in power they chickened out and backed off.

It is interesting to note that the party opposite is all in favor of marketing boards, compulsory and government controlled, which are opposed by any responsible Department of Consumer Affairs and which are opposed by the Consumer Association of Canada.

It is interesting to note that the Member opposite calls for select price control. That policy was an abject failure in the United States under President Nixon. Here is the party urging Nixonian economic policies which is probably one of the sorriest days in the history of this Legislature. Everything the Hon. Member has proposed has been proved either a failure or as an attempt to whitewash the abject failure of the Government opposite to do anything within its own jurisdiction to curb high prices and to curb the high cost of food and the rising inflation.

It is interesting to note, the Government opposite has an opportunity to control the prices of Olympic meats, but I haven't heard the Members opposite or the Minister of Consumer Affairs take any action to ensure the people of Saskatchewan that they

March 25, 1975

are getting their 45 per cent, their \$11 million worth by having cheaper Olympic meats in the Province of Saskatchewan under the partially state controlled packing plant. Obviously your actions are completely at variance with your proposals. You've got no credibility in this field, you are not to be believed and the people of Saskatchewan know that your policies add to inflation, create inflation, and create inflationary pressures and do not solve the basic problems of inflation.

The Economic Council of Canada in its tenth annual report makes it quite clear that the main reason for inflation in Canada is the high cost of government spending and that the biggest offenders, the ones that are causing the biggest problems in the high cost of government inflation are provincial governments, not the Federal Government. Here is the Government opposite that has doubled government spending in four years, over doubled. You don't think that is inflationary? Certainly it's inflationary and each and every one of you know it. Each and everyone of you know it and every province in Canada is doing the same thing whether it's NDP, Liberal' Tory or anything else. As a matter of fact possibly the worst government in Canada is the Conservative Government in Ontario which is running a deficit of close to \$1 billion. It is obviously inflationary. Your whole approach is inflationary. The Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs stands up in this House and says, oh, we made a great effort - I think it was binder twine or baler twine.

The Opposition urged the Minister of Consumer Affairs to set up a government inventory of basic farm products and the Government opposite refused to do it. We could very easily have had an inventory in the Province of Saskatchewan of what farm supplies are available. It would have been very easy to do. The cost would have been minimal, the results would have been excellent.

We had the talk of antifreeze and I think that was the particular commodity or product that the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs referred to. He made a speech on it and he talked a little. While they were crying for antifreeze in Swift Current and prices were jacked up because there was a shortage, in Shaunavon there was a surplus, and there was a stockpile in warehouses and there were pockets around this province where they were oversupplied with farm commodities. And yet the Minister irresponsible for Consumer Affairs did nothing about it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution is phoney, it's stupid, it's cheap and it is demeaning to the Member who was forced to mouth the words of John Burton, because everything urged in the Resolution has been proved unworkable. It has been proved it creates hardships, creates problems, is disruptive of the market, especially the Nixonian approach to selective Price controls. Obviously the Opposition has much more to say on this what, I think, is an absolutely ludicrous proposal of the Member opposite and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 12 - BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITALS**

MR. D. F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North) moved, seconded by Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to repeal its authority under Section 29 of the Hospital Standards Act to dismiss the Board of Governors of Saskatchewan hospitals by decision of the Executive Council.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before moving the Resolution I just want to say a few words Members of this House will remember that an Act was passed in 1972 by Mr. Blakeney's Government to amend the Hospital Standards Act.

Section 29 is the portion of that Act that in my mind is an abuse of power by the NDP Government. I think that it should be removed from the statutes. It reads:

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may at any time appoint a person as a public administrator to manage the affairs of a Board of Governors that owns or operates a hospital.

There are certain criteria listed as reasons for the Cabinet to depose a Board of Governors but Section 29 (1) (e) says:

The Minister may appoint an administrator if he feels it is in the public interest.

In other words the Minister can throw out a Board of Governors for any reason that satisfies himself. This is an abuse of power. It is an abuse of power if that provision is exercised but it is also an abuse of power even if it is never exercised. The provisions of Section 29 hang over the heads of every Board of Governors in Saskatchewan hospitals. They know that at any time if the Minister of Health does not agree with the Board of Governors then that same Minister of Health may simply remove the Board and replace the Board with a person of his own choosing. This is an insidious threat hanging over the Boards of Saskatchewan Hospitals. This is a threat that must be removed from the Saskatchewan Statute Books.

If we read Section 29 we find out what powers are given to that administrator whom the Minister can appoint:

(1) The Minister is given the exclusive right to exercise all the powers of a duly constituted Board of Governors.

(2) The administrator is given. . .

And I will quote Section 29 (2) (b):

. . . the exclusive control of the property, assets and revenues of the Board of Governors as they relate to the hospital described in clause (a) and the disposition of them.

The administrator is even given the right to dispose of the property and assets of the hospital. We must remember who owns these hospitals. It is recognized in Section 29 that the hospital is owned by the Board of Governors. The hospital is not owned by the Provincial Government, hospitals are community owned. Hospitals are run by a Board of Governors elected in the community. The Board of Governors represents a level of local government. Section 29 represents a direct attack on local government and local control. Section 29 is a typical example of the erosion of local government control that has taken place under the Blakeney Government.

March 25, 1975

This Resolution asking for the repeal of Section 29 is a typical example of how the Liberal Party believes in strengthening and assuring local control. I have no argument with a provision in the Act that would allow for appointment of an administrator where possibly a Board of Governors had resigned or for some hypothetical reasons had somehow disappeared. However, if this provision were in the Act there must also be a provision which identified the length of time such a person could be appointed for. There must also be provisions which clearly set out the timing and the method for the local community to choose a new Board of Governors to take over the management to regain the management of their own hospital. As I have stated the act of usurping local control must only be taken under extreme conditions and even then the return to local control must be assured in the legislation. This Resolution represents the Liberal philosophy of assuring and strengthening local control. We believe local government to be an extremely important and vital level of government.

Mr. Speaker, I now move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A. E. SMISHEK:** (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, I wished that the Hon. Member when he spoke to the Resolution had quoted the full section of the Act, instead of quoting only part of it and thus leaving a completely false impression with this House. I am sure that he wasn't really played for our ears in the House but for the Press by using words like "insidious threats", "attack on the local government" and so on.

Mr. Speaker, for the record let's read the whole section so that everybody is informed as to what is in this particular section of the Act. Section 29 states:

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may at any time appoint a person as a public administrator to manage the affairs of the Board of Governors that owns or operates or is constructing or planning a construction of a hospital if the Minister is of the opinion that (a) the continuing provision of care to patients in the hospital is for any reason being threatened; (b) members of the Board of Governors have resigned and they are not being immediately replaced; (c) the safety of patients in the hospital is being jeopardized by reason of a serious failure to comply with reasonable standards of care; (d) the Board has been failing to assume responsibility for the provision of hospital facilities or services; or (e) under the particular circumstances of the case it is in the public interest that a public administrator be appointed to manage the affairs of the Board of Governors.

Mr. Speaker, it is true the provision is fairly wide, but this Section is also set out for very deliberate reasons. For the Hon. Member to suggest that this particular Section has some kind of sinister motivation for the Provincial Government to take over the control of local hospitals, is just not true. Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the record.

Section 29 was added to the Hospital Standards Act in 1972.

It was simply to protect the patient in the hospital when a board fails to carry out its managerial responsibility. I indicated in April of 1972 when speaking on second reading of this I amendment that I hoped that this provision would never have to be used by me or any other Health Minister. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that in the three years that this provision has been in the Act it was not necessary to use that provision and I am glad that is the case. However, it is also important that the Government has the proper authority to deal with serious situations which may develop in certain hospitals. As stated in the amendment, and which I have now spelled out, there are four situations where the well-being of patients may be affected and in their best interests it may be necessary for an objective third party to intervene. These situations are where the board has threatened to abdicate its responsibility by resigning or withdrawing support of the hospital services; where a board experiences extreme difficulties in the internal management of the hospital; where a board is not able adequately to control the activities of the medical staff, or where the board is mismanaging the responsibility for medical staff supervision; and fourthly, where a board is suddenly faced with major theft and disappearance of the administrator.

Fortunately, none of these situations have arisen in the past few years. As I said earlier, I hope that the situation will never arise where the Minister will have to use this particular Section. However, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Members of the House that all of these situations have arisen on several occasions in the past 20 years or more. It is only through the power and expert intervention of the Department of Health and through their staff that patient care was not jeopardized. This type of protective legislation for the consumer and taxpayer is really not an exclusive prerogative of the Department of Health or the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention and the attention of the Members of the Legislature to Chapter 39 of the Urban Municipality Act. Let me quote where in that particular Act the provision states that in case of towns and villages the Minister may at any time, "Appoint some person or persons to act in the place or instead of the council, clerk, treasurer and assessor or such one or more of them in whose stead he is appointed." In the Urban Municipalities Act that same kind of power exists for the protection of towns and villages.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention that it was the former administration that brought in the overall revision of this particular Act and they found it necessary and advisable to put in that kind of a provision in that Act. Let me also point out under The Rural Municipalities Act, Section 34 contains the following provision and let me read it:

1. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may at any time appoint some person to act as a reeve or councillor for one or more of the divisions of a municipality or may appoint some person or persons to act as Reeves and councillors for a division of municipalities.
2. Every person so appointed shall have the powers and authority conferred by this Act upon the elected members of the Council and shall be remunerated out of the funds of the municipalities or otherwise the Lieutenant-Governor in-Council may determine.

March 25, 1975

A further law, Mr. Speaker, giving similar authority is contained in the Local Government Board Act. Section 9 of that Act says

1. The Local Board may recommend the removal from office of the council, board of trustees, or board of directors of the local authority to which this Act has been made to apply and appoint an administrator for the local authority and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make an order accordingly and may fix the salaries of the persons.

2. An administrator appointed under subsection (1) shall have all the powers and may perform all the duties of the local authority and all or any of the officials thereof, and shall be responsible for the performance to the Board whose orders and directions shall be carried out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is contained in this Act, The Hospital Standards Act is not unique. Similar legislation is contained in at least three municipal statutes that because of resignations or because of the failure of local government to assume the responsibility, the Minister does have the power to appoint administrators or councillors to act on their behalf in the interest of the local government and so that local government can carry on, and the public and the citizens are protected.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out that the provision in this particular Act, The Hospital Standards Act is not unique to Saskatchewan. Other provinces have also recognized the need to ensure that the provision of adequate levels of hospital services and care. British Columbia and Ontario and other provinces have similar legislation. I should also emphasize that before this legislation was proceeded with in 1972, I consulted both the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons and both these organizations agreed that a formal method should exist for handling the types of problems that I have just described. They are in general agreement and indicated support for this particular provision in the Act. Thus, I wonder if the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. D. F. MacDonald) really understands the full ramifications and implications of his Resolution to repeal this authority when the people most closely concerned with the patient here agree that that kind of authority is necessary.

I noticed, Mr. Speaker, in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, a Mrs. Evelyn Edwards who happens to be the Liberal candidate for Saskatoon Sutherland and as it happens she is also the president of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association this year. Speaking in Moose Jaw, I don't know precisely when, but she is quoted in the Star-Phoenix saying this:

Under the proposed Hospital Bill . . .

I don't know what proposed Hospital Bill she is talking about.

. . . the Minister of Health can take over a hospital on his own opinion. He can dismiss the Hospital Board and he can be accountable to nobody. This is an example of the Government trying to take away local autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, no such legislation is being proposed this year. I don't know what Mrs. Evelyn Edwards is talking about. If she is talking about the Bill in 1972, then that's fine, but I also

want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. E. Edwards was on the executive of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association back in 1972.

**MR. ROMANOW:** She is playing politics with her position.

**MR. SMISHEK:** That's right. She is trying to misuse the Hospital Association and trying to throw that organization into the political arena, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Edwards was one of the regional directors on the Hospital Association at that time. There was also the past president of the Hospital Association, Justice Hughes; the president was Mr. Haggerty, the first vice president was Mr. Joe Young, the second vice president was Owens and other members of the executive. The interesting thing is the people whom I discussed this Bill with in 1972 supported the proposition, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether she attended that particular meeting but she certainly was on the executive of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. So Mrs. Edwards and the Liberal Party are really trying to play politics with the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Members that since 1958 at least 13 situations have arisen where the Department of Health and the Hospital Services Plan was invited to assist the local hospitals because there were threats of resignations and numerous cases have arisen in which it would appear that it was necessary to have the Department help in one form or another. I am glad to say that the boards have not resigned and it was not found necessary in those situations to appoint an administrator. I can also advise the House that at least on three separate occasions since 1972, on two occasions the Hospital Board because of particular problems that they had did talk to our people in the Hospital Services Plan that they were going to be resigning because they couldn't possibly carry on and manage the affairs because of differences in the community, because of differences with the medical staff; however, we were able to persuade them to carry on and as I said it wasn't necessary to use the authority.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to assure the Members of the House once again that this Section of the Hospital Standards Act is not intended to provide the Government with a means of taking over hospital management under normal circumstances. However, where a hospital finds itself in serious difficulty that it cannot be resolved at the local level, this Section allows the Government to appoint a public administrator to ensure that the patients receive adequate care until such time as the local authority is once again in a position to assume that responsibility for continuation of the hospital services and for the appointment of competent management.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is nothing but a mischievous act on the part of the Opposition who are trying to mislead the public that here is a Government trying to grab onto itself authority to undermine local government. Mr. Speaker, that is just not the case and I would suggest that the Legislature defeat this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

March 25, 1975

**MR. D. G. STEUART:** (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, talk about somebody trying to mislead. I should just like to analyse some of the statements that the Minister of Health just made.

To begin with we are quite aware that the Hospital Association and the medical profession have wanted and were quite prepared to support some move, as the Minister said, to enable government or someone of authority to move in, if the hospital administrator resigns or if a board resigns or if a hospital board is not fulfilling its proper duties and the quality of health care is being threatened or the patients of that hospital are being left unattended. We are quite aware of that, but what they didn't ask for was the power given to the Minister where "in his opinion" - this is what we object to. If the Minister sees - and this is typical of the NDP - one little wrong that needs correcting or some weakness, of course, there must be authority for someone to move into the hospital board and take over their responsibility if the administrator of a hospital board is doing something obviously that he shouldn't be doing or if the patients are in danger.

But, what this Act gives is "in the Minister's opinion." It doesn't have to be a fact. In fact, one of the most ludicrous things in it is that if in the Minister's opinion the board has resigned and will not be replaced - well, if the board has resigned it doesn't call on the Minister's opinion. They have either resigned or they haven't resigned. And then it is up to him to decide if in his opinion the various local governments responsible for reinstating or nominating new members to the board are not prepared to do it, he doesn't have to wait for that, he may just say, in my opinion that board has resigned and they may not have - but in his opinion he says he thinks they have and they are going to be replaced or in his opinion that administrator is not doing what he thinks he should do, so he will move in and put in an administrator.

That is a totally different thing than the Hospital Association asked for or the medical profession asked for. And what he has done is a threat to local government and it hangs over the local government's head. They may have seen it, but like every other group that has ever negotiated, whether it is the nurses, the pharmacists or the doctors or the Hospital Association, with the present Minister of Health, they know that it is absolutely totally pointless to negotiate with him or try to get him to see any common sense.

We know the real reason this was done. The real reason that this was done was that if in the Minister's opinion some doctors were not given privileges or community health clinics were not being treated as he thought they should be treated, then the Minister would have the right to walk in and remove that hospital board, literally, and take over that operation of that hospital.

Let me point out very clearly that this is exactly the situation that we had in this province when I became Minister of Health. It is a situation that the old CCF reacted to by passing amendments to The Hospital Standards Act at that time giving themselves total and unlimited power over the administration of local hospitals.

When we became the Government we took those restrictive

laws off the book and renegotiated between the doctors and the hospital boards; we got every situation that we inherited, every mess that we inherited from the former CCF Government settled. We got the doctors in the hospitals in Regina throughout all this province, we settled every one of those disputes and we didn't do it by hanging over their heads the kinds of acts, the kind of power the Minister took unto himself in this Act.

So don't try to pretend to anyone that this is the kind of an amendment that the hospital association wants or that the doctors want. It is not! It is far more power than ever anticipated you would take, however, once you took it they have learned by hard bitter experience that there is totally and absolutely no use in trying to negotiate in an acceptable decent manner with the present Minister of Health.

Let me say something further that he quotes from the other Act and he says that the local government board is given rights and they are. That is a far different cry from the Minister being given that kind of right in his opinion. Don't try to tell this House that the Minister of Municipal Affairs can remove a reeve, or a mayor, or a city commissioner or the secretary of a rural municipality if in his opinion they are doing something wrong. He has no such power. Local governments of the RMs or the Urban Municipal Association or people involved in that level of local government would never stand for that. And, so again, he is trying to mislead this House and the people of this province when he tries to compare the powers that he has taken under The Hospital Standards Act with the powers that have been rightfully given to the local government board, which is a totally independent body. It is a far different thing than a political appointment such as the Minister of Health, any Minister of Health, under any government.

So, Mr. Speaker, they again try to throw up a smokescreen and mislead the public. This portion of the Bill stands exactly for what it is - another grab by the NDP Government of more power over somebody in this province. In this case, the hospital board. I agree with the Member for Moose Jaw that the Government should consider this amendment to show if they truly have any regard for the independence and autonomy of our hospital boards, to show it by amending this Act and bringing in an amendment that will do what the hospital boards want; to do what the medical profession wants to do what the hospital association wants; to do what any sane-minded sensible person would want, and that is to make it possible to replace an administrator if he is doing the wrong thing; make it possible if a hospital is left without a hospital board, very clearly, and after consultation with some groups that this board would be replaced. But not hand that kind of power to the Minister. It doesn't even have to be a fact, it just has to be "in his opinion".

So I support the Resolution and I totally oppose and point out that what the Minister said is wrong. He is not talking facts. He was waving around Mrs. Edwards and it was very interesting when he said he didn't know where she was speaking; I don't know what amendment she was talking about. Well, I will tell you what she was talking about. She was speaking at Moose Jaw at the nomination of the Member who will defeat the Minister of Labour in Moose Jaw South, she was speaking probably about an amendment that we will bring in when we become the Government and Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Smishek are back doing whatever they did before they became the Government. That is what she was talking about.

March 25, 1975

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. H. H. ROLFES:** (Saskatoon Nutana South) Mr. Speaker, I always find it rather humorous when the Leader of the Opposition talks about human rights, freedom, abuse, government takeover, morality, or when he talks about negotiations. He doesn't know what negotiations are, because he didn't allow it when he was in the Government. Bill 2 simply wouldn't allow it. They simply said either you accept or boys you can get out. And we know what happened to many of our young people, Mr. Speaker. Many of our young people left this province, they went to other provinces where they could have some freedom; where they could legitimately negotiate. I find that the Leader of the Opposition when he doesn't have a point to make or very little argument on his side, he gets rather loud and he points that little finger.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment that we have before us was a good amendment. There is nothing insidious or mischievous about this amendment that the Opposition is trying to convey to the public. Every time we try to make some amendments conserving local autonomy and with which local people agree, the Members opposite try to misinform the public. They try to say, well here is a government that wants to grab power.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather annoyed when I read the Leader—Post today to see that the president of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association is abusing her power as president of the Hospital Association, in her capacity as a candidate who is seeking election. She is using the Saskatchewan Hospital Association to further her own personal ambitions. I think that Mrs. E. Edwards simply can't wear two hats and can't afford to make the Hospital Association a political association. Mrs. Edwards should either declare herself as a Liberal candidate and put forward her position as such or else I think Mrs. Edwards has to resign as president of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** She can't do both and hope to be credible in the eyes of the people of this province. This Association is a non-political association and it should remain as such.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROLFES:** Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that Mrs. Edwards would use her position as president of the Association to further her own political ambitions which are not, in my opinion, in the best interests of the Hospital Association nor of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have further words to say on this motion and I beg leave to adjourn the debate

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 13 - REVISION OF THE ACT TO REGULATE THE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF AGRICULTURAL LAND IN SASKATCHEWAN**

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to revise the Act to Regulate the Ownership and Control of Agricultural Land in Saskatchewan, by removing the restrictions on Canadians owning Saskatchewan farm land and by considering the inclusion of the ownership of recreational land within the scope of this legislation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I move this Resolution I should like to make a few remarks about it.

The Resolution calls for the Government to change its legislation in regard to The Act to Regulate the Ownership and Control of Agricultural Land in Saskatchewan. We have had a long debate and we have had studies on the whole question of ownership by foreigners of agricultural land in the Province of Saskatchewan. The NDP Government brought in a very, very repressive Bill, the first Bill that they brought in, which made all Canadians foreigners. The only people who could own farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan were people who lived here, if they farmed here and they decided they wanted to retire to British Columbia or anywhere else they had to get rid of their land within the year or the government would move in and take it over. There was a great outcry as that first Bill said that if somebody willed his farm to his son or daughter and he happened to live in a province other than Saskatchewan, even though he was Canadian and might want to come back in three, four or five years he couldn't do it as he had one year to get rid of the land. There was such an outcry against that very, very repressive piece of legislation that the Government withdrew it. They then held some hearings and they found out that the people of this province did have a legitimate fear about bona fide foreigners owning farm land.

At that time we called upon the Government to do a study and see how much in fact was owned by foreigners. They didn't. However, the fear was there and I think that that part of the Act which restricts the ownership of farm land in Saskatchewan to Canadians has been well received by Saskatchewan people by and large.

However, the Government went further than that. They, again made, in effect, foreigners out of Canadians. They, again, in effect drew a line or built a wall around Saskatchewan. They, again, brought in a Bill that is wrong as far as Canadians are concerned. Because in the present Bill anyone residing outside of a line or a perimeter 20 miles around the Province of Saskatchewan, is very limited as to how much farm land he can own. Now this means that Canadians are not free to go from one end of Canada to the other and own land. I object to this and Members on this side of the House object to this and I think most Saskatchewan people object to this, because if all provinces retaliate and act the same way we are then, I think, on the road to developing ten sort of Balkan States. We then would have it that a Canadian could do certain things if he happens to live in British Columbia and he can't do it in Alberta and he can't do

March 25, 1975

it anywhere else. If he happens to live in Saskatchewan and wants to go out and buy a home to retire in British Columbia, if British Columbia retaliated and took the same stand that the present NDP Government has taken, we would find that he couldn't do that.

I think that this is a very, very bad move. It is even worse when you consider that if someone happens to live 15 or 16 miles down in Montana or in North Dakota, he has more privileges to own farm land in Saskatchewan than someone who happens to live 21 or 22 miles over in Alberta or in Manitoba. It means that . . .

**MR. MESSER:** . . . talk to the Federal Government.

**MR. STEUART:** Oh, you don't have to talk to the Federal Government. I am aware of the point that was raised by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Premier who said that the Federal Government has an enactment which says that we must treat all people the same; that if we draw a line around Saskatchewan we must treat the Canadians and Americans equally. I don't agree with that law if in fact it does exist and I want to point out that it was the NDP themselves who created this situation.

What we say in this Resolution, and I think it reflects the majority of thinking of the people of Saskatchewan and the Canadian people, is change your Act and make it very clear that we, in Saskatchewan, will not prohibit any Canadians from owning land in Saskatchewan, nor do we want other provinces to prohibit us from owning land in any other part of Canada. If we are to be one nation, surely then we should be free to go from one end of this vast and great land to the other and have the same privileges, rights, whether we live in Toronto, whether we move to Vancouver or live in Regina or Saskatoon.

We are saying, amend the Act, make it clear that bona fide foreigners, real foreigners, people who are not Canadians cannot own farm land or are restricted to owning very little farm land. In other words, keep our farm land which is one of our very great resources for Canadians, for Saskatchewan people. Fine, but don't build this Berlin Wall, this wall around Saskatchewan as you continue to do in this Act and other Acts and try to set one Canadian against another. If you do make that amendment then you don't have any problem, if a Federal act does exist that says that we have to treat all people who live around us, whether they are Americans or Canadians who live in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan or Montana the same way, I don't agree with it. But if you amend this Act, as we suggest, you won't have any concern for that.

There is another point that I wish to raise and it is raised in this Resolution. I think that we should look beyond agricultural land. I think we should look at recreational land. While it is true that most recreational land in the Province of Saskatchewan, or land that is considered recreational, is owned by the Crown, owned by the Government and so they therefore have total control and they do sell very little of it to anyone, and I by and large agree with this policy. However, there is some land that can be considered recreational that is now in private hands and I think we should take a look at whether we should

restrict the ownership of that land to Canadians. We have found in other provinces, by and large the West Coast and some provinces of the Atlantic Seaboard are now facing a very serious problem with outsiders, with real foreigners, Americans or people from other lands moving in and buying up what is very obviously recreational land and then prohibiting its use by everyone, including Canadians. I don't agree with this and I think that we should go further, we should take a look at recreational land. In fact, although it doesn't say it in the Resolution, we should take a look at industrial land and take a look at land normally used for the construction of dwellings.

We had a situation in Regina, for example, where a great deal of the land around this city may still be, but at one time was in fact controlled by someone who lived in New York. I don't think that is reasonable and I don't think that should happen. If that is still the case in point, I think it has been changed, I think it has been bought by Canadians, but I don't think that should be allowed to happen.

What we are suggesting in this Resolution is to change this Act so that Canadians clearly can go from one end of this nation to the other, with the right to do business and to own land. Because if we don't and other provinces retaliate against us we shall be the loser and all of Canada will be the loser. At the same time, recognize the stupidity of the situation that now treats, in effect, Canadians worse than some people who live in North Dakota and Montana and denies the right, I think, of basic Canadianism to people who happen to live outside of our boundaries. In fact, you can get people like Tommy Douglas, John Diefenbaker and a host of other people who contributed greatly to the Province of Saskatchewan, but who don't happen to reside now in the Province of Saskatchewan, who happen to reside in British Columbia or Ottawa. Under the Act passed by the NDP they do not have the right, they are very restricted in their right to own farm land and yet an American living 15 or 16 or 19 and a half miles in Montana has more rights in this province than Tommy Douglas for example, or John Diefenbaker. I think this situation is, as I say, ludicrous and I think it should be changed.

At the same time I think a study should be done about the ownership of recreational land and I would also include industrial land and residential land.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK:** (Minister of Tourism & Renewable Resources) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to participate in the debate on this Resolution I view it as somewhat unfortunate that this Assembly has to spend the time again debating an issue which has, in the past, received extensive and thorough debate and consideration. However, due to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to revive the matter I am pleased to have the opportunity to present some thoughts on this issue.

When this Government, Mr. Speaker, brought forward its first White Paper on land ownership the Leader of the Opposition was one of the first people on his feet to offer unconditional condemnation, screeching to high heaven that it wasn't a White Paper, that indeed it was legislation. Of course, we all knew

March 25, 1975

he was wrong, proved beyond any shadow of doubt when we introduced the Act to regulate the Ownership and Control of Agricultural Land in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

I can still vividly recall his arguments at the time and I want to tell this Assembly that his arguments are just as invalid today as they were then.

Members to your left failed miserably to win the support for their case, as it was very evident, and rather than approaching this important issue with objectivity and, I say, honesty, they chose rather to play politics, and, Mr. Speaker, they lost.

By placing their Resolution on the Order Paper the Leader of the Opposition is saying to the people of Saskatchewan that he does not believe the control of Saskatchewan farm land should be placed in the hands of Saskatchewan residents. By opposing the policy, our policy, he says he is against keeping that control in the hands of those people whose chief occupation is farming. Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary to examine the motives of the Leader of the Opposition as he makes a pitch to remove the restriction to allow all Canadians the right to own agricultural land, any amount of land, Mr. Speaker, beyond that already allowed by the Act, \$15,000 of assessment, Mr. Speaker. In the park land region now one could very well buy eight or ten quarters of land for that amount, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition says even that restriction should be removed.

I want him to come out and say that on the platform in the Melville constituency for all my four quarter farm friends to hear, Mr. Speaker. I'd like him to come to tell them that he's in favor of the Toronto harbor man to be allowed to buy land beyond the figure that is allowed, including his friend probably, Steve Roman and a number of others.

Last year when this Legislature debated this legislation there was a great cry from the Opposition that we were anti-Canadian, Mr. Speaker, that we were helping to destroy the very freedoms upon which Confederation was built, that we were balkanizing the country. Mr. Speaker, I dismiss these absurdities outright. By attempting to create a bogey man the Leader of the Opposition tries and tries at every opportunity to becloud the issue with, I say, cheap political charges mingled with innuendo and outright deception.

When this Government, Mr. Speaker, showed initiative by addressing itself to this fundamentally important question, we were criticized and condemned by the Liberal Opposition because they felt it was not necessary. They said there wasn't any problem so we shouldn't do anything. Land ownership of any kind, it was just pooh, poohed we shouldn't have any controls. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the point of the whole matter. While studies similar to those conducted by professor Jake Brown indicated the problem was not serious on the provincial scale, there were problems in certain parts of Saskatchewan and a number of communities were feeling the impact of this situation.

We do not agree with those who feel that action is only necessary after a problem has grown to such a proportion, Mr. Speaker, that it threatens to have a dramatic effect on the entire province. Yes, I was one who was strong on this point, that you don't apply remedies when it's too late, that you don't

call the fire brigade when the house is in ashes. We choose rather, Mr. Speaker, to offer safeguards now to ensure that Saskatchewan agriculture is protected from those elements which might in the future present themselves to the detriment of the important way of life that we have.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to ignore isolated problems by arguing that on a provincial basis the problem is minimal and no action is needed. To use that logic when talking with people from Weyburn and Estevan and Torquay where the problem is real, is like trying to console a soldier's widow by saying there was only a one per cent casualty rate in the action which killed her husband.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says, we should drop the Canadian restriction. What he really is saying, that while he doesn't feel a wealthy land baron from Minneapolis should be allowed to own huge tracts of land in Saskatchewan, it is okay for a wealthy land baron from Toronto to come in and take over thousands of acres of land.

Like I remember, Mr. Speaker, the wealthy Torontonians who appeared before the Saskatoon hearings on the foreign land ownership and control hearings that we held, who presented a brief saying that he wanted to come to Saskatchewan, purchase about ten to twelve sections of land and do some hobby farming weekends, by flying in from Toronto in his own private plane. Mr. Steuart says that's the kind of people that we should have in the farming business.

Mr. Speaker, that is his position and I certainly challenge that logic. It doesn't make any sense, nor is it desirable, Mr. Speaker, I say, to base legislation on citizenship rather than on residency. A land baron, in my opinion, whether he comes from Toronto is going to cause as much of a problem as a land baron from Minneapolis. It is as simple as that, Mr. Speaker.

However, there are two other fundamentally sound reasons for basing this legislation which was based on residency rather than citizenship and in my opinion, residency is of extreme importance. People who make up and are part of a community are the ones who should be considered.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, it is an absentee ownership problem as much as it is a foreign ownership problem and the power to legislate based on citizenship is open to question and until such time, Mr. Speaker, as the Prince Edward Island test case is resolved we will not know how the interpretation is made.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition likes to leave the impression that this Government is the only government preoccupied with this question. He likes to tell the public that this New Democratic Government has some devious motive in bringing forward this legislation. What he doesn't say and what he doesn't tell the people of Saskatchewan is that every other province in Canada either has legislation on the books or are in the process of studying this very same land ownership question, with the view of offering the people of their provinces some protection against these outside threats.

Granted, some provinces, including the Maritimes and British Columbia, have geared their legislation more towards recreational land. However, the overall question remains

March 25, 1975

consistent, recreational land or agricultural land, it is all the same and the attitudes of the other provincial governments is consistent with ours.

Yet the Leader of the Opposition disagrees with our initiative. He says the legislation is not necessary and that there is no degree of public support for this legislation. I say, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn't been listening. I say the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, farmers as well as business people know that a four or a six quarter section farmer is far more preferable to an eight or ten section farmer, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition and other Members of the Opposition where have they been for the past few years. Where were they when our inter-sessional committee held public hearings across the province and at every one the message came through loud and clear, that there was indeed general concern.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that this whole issue has been generated by the NFU and the NDP. Well, I know the Member for Prince Albert West has no great admiration for the Farmers' Union, however, why doesn't he then check with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the other major farm organizations which recognize the need for action and support our initiative. Or why doesn't he take the time to get a copy of that brief which Unifarm in Alberta presented to their Cabinet requesting government action to protect Alberta agriculture against the influences of these same problems.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and to the people of Saskatchewan that the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan are not interested in honestly analyzing the facts but rather they choose to pursue a position which does absolutely nothing to contribute favorably to the solutions which are needed to deal successfully with this entire matter.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to create a bogey man. They are attempting to paint a picture that somehow this Government is anti-Canadian, that we have an unquenchable thirst and lust for power to control all the lands in the province. But we know and the people know that the Liberals are purposely distorting the intent of the legislation that was passed and attempting to impune our motives.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at their Land Bank propaganda to know that the Opposition in this Legislature is interested only in misrepresentation and scare tactics. They say the Land Bank is socialism and a Liberal government would immediately destroy this program if they were elected.

When they say the Land Bank owns 250,000 acres of land, that is perhaps true. Yet they say we are out to socialize all the land, plain unadulterated hog-wash, Mr. Speaker.

As my colleague, the Attorney General so ably pointed out the other day, Sir, even if we continued to purchase all that land at current rates from those wishing to participate in the Land Bank program, it would literally take hundreds of years to do so.

Also, as my colleague stated so well. it is only the devious minds of the Liberal Party which can impune motives and level such a ludicrous charge. But there is another insidious aspect

of this Liberal approach as well and to which I want to refer briefly. Mr. Speaker, this is to an ad about the Land Bank, an advertisement which they have peddled around this province and which is filled, with what I think, is vicious and disgraceful untruths. I often wonder where they got the huge sums of money to finance such a campaign months before an election. Mr. Speaker, this ad contains a number of falsehoods. I object particularly to one aspect of this advertisement and that advertisement which is headed, "Remember why our Grandparents came to Saskatchewan". Here is that famous page, the famous ad. I refer to that high priced Liberal ad that you see here before you, that is being run in many papers, usually on the back page. I saw it in the Western Producer. I will leave out everything except a one main sentence which says:

Many of our grandparents came from countries where the state owned the land. This was so distasteful that they travelled thousands of miles into a strange and sometimes hostile land.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that if there ever was an attempt at outright deceit and deliberate untruth, that was it. That part of that statement, particularly which says, "where the state owned land". Of all the European people, Mr. Speaker, including Great Britain, those that settled and are here today in Canada, I would say 98 per cent of those left Europe, they left Europe due to free, unbridled, vicious, corrupt, private enterprise, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** And not to any state control. Why did our forefathers come to Saskatchewan and western Canada, Mr. Speaker? They came because there was no future for themselves or their children in most of the European countries. They came, not because they wanted lots of land, but they wanted a nook in which to raise their families, to speak in freedom . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** They had Liberals there too.

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** Yes, they came from all political philosophies you can think of. To speak in freedom, to have the choice of what was being offered in Canada, but, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether it was from Russia, Poland or France, or wherever they left, they left these countries not because of the fact that the state had control of the land. They left their native lands because of the private sector. As I said before, the corrupt, unbridled, paternalistic, free-enterprise system, the greedy, vicious, feudal-private sector, who as individuals held realm and control over thousands of acres of estate while the poor had none and had no opportunity to ever own a little of their own land. I heard a smirk from the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). Now he sure doesn't know much about the history of the people who settled these western prairies, when he would be partner to that kind of junk that's put in here in this paper and say that these people . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not a fourth or a fifth generation

March 25, 1975

Canadian, I'm a first generation Canadian and my father and my grandfather came to this country because of what I said, not about what they are saying.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** Not because of the state having possession of lands. Why did thousands of these people come? They came, Mr. Speaker, to get away from the kind of system that the Leader of the Opposition would uphold and give support and fight for.

A good example of what I'm going to say and what I am saying is the comparison of the obvious, acceptable land use as set out through the Land Bank in the Matador Co-op farm where six sons and daughters of former co-op members will remain to farm the land with five other young farmers, a move I support and the New Democratic Party supports.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** Compared, Mr. Speaker, with the Beechy Co-op where three already extra large farm owners of some 9,000 acres of land, two non-resident and only one resident, purchased the Beechy farm and today these three are "lords of the manor" of some 19,000 acres in total. That is the type of freedom Mr. Steuart speaks about, Mr. Speaker. The freedom for man to enslave mankind in chains of wealth by greedily hoarding as much land as they can with no alternative for the young people to farm, as is the case of the Matador Co-op farm, Mr. Speaker. This Beechy land could have accommodated eight to ten families but now it has three "land barons".

Where is the future of our young people if this land gobbling up continues by the few? The Leader of the Opposition tries to scare the people of Saskatchewan with an NDP bogey man similar to that used by the Liberals 25 and 30 years ago when they preached to the European immigrants that the CCF will take your land away and I can say it in Ukrainian, I still have a copy of that in Ukrainian where they said the CCF will take your land away, most of these people owned only one quarter of land. It wasn't much to take away.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a very sad period in Saskatchewan history because Liberals and Conservatives stood by and watched it happen. Mr. Speaker, it may have worked once, it may have worked once for the Liberals, once upon a time, but I assure them it won't work again.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** The people of Saskatchewan, including the immigrants and their sons and daughters and their children know better to day. They know who is frantically fishing about and dragging the red herring and they know it's our friend Mr. Steuart, not the NDP. They know whom to trust. They've heard you before, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, through the same words uttered by the late Mr. Thatcher. They didn't buy it then and they won't buy it now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** You know, I read the story and I saw the story on the page of the Western Producer. Nothing but Liberal propaganda. I know, too, what back-breaking work it is to pull up the roots and pick up the stones, but I also remember, Mr. Speaker, that there were only Liberals and Conservatives around in those days. Our land was being taken away for taxes, and debt arrears. Yet no Liberal or Conservative Government stepped in to help or stop the takeover of the land! It was the CCF, Mr. Speaker, who were the first to stop this takeover with legislative protection for the homestead. And it's been ever thus, a continuous fight. The Liberals and Conservatives always espousing the right of the gouging free enterprisers to enslave one's fellow man by any means, providing it was within the law and that they had the financial resources.

The NDP has steadfastly stood by the common man saying that when necessary our citizens have the right to expect some protection from these conglomerate and corporate greedy people; that in this, society and governments have the responsibility to give that kind of protection, Mr. Speaker.

By this Resolution the Leader of the Opposition is saying that the acquisition of the land resource in Saskatchewan should be uncontrolled and free to all exploitation, that he cares little if one man from any part of Canada is allowed to own any amount of land in Saskatchewan while many of our eager young farmers are left out in the cold. I say, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be allowed to happen. The Land Bank is giving many young people some of the opportunities. There must be other means of assistance for these future young farmers. Such means must be found, Mr. Speaker.

Back to the Land Bank ad. It says, as I stated earlier, "Remember why our Grandparents came to this Country."

And I'd like to interject one more thing. The implication of course, is that people from the European countries came to this country to be able to own their own land and now the Government of Saskatchewan is somehow taking it away from them. Mr. Speaker, I object, of course, to that kind of phoney, false scare tactic. The Liberals are trying to say the people came to Saskatchewan very plainly to escape from a communistic system which did not permit them to own land and I say that's all hogwash.

Mr. Speaker, I ask them to look at those who immigrated to this country and when did they come. By far the largest group of people, coming from one particular European country, came from Great Britain. Those Scottish, Irish and Welsh people certainly weren't trying to get away from a communal type of farm. They were trying to get a place where they could acquire land and perhaps even buy some of it. But it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, who or what those people were trying to escape from. Were they trying to escape a communistic or socialistic state, Mr. Speaker? Now, Mr. Speaker, they were trying to get away from a free enterprise system which had allowed individuals, few in number, to corral every acre of land in the country and they had no opportunity to establish a farming operation.

Mr. Speaker, over the years those people who immigrated to Saskatchewan came from all over. They came from all the European countries and of course many of them came from what is now known

March 25, 1975

as countries under the present communistic rule.

However, the large percentage of these people immigrated in the late 1800's and 1900's prior to 1917, when communists took over. And again why did these people leave, Mr. Speaker? Because they were under the control of the czar who had allowed the land to be controlled by a few land barons and the common people had no opportunity to acquire land.

I wanted to mention again this particular issue as I feel it relates generally to this whole question and shows clearly that the Liberals cannot be trusted to honestly participate in any debate dealing with land ownership and control, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we know that our forefathers came to this country and to this province in order to establish a new life for themselves where there was land available. I say to all Members of this Assembly that I do not want the same circumstances to present themselves here in 10 or 20 or 30 years when there will be no more land available as was the case in Europe three-quarters of a century ago! The circumstances in Canada leading to such a catastrophe may be different but the end result would be the same, Mr. Speaker.

This Government wants to ensure our farmers and their offspring and all residents of Saskatchewan that they will have the first opportunity to be able to control and own and set their own destiny in this province, and that is what this legislation has set out to achieve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Liberal view that we should open the floodgates to everybody. Our first opportunity is to the people of Saskatchewan and we are determined that our policies reflect that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to offer a few remarks with respect to the second part of this Resolution which calls on this Government to bring recreational land under the scope of this Bill. Again, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of the Liberal party is brought to focus. The Liberals are the last people in Saskatchewan who should pretend to be concerned about the future of our recreational land. Prior to 1954, the CCF Government had a policy against selling these recreational acreages. But what did the Liberals do when they came to office, Mr. Speaker? They sold immeasurable islands and literally thousands of acres of lakefront lots. That's what they did. Now all of a sudden they've been hit with a strange sense of concern, Mr. Speaker, and they want this Government to do something to protect the available recreational land from the same kind of fate.

Yes, and we certainly are going to attempt to do that. We know our responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. We don't need the Leader of the Opposition to give directions. Indeed we are doing something right now. Mr. Speaker, we're doing something about recreational land and other land as directed by the Final Report of the Special Committee on Ownership of Agricultural Lands. Mr. Speaker, the inter-sessional committee to which I referred earlier recommended a study with respect to recreational land.

The Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) asked the question in the House a few days ago about information being sought at land titles offices and later saying, at the municipal offices. This information is being gathered and complied by my department – the

Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, compiling information regarding foreign non-resident and corporate controlled land, as well as compiling and documenting information with regard to recreational lands, Mr. Speaker. When completed this will make what is anticipated to be a centralized land registry. There is nothing sinister or new about our action. In the Final Report by the Special Committee on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands, recommendation No. 8 stated: "That ownership and control of lands suitable for recreation be studied." Recommendation No. 10 stated: "That a central registry be maintained showing the ownership and operator of agricultural and recreational lands."

We are proceeding to do what the recommendations suggested, make events happen, Mr. Speaker. We are, however, patiently awaiting the results of some other events, one in particular in Prince Edward Island, the court results.

Once the Final Report, of which I just spoke a minute ago is completed this summer, there will be an opportunity for every one to study the contents and it's my hope that an early decision can be made with respect to those same recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how Liberals think. Here we have the Leader of the Opposition urging, in fact, pleading crocodile tears, for us to legislate the inclusion of recreational lands within the scope of our legislation, while at the same time his federal side kick, the Minister of Justice, Otto Lang, has thrown the support of the Federal Ministry behind two Americans who have challenged Prince Edward Island's recreational land legislation.

How ironical a situation, Mr. Speaker, and how contradictory can Liberals be?

I would hope that some time during this debate the Members opposite indicate to the people of Saskatchewan just where they stand on this same issue.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the proposal to remove the Canadian restriction from the legislation is not the answer, but with respect to recreational land I would say that any decision would be premature until such a time as we, as a Government, have had an opportunity to thoroughly analyze the study which should be completed, as I have already said, in the next half year.

Mr. Speaker, by this Resolution the Leader of the Opposition has shown his true colors. As he champions Exxon and multinational oil cartels in their rape of our oil resource profits; as he champions the potash cartels, whose basic desire is to maintain a viable American potash industry at our expense; as he champions the Landeggers and the Steve Romans, is it so surprising that he also champions the big rich land barons, Canadians or otherwise? To me it is no surprise. It should be no surprise to anyone in Saskatchewan that the Liberals and Conservatives are champions of big business, big cartels, big money; that's what keeps them alive, Mr. Speaker.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that we in the New Democratic Party are proud of the fact, of the course that we have steered. In my opinion it's the sane and sensible and humanitarian approach to the system of really governing our people.

March 25, 1975

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES:** (Touchwood) Mr. Speaker, I am not really surprised at seeing such a motion on the order paper under the name of the Leader of the Opposition. At one time I might have been, but nothing he does surprises me any more. The fact that he has placed this motion on the Order Paper proves, Mr. Speaker, again, without a doubt that he and the Liberal Party are still dreaming of the 18th century, when the privileged few were the feudal lords who controlled the land and had the common people as serfs and slaves. His opposition to the Land Bank and to this legislation shows his willingness for Canadian business to take over the natural resources, our natural resource of farm soil.

After all CPR is a Canadian company and so is its subsidiary, Marathon Realty. It was interesting to note that according to the rural municipality survey done by our committee in 1973, it showed that Marathon Realty to which CPR turned all their land over to, owned 1,079 quarters. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was a voluntary survey done by the municipal secretaries. The committee was suspicious of these figures. So on the advice of the Member for Albert Park, after we had written several letters to Marathon's office in Calgary and got no answer, and on the advice of the then Member for Albert Park, we sent them a letter threatening to subpoena them before the committee. Right away we got an answer from them stating they owned 1,635 quarters, just about 600 quarters more than the voluntary survey showed.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote a bit out of the part of the Foreign Ownership Committee Report, page 26. This was from a brief that was presented while we met in Kerrobert and I'm going to quote from the report:

One example was cited in evidence presented at the Kerrobert meeting. The evidence was that Marathon Realty, a wholly owned subsidiary of CPR, owns approximately 40 sections of the land in the RM of Rosemount, No. 378. Eight sections are operated by the Mesa Ranching Company which is reported to be from Minnesota.

The director of district six of the National Farmers Union stated:

All of this land was formerly used by local farmers who needed it as pasture to provide themselves with a viable cattle operation. They were dependent on this land for income. It would appear that Marathon is leasing pasture land to Mesa in preference to renewing the leases to farmers. For at least seven farmers the leases were just not renewed but they were subsequently granted to the Mesa Ranching Company. The major purchases of this eight section ranch are not done locally, but are reported by businessmen in the area to be done in Calgary. Lumber treated posts and cattle are brought by semi-trailer loads from elsewhere. The farmers who formerly leased this land did their shopping locally, thus supporting the local community. I would like to add that as long as a farmer rented land from Marathon he was not allowed to take any of his neighbor's cattle into the pasture but now Mesa Ranching Company are actively soliciting cattle to be put into the pasture.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the companies my friends across the way like. These are the type of companies that the New Democratic Party says must be stopped. And I challenge the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) to use this as an election issue in my area because if he does we'll clobber him.

I see no difference, I see no difference between an absentee landlord from Toronto, Vancouver, Saskatchewan or Florida. All do the same thing. If there are profits, the money leaves the community and the local community loses business, loses people and loses itself.

The previous speaker mentioned the Toronto businessman, born in Saskatchewan, who flew from Toronto to appear as a witness before us at the Saskatoon hearing, in which he spoke against any restriction. Under questioning he told of his dream of owning 12 to 15 quarter sections. He stated that he wished to own the land, fly to it from Toronto weekends and do the farming. He had no thought of what this might do to the local community or what effect it might have on the neighbors or whether this was a desirable way to farm. No, he wanted 12 to 15 quarters to play around with in his leisure time. I say that this is an undesirable form of use of our natural resource - soil.

If we are to have live, viable, active communities, we must have people who live in that community. I remember driving through villages in Colorado where grass was growing on the streets. Only a pub, a post office or maybe a store. All the other buildings were boarded up. Is that what the Leader of the Opposition wants? No doubt he does. This is what corporate enterprise wants. The worship at the shrine of efficiency, period. It doesn't matter if people's life investments are lost in the buildings boarded up. It doesn't matter if people's spirits are broken, their money gone, and forced to live on welfare, as long as corporate enterprise can make money.

I remember the businessmen of Mott, North Dakota where the land has fallen into the hands of a few people. These men are farming from 75 to 125 quarters of land. The businessmen told us of how business had failed; how many businesses had closed; how many houses were boarded up; and in their own words to us they said, "lock the barn door before the horse is stolen."

I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, again from the Report, this is on the bottom of page 20 and going over into 21:

The Committee asked the businessmen in the town of Mott to comment on the effect of increasing farm size on their business and on the community. The businessman who sold steel granaries said he thought that the larger farm had actually helped his business. His experience was, however, in sharp contrast from the observation of the other businessmen. The Farm Union Insurance agent said, "I have been here for 26 years, there were six grocery stores, now we have only two. When you lose people you lose businesses. Some of the churches merged together and became one church. At the present time our school is starting to go down in enrolment." The increased cost of running the business and the effect of better roads were also noted as possible reasons for the disappearance of business in the small towns. The Mayor of Mott said, "The basic question is whether this way of life should be preserved, should be acknowledged through legislation or

March 25, 1975

any kind of Act. Do we act to keep the people here to continue what we have established or do we become big and continue to slough off our youth and our surplus people to the big cities and create problems there which we have to pay for in another way through retraining people and through welfare programs?"

When we, Mr. Speaker, visited Colorado and saw the Ceres Land and Cattle Company in operation, the Gates Rubber farming operation of over 60 quarters and the 100,000 Montford Feed Lots, we were told by all the local people to, "lock the door before the horse is stolen." They all said something of the same thing, "If we had only acted 25 years ago."

We drove through 25 miles or so where the signs on every mile said, "Farmed by Colorado Agencies." Not a soul to visit, not a community in sight. Is this what the Leader of the Opposition wants? We don't. Don't forget they were not referring to foreigners of the USA. They were citizens of that country. If it were Canadian private citizens we had to fear it wouldn't be so bad, but this law is basically to stop either Canadian or American companies from taking over our natural resource - soil.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1971 election, the NDP campaigned on the program of stopping absentee ownership and foreign takeovers. We fulfilled our promise and we are not going to change it now and the Saskatchewan farmers will re-elect the Blakeney Government on the action taken.

I think of our hearings at Weyburn when we were told of an American farmer who crossed the border in the spring with machinery, fuel and food and farmed 70 quarter sections. He then went back and then he came back to summerfallow, back over the border again. Fall came and back he came again to harvest the crop and all this time he never spent practically a cent in Canada. I ask the Liberal Party what do they say to this? Do they like this kind of operation? What does this man do to contribute to our country or to the province?

In what way will he help the community if he comes from Brandon, Manitoba or Camrose, Alberta, any more than being an American? No, Mr. Speaker, our legislation is good legislation. We, as legislators have a responsibility to this generation, to the generation unborn, to see that the great heritage we inherited from our parents is passed on down to them intact, and still able to produce. Anyone who from far away invests in Saskatchewan land for profit, will mine that land for all it's worth. They will destroy it and in time throw the title away and rush off with their profits.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to be able to peruse the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he moves this, so I now ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 18 - GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

**MR. D. BOLDT** (Rosthern) moved, seconded by Mr. G. B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park):

That this Assembly recommend for the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that it immediately cease

the granting of contracts or provision of government advertising for any firm or publication owned by a political party.

He said: Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past years on this Resolution and on this matter. I don't aim to repeat what has already been said, however, politicians in recent months have come under very severe criticism. I believe that most politicians are honest people. I believe that most NDP supporters would rather not have the Government take advantage of their position and channel public funds to a company or a political party to support their own political ambitions. This is particularly true now since the Federal Government has made it possible under the federal legislation for any individual to contribute to a political party of its choice and get an income tax deduction. Political parties should be financed by private funds and no party should have access to the public treasury unless all parties receive the same consideration as will be the case when the Government brings in this new Election Act that has been forecast by the Attorney General.

I believe that each individual politician has a responsibility to the public and we have a responsibility to each other. If we want the public to respect us as individuals and respect us as politicians then we must keep our records clean. If one individual of a government is proven to be dishonest the public no doubt will condemn your entire government. It might even include members of the Opposition. This Resolution applies to the Government of the day and to all governments in the future. I encourage all Members to support this Motion.

**HON. J. L. BROCKELBANK:** (Minister of Government Services) Mr. Speaker, having heard the Hon. Member's comments in support of Resolution No. 18 before us, I should like time to consider his comments and therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 23 - QUESTION PERIOD OF 20 MINUTES**

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview) moved, seconded by D. F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly allow the Members of the Opposition to direct questions to Members of the Executive Council, prior to the Orders of the Day, for a period of not less than twenty minutes, in order to attain information concerning the conduct of the Government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before introducing the Resolution I should like to make a few comments.

**MR. ROMANOW:** Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I notice that Resolution No. 23 that my learned friend from Lakeview is now about to introduce is on the Order Paper and I also believe if my memory serves me correctly, I stand to be corrected on this, but on page 5 of the Blues, Resolution No. 1 also stands in the name of the Member. I think the rules say you can't have two motions on at the same time.

March 25, 1975

**MR. SPEAKER:** The rule is correct, you cannot have two motions on at the same time. The Member moved Resolution No. 1, it was then adjourned by another Member. It is no longer the property of the Member who first moved it, it is in the adjourned debate column. So once having been adjourned then the Member has a right to put another motion on, otherwise if an adjournment disallowed a person from having another motion on, any Member adjourning second reading on a Bill, if a Private Member adjourned it, it would still disqualify them from having another motion. So the first motion is now not the property of the Member for Regina Lakeview, it is the property of the Member who adjourned it. So I would rule that this motion is in order at this time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** With respect, Mr. Speaker, that is the first time I have heard that as a ruling by you. In fact it was a resolution that we had, one of our Members last year I believe or two years before that stood in two names which was ruled out of order. I don't have it in front of me but how could it be that all sorts of resolutions can be placed before the House. I can't understand that, I would be pleased to have Mr. Speaker point out to me where in the rules that is the case and I would be pleased to stand by the rules on that.

**MR. MALONE:** Can I speak to the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker? I think the Attorney General rising the way he does certainly illustrates the Government's feeling about this Resolution, they desperately don't want it debated. But may I say to you, Mr. Speaker, although I have not been in this House as long as the Attorney General and certainly not as long as you, it has been customary since I have been here to allow Members to have more than one resolution on the Order Paper after they have spoken to the first resolution when it then stands under somebody else's name. I am very surprised that the Attorney General now rises and tries to in effect change this rule. It is the custom of this House since I have been here that this is the case.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think the first time this arose, where more than one motion at a time was really in force was one year ago now. The Chair found that some Members had a number of motions on and other Members who were away at the bottom could never get to the top, so the ruling was enforced. It is taken from Beauchesne, Standing Order 48 (3) of the House of Commons, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, page 162 which states:

No member shall have more than one notice of motion at a time on the order paper.

Once a debate is adjourned it is not then a notice of motion. The notice of motion part has disappeared and it is then an adjourned debate. Therefore, that is why I rule that they can have one motion at a time. That was the reason the other day, I drew it to the Leader of the Opposition's attention, he had two and he eventually withdrew one rather than have one ruled out of order. Once it goes into an adjourned debate, it is no longer a notice of motion.

**MR. ROMANOW:** Mr. Speaker, you have made your ruling and I am not

going to be in the position of challenging it but I do say, with respect, that I cannot see the difference in the logic for that ruling. Because in effect the ruling says that you can only give one notice but you can have five or six motions. I don't see what the logic for that is, what the distinction is to say that you can only have one notice on at one time but you can have five topics under debate at one time. Surely the orderly conduct of the House must be predicated on the assumption that only one motion can be dealt with by one Member at one time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Attorney General should consider where this would leave him and other Members if what you are suggesting was enforced. If you could only have one motion on the Order Paper at a time you could only have one adjournment and the Minister would not be able to adjourn a second reading of another Minister if he already had an adjournment or a motion on the Order Paper. Neither would he be able to adjourn any other because he would have two motions and I rule that the Member for Regina Lakeview does not have a motion on the Order Paper, it is no longer the property of that Member, it is in the hands of another Member. The same would apply to Motions for Return or other debate.

Now I think this has been debated long enough, unless my ruling is challenged, I think the Member should continue with his motion.

**MR. MALONE:** Well, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted by the Attorney General, I do have a few comments I should like to make before introducing this Resolution.

The first of my comments is my complete astonishment that the Attorney General tried to keep this Resolution from being debated before the legislature.

**MR. ROMANOW:** On a Point of Personal Privilege. Every Member has a right to raise a Point of Order or a Point of Personal Privilege without any comment as to whether they are trying to keep the motion debated or not being debated. I am perfectly prepared to debate the motion and I ask the Member - well not to withdraw but to make his remarks in order and he is clearly out of order when he says that I rise on a Point of Order I have no right to do so, everybody does.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Your point is well taken. Every Member has a right to rise on a Point of Order. Sometimes the Speaker feels that it is not a Point of Order but I think the Attorney General did raise a Point of Order which needed clarifying in this House.

**MR. MALONE:** I wouldn't want to . . .

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** Point of Order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** What's your Point of Order?

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** Mr. Speaker, when you were making your ruling you mentioned motions on the Order Paper and I wonder if in your view the term resolution is interchangeable with the word motion with regard to that statement about motions on the Order Paper.

March 25, 1975

**MR. BOLDT:** Mr. Speaker, you make your ruling and you cut him off, why do you let him . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Quiet please! The motion does not include questions or Orders for Return seeking information and I can quote you that right from Beauchesne. A motion is what we have before us now and an Order for Return or a question, written question seeking information does not come into this same category and it is quite plain in Beauchesne. Proceed.

**MR. MALONE:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to make some remarks about the attitude of the Government on other days in connection with this matter but to keep the debate at a higher level I will refrain from doing so. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, at the outset that one of the tests of how well a government is acting in the interest of the public and the people whom they are supposed to be governing, is how much information that government is prepared to divulge about their affairs. I am not referring, Mr. Speaker, to self-serving information that is ground out by various propaganda machines operated by the Government within government departments. I am talking about information that may or may not be in the best interest of the Government as a political party to divulge but it would be in the best interests of the people to hear about.

There is an American writer whom I'm fond of and who I think is a great critic and commentator of his day by the name of I. F. Stone. He has been quoted on many occasions as saying, "All governments lie and that people should realize this and judge governments on this basic precept." I'm not for a moment, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that this applies to this Government. It may apply to the governments that Mr. Stone was familiar with in the United States.

But one of the ways that we can ensure that governments do not lie and do not mislead the public and do not hold back information that is relevant is to have a free and open daily question period when the Legislature is in session, where the Opposition will pick the topics to be discussed, not the Government; where the Opposition will ask the questions and hopefully obtain proper answers from the Government.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the existing question period is completely inadequate to accomplish this. I believe that you brought it to the attention of this Legislature a week or so ago when this matter was first raised, that the question period was something that was introduced in the early 1960s. It was introduced at that time, I believe, in the form that it is now before this House, that is, three daily questions with one supplemental question being allowed afterwards.

I remind you though now, Mr. Speaker, that we have before this House a Budget far in excess of \$1 billion, which is something we did not have in the 1960s. We have a government which, not particularly this Government, but all governments, are becoming more and more involved in the daily activities of people in this province and in other places in Canada. In connection with this Government we have, as I indicated earlier, government agencies that literally pour out propaganda that is favorable to the Government, puts it in the best possible light and in my view, does not tell the whole story.

Other areas in Canada, other legislatures, Mr. Speaker, have acknowledged that there is a problem in getting information from government by expanding their question periods. For the information of the House I would like to just read what the other if legislatures and the House of Commons have by way of question periods. In Alberta the question period is 30 minutes; in Ontario the question period is 45 minutes; Prince Edward Island the question period is 40 minutes, Prince Edward Island which is about the same population of the city of Regina permits a question period of 40 minutes; in Ottawa, I believe it is presently 40 minutes but there is some discussion about having it increased to an hour. I'm not suggesting that we should follow Ottawa's lead in this because there are many, many more Members. Quebec and New Brunswick, 30 minutes; Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland no limit on the question period; British Columbia, 15 minutes and Saskatchewan, as we know, three questions.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature has fallen badly behind the lead of the other legislatures. It is apparent that we have probably the worst question period in Canada in the sense of the time allotted to it and it appears the Government is not prepared to make any changes in this regard.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MALONE:** May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government moves to reject this Resolution, to vote it down, I think one can make several inferences. The first of these is, that the Government has something to hide, because if they haven't got anything to hide why would they simply not be prepared to answer questions for a short period of time each day? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think one can make the inference that the Government is afraid to put its policies and its Ministers under public scrutiny, because why would they not be agreeable to answering questions where they have probably more knowledge about the question than the questioner has and usually if they work it properly, they can work it to their own advantage.

I would suggest finally, Mr. Speaker, that an inference can be made that the Government is not prepared to give information to the public that is asked for by the Opposition, but is only prepared to give that information which they feel they need to disclose.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit that the question period that we are asking for is not unreasonable. It would be 20 minutes which would not be to the same extent as they have in most other provinces of Canada. We would only be a little more than British Columbia, far behind P.E.I., New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this request is not unreasonable, that it is a very reasonable request, that the Government should grant it, that the Government backbenchers should be supporting this type of resolution.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest this. It's apparent, I feel, that the Government is reluctant to discuss the question, they've had notice for some weeks that this matter would be coming before it, surely they are prepared to discuss the Resolution, to debate it, surely they are prepared to vote on it today, not at some later date. It's been the

March 25, 1975

practice of this Government, Mr. Speaker, where any kind of a resolution appears on the Order Paper that they do not want to discuss is they allow a Member of the Opposition to make his introductory remarks, one of their backbenchers or Cabinet Minister gets up and says about two words and then adjourns debate and we never see it again unless we try to force the issue

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that for the Government to do this in this case would be completely inappropriate and the matter has been before this House now for almost two or three weeks. I would hope that the members of the Press and the public would come to the proper conclusions if this is what the Government tries to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move this Resolution.

**MR. J. G. RICHARDS:** (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, if I might make just a few words in support of this Motion. I am fearful that what could result is a debate in which we bring up past injustices which one party claims to have been done by the other. If that is the kind of debate we get into it is almost certain that the ensuing result will be no change and no improvement in the question period for the Saskatchewan Legislature.

Without being overly melodramatic about it, Mr. Speaker, it's not unjust to say that legislatures - whether they be in Saskatchewan or elsewhere - face a crisis of credibility, that the important decisions are made by Cabinet. the important decisions are made by senior bureaucrats in the civil service and legislatures everywhere are in decline. Accordingly the attention, the interest, the qualifications of people who come forward to work in legislatures decline and people with qualifications apply their efforts and abilities elsewhere. If we are interested as elected Members, sitting in a legislature, in the institution being anything other than a rubber stamp for government motions or a forum where one team attacks the other, and in the spirit of team support everybody gets in his licks, if legislatures are to be other than that, the functions they serve as checks on government or means to get information out of a powerful government, are essential. One small way that function can be performed is through a reasonable question period.

Accordingly, I think, the Motion put forward by the Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) is valuable and it deserves the bipartisan support of all Members in this Legislature.

**MR. D. BOLDT:** (Rosthern) Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one comment on this Resolution. Members opposite will certainly agree with me that I haven't pestered them very often with questions, but what bothers me is that during this Session the Premier can get on the hot-line and he can stay there a whole hour and can be asked questions by the public. We are denied this. The Attorney General can go on a hot-line and talk for a whole hour, maybe two hours and we are denied this. Every Minister, every MLA can get on the hot-line and be questioned by the public but we as elected representatives cannot ask the Premier questions.

I think one of the biggest problems that we have, we are always tied in with that radio and if we could throw that radio out of this building, then perhaps we would have time to ask

questions. But we are always geared for 15 minutes, we have 15 minutes time and then you're on the air and we want to behave like ladies and gentlemen, we don't want to embarrass the public. So we act accordingly.

I want to read an article out of the Star-Phoenix of March 13, 1975, written by Jim Greenblat. He writes regarding the Victoria government. I'll just read one or two paragraphs.

Democracy is supposed to be chewed out in parliament, but that is not necessarily so. Monday and Tuesday the top banana of Vancouver radio hot-liners had a studio in the Empress Hotel in Victoria. At 8 30 a.m. Premier Barrett was on the radio with Jack Webster, with a million ears listening intently as the head of the government here had to answer questions which belonged in the legislature. But it was worthwhile.

Now this was from 8:30 to noon, between Webster and the open line with callers questioning.

The Premier had a hot time. Then on came other Ministers and that went until noon.

But we're not given this privilege. No, I'm an elected representative, I represent 8,000 to 10,000 voters and I'm not supposed to question and because of the radio I'll be cut off. I'm not a true representative of my constituency because we haven't got a question period and we're tied on to that radio system. You can either push the questions in, in 15 minutes, or you have to get off in time and if I speak on radio and I'm wedged in between the time, I steal a minute, I'm not honest and you Members will be upset over it, if you do the same, we're upset. This isn't democracy the way I see it. I should like to see democracy at work. If I have a question to ask of the Attorney General or the Minister of Health, this is the place where it should be done. No other place. This is the first place where it should be done. I'm not opposed, I don't want to leave the impression that I'm opposed to the Premier getting on the hot-line, that's fine, I wish he was on there more often, he might get into more trouble. But I also want that privilege in this House. If he makes himself available to my constituents, he should also make himself available to those people who are elected and that is the reason for this Resolution. I'm sure there would be days when there will be no questions and there might be days like today when the Minister of Social Services has got himself into some deep trouble, we would like to ask him more questions, but we are cut off. In this particular case where we have an independent Member, if there are only three questions, and we catch the eye of the Speaker first, the poor fellow would never have an opportunity to ask a question in this House. He wouldn't be given the privilege. He represents a few people as well. He should be given the opportunity.

I support this Motion and I hope this Motion will be dealt with today and my purpose isn't to have this Motion passed so that I can have a barrage of questions tomorrow. I'll behave in a sensible manner, I'll try and ask sensible questions. This is what the Opposition wants. You have the civil service behind you, that if you're not able to answer the question the day it is asked you can tell us you'll come in with the answer tomorrow

March 25, 1975

and we'll have other questions to ask. This is what this House is for. I urge you very strongly to support this Motion.

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY:** (Premier) Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether I was really listening to the same person that I thought I was when I heard the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) indicate how he favored the operations of this House, that he really felt we ought to have a general question period and that these were the views that he holds as a parliamentarian. I recall a comment of his, unfortunately I do not have it with me, I will certainly want to dig it up so I will refresh his memory, on an occasion when, as I recall it, he indicated that he felt that there really shouldn't be a legislature at all. That the Government was elected for four years to govern and that's what it should be doing and if he had his way he wouldn't be having these people here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I haven't made that statement, but I agree that very often this Legislature is absolutely useless.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** I will attempt to check the records because it was one of the more outstanding pronouncements of the Member for Rosthern.

I do, however, want to refresh the memories of the Members of this House with respect to the Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures of the Assembly. The Report is dated December of 1969 and it was set up on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, who moved that we set up this committee. It was set up to establish rules for this House. It had a government majority. At that time the desirability or undesirability of having a question period was dealt with. It was dealt with by the majority, Messieurs Forsyth, Hooker, Howes, Loken and Weatherald. It will be recalled that when this committee report came into the House, even though the Report provided some amelioration of the position of the Opposition in this Legislature, the Report itself was not adopted by the government of the day. In fact when this Report was debated - and I invite all Hon. Members to look back on that day - it will be recalled that a couple of Hon. Members, including the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) launched a concerted attack on the Report, moving amendment after amendment which had the effect of cutting down the rights of the Opposition. I invite all Hon. Members to check the record and they will have an opportunity then to understand the position taken by, as it then was, the Member for Meadow Lake, and as then was the Member for Rosetown, and the Member for Athabasca and the Member for Rosthern and the Member for Whitmore Park and the Member for Prince Albert West and the Member for Moosomin.

We, I think, know your views on this matter. We know your views on this matter. I hope that we're not going to see another flip-flop. Certainly when it comes to wriggling there are some past masters on the other side. But let me say this, the Report is September 1969 and it was accepted in 1970. The debates are in the record of 1970.

**MR. STEUART:** Is your mind changed?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** I take it that the minds of Members opposite have changed judging by the comments on this. Certainly the mind of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) has changed.

Let me go one step further with respect to this. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) can contain himself. I know that he wants to rush into this debate, but I do want to present a few thoughts. I appreciate that they will probably fall on rather barren ground, but I will attempt to put forward a point of view.

May I put this point of view: notwithstanding the comments of the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone), many of the so-called question periods that he talks about, including, for example the question period in Ottawa is not the sort of question period he is asking for. And if he is talking about a question period such as we have at Ottawa, then that is another ball game. That has a question period where Members put in a written question so that the Minister knows what general subject is going to be raised and then supplementary orals are permitted and a Minister has an opportunity to prepare himself in a general way and the orals can follow and they can probe. But in this House we see quite another operation.

We see Members standing up and alluding to affidavits, mythical affidavits, or else not yet produced by the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) or whoever has them tucked away. The proposition then becomes one of the Opposition putting forward a series of innuendoes by questions, which the Minister cannot possibly be expected to answer since he has no notice whatsoever. And the matter goes on to the next day, or the next day after, in which case we are left chasing the proverbial misstatement. If, in fact, the proposition is one that we would have a general question period of the type they have at Westminster or at Ottawa, then this is something that we could willingly look at, because this is something which could be coped with.

We all know that the pursuit is not for information. I don't know when in a period of ten days or so we have seen fewer written questions on the Order Paper. There is currently one unanswered question on the Order Paper. I acknowledge that some are converted to Orders for Return, but a good number are not. I will stack the record of this Government in answering questions against the record of the government headed by Members opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** Let us then be clear, we are not using those opportunities available to us. Maybe they are not satisfactory. But, why then do we have this motion which simply talks about a question period instead of a motion such as that moved by the Member for Prince Albert West, referring the matter to a interparty committee, so that we could come up with a procedure. We don't have that, because frankly the Members opposite are not interested in the question period, but rather interested in getting some publicity.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** Alleging that the Government is unwilling to answer

March 25, 1975

questions.

I know and every Member opposite who was here in 1971 knows that Mr. Speaker Dewburst has consistently permitted a much greater degree of latitude in asking questions than did Mr. Speaker Snedker.

I invite all Hon. Members, again, to check the records. Fortunately it is there. So there is no doubt that the question period has been expanded. There is no doubt that many more questions are asked. If, indeed, we could arrive at a procedure whereby questions were asked in the manner used in most legislative bodies, I would see no problem. My problem arises when I see questions being asked which are clearly unanswerable, clearly meant to spread an innuendo, which cannot be definition be answered until the next day or the day after. That, of course, is not permissible in a written question, hence the resort to oral questions; hence the abandonment of written questions and hence the resort to oral questions without notice.

The Member for Lakeview says that my argument will not wash. I do invite him before he closes his mind on the subject, to look at what we said when we were discussing this in this Chamber just five years or so ago – 1970, to see what the arguments were then. I invite him to consider whether or not he would be prepared to move into a question period like the one at Ottawa, which this motion gives no suggestion of, none whatever. It seems to me if that is what he has in mind then obviously we could give consideration to a proposal which would move this to an interparty committee so that we could come up with a procedure.

That is the sort of thing that can work; that is the procedure which was used in 1969 by such a well-known parliamentarian as the Member for Prince Albert West. I have no reason to believe that we can improve on the precedent.

I think that we ought to consider some of these things. I think we ought particularly to consider some of the comments made by Members opposite in that debate a few short years ago, and with that in mind I am going to move, Mr. Speaker, that the debate be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **RETURN NO. 60**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse) for Return No. 60 showing:

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

**HON. A. TAYLOR:** (Minister of Public Service Commission) Mr. Speaker, I indicated when this motion was first

introduced that I should like to make a couple of comments and have time to see if an amendment was necessary or in order. I will be moving such an amendment.

It is interesting to note, as I mentioned earlier, that there are no dates mentioned in the particular motion before us which leaves it very open ended and very difficult to gather the information. It seems as though the Members of the Opposition expect us to keep records in the Public Service Commission showing who have been candidates at some time in federal elections. I assure the Members of the House, although that may have been their practice, it is not the practice of this Government. We don't keep a record of who was or who was not a candidate.

The person with the only accurate record in this regard, of course, will be the Federal Chief Returning Officer, or Chief Electoral Officer. We will, therefore, have to depend on him for the supply of the names, which we will then be able to compare with the record of our employees. We certainly have a record of the employees and we will be able to match the names.

I must say to the House that all that we will be able to do is to match the names. In some cases there may be an initial supplied to us and we may have a person of the same name and initial. We will certainly record this for the Members, but we can't guarantee that that was in fact the candidate. We will do what we can.

It is also interesting that the Members opposite did not ask for anything other than the New Democratic candidates. I suppose that could be taken by some as an attempt to develop a prejudicial case, but I wouldn't suggest that. It is probably just an unwillingness to admit the number of Liberal candidates who have been defeated.

I suggest, therefore, that we ask for full disclosure instead of just New Democratic candidates. I am going to move an amendment which will be two things. First of all, it will ask for the period of time 1962 to 1975. Secondly, it will ask for all candidates of any party or independent candidates.

I therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer):

That Return No. 60 be amended by striking out all the words following the word "showing" and substituting the following:

Whether any Saskatchewan political candidates were employed by the Government of Saskatchewan following their defeat in a federal election during the period 1962 to 1975. If so, (a) their names, (b) their party affiliation, (c) the election year in which they were a candidate, (d) the positions they hold, (e) their salaries.

**MR. J. WIEBE:** (Morse) Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I must apologize to the House for not expanding the question as large as I originally wanted. I wanted to save the Government a little bit of work and I am quite pleased that they have included all political parties so that we shall have a good look at what they are doing today.

March 25, 1975

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 2 - FREEZE ON RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats):

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.

**MR. R. GROSS:** (Gravelbourg) Mr. Speaker, rail line abandonment is an issue that will have profound effect on rural Saskatchewan and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this will be one of the major issues in this following campaign.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Particularly in Morse. When the issue is discussed the Liberals would like to dismiss it as an issue of pure rhetoric in fact, they discuss it as pure NDP rhetoric and gossip. I don't blame them, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't want to be a Liberal in a million years and have to go around, particularly with a provincial election coming around, and have somehow to justify the issue of rail line abandonment.

Liberals, Mr. Speaker, are running scared, they are running scared but the people of Saskatchewan will have little or no mercy on them I assure you.

The Member who last spoke claims that it is the NDP Government in Saskatchewan that wants to abandon branch lines. He claimed this in his last speech on Wednesday. Mr. Speaker, this is confusion; it is confusing to me, and it is confusing to the general public.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** But, Mr. Speaker, that is the tactics, the tactics of confusion. The name of the game is confusion. First you tell them it is going to happen and then you tell them it is not going to happen. Then, Mr. Speaker, you completely confuse the public as to what the real problem is and they are then totally confused.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members opposite, because somehow they are lacking a great deal of information and credibility, but what they are lacking, particularly, is a great deal of information. They are trying to build an argument now saying that it is the Provincial NDP Government that is planning on abandoning branch lines.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, they say right on, but let's look at the press release from the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. Does that ring any bells? This is not a press clipping, this is a news release right out of his own office. December 23, 1974, and what does Mr. Lang say in that press release? Mr. Speaker, he is going to talk about the issue of rail line abandonment and he categorizes all the rail network in the Prairie Provinces into three basic categories. First category is main lines, and he is going to be a good fellow, he is going to protect the main lines to the year 2,000. What a nice guy! That takes a load off the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. But he also adds a category, which he considers needs more consultation and I quote:

Lines Which Require Study and Consultation. These constitute 6,283 miles which will remain frozen for at least another year. A further year until they have been carefully examined by regional inquiries to determine their status in future.

Mr. Speaker, I think they are waiting and they are stalling because there is a provincial election coming on and they want to wait another year before they bring in the program.

They also, in the third category, talk about the 525 miles that they are going to abandon. The category apparently requires no more further protection and seems sensible to abandon. Mr. Speaker, what does this do to Saskatchewan, I ask you?

In Saskatchewan, in his own press release and his own timetable, Hon. Mr. Lang shows that there are going to be 3,636 miles in Saskatchewan that will be abandoned. 3,636 miles of branch line in Saskatchewan that will cut into the hearts and roots of 94 communities, each with populations in excess of 100.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're going to see in the next provincial election who's going to believe that. I can assure you we'll see who's going to believe that.

Mr. Speaker, he went on in his release and he talked about all the branch line abandonment that's going to take place and I quote, Mr. Speaker, some of the branch lines he refers to, perhaps it might ring bells with some of the Members. The Canadian Pacific branch line in the Notukeu region that goes from Notukeu to Val Marie, the Outlook branch line or subdivision that goes from Moose Jaw to Outlook, the Portal one that goes from Pasqua to North Portal, Prince Albert from Lanigan to Norquay, the Shaunavon subdivision that goes all the way from Assiniboia to Shaunavon, the Vanguard subdivision in my own area that goes from Vanguard, pardon me, from Swift Current to Meyronne.

Mr. Speaker, these are included in the hundreds and hundreds of miles of branch lines that are being proposed for abandonment.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to see the political manoeuvrability, weaselling and flexibility of Members opposite and when we talk about confusion I want to talk about some of the confusion that's going on. For example, Mr. Speaker, when he announced this program he came up with a map and on this map it showed all the lines that were proposed to be abandoned. One

March 25, 1975

line went right through the constituency I represent in Gravelbourg and happens to be the CNR subdivision called the Gravelbourg subdivision that goes all the way from Moose Jaw clear over to Neidpath. And, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Gravelbourg became particularly alarmed at this proposal to abandon the branch line that goes through their community. And for good reason. So what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They got together in March, pardon me, on February 21, 1975 and in the February 27 issue of the Gravelbourg Star it recorded that they had better send a delegation to their Member of Parliament and I quote from the paper, Mr. Speaker.

On Friday, February 21, 1975 a five band delegation headed by Jean Bourree (who is the ex-president of the Liberal association in Gravelbourg), Emmery Allard who is a merchant in Gravelbourg, Andre Beaudoin who is the president of the Board of Trade in Gravelbourg, Marcel Moore and the writer on the paper Journeyed to Assiniboia to meet with Liberal MP Ralph Goodale. The rail line preservation was the main topic of discussion.

Recent rumors among certain town and local citizens have had very negative overtones in regard to the railway situation.

Mr. Goodale, when questioned on his stand regarding the railways explained, "I shall maintain as many lines in the Assiniboia constituency as I can."

He went on, Mr. Speaker, just wait. He went on, he said:

In particular the Mossbank, the Hodgeville rail length should be maintained as is or included in the basic railway system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's very interesting, very interesting because Otto Lang says, here's the map, it says it's going to go and the Member of Parliament for the area, Ralph Goodale, who is the gopher for Otto Lang formerly the executive assistant to Otto Lang is now saying . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** You'll have your turn. The Member for Assiniboia Gravelbourg, the Member of Parliament is now saying that it's not going to go. He assured the delegation from Gravelbourg that no way, as long as he is Member of Parliament will that rail line ever disappear out of Gravelbourg, but the Minister of Justice, the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board says it's going to go. Mr. Speaker, that's a very interesting political manoeuvre because the Government, the Federal Government is saying if we're going to abandon your branch line, after hearings one year from now, the same kind of hearings that Gravelbourg was allowed to have when the radio station was going to go, the same kind of reception they will have when they try to plead the case to maintain the branch line in Gravelbourg so they're saying the branch line's going to go, the Federal Government says the branch line is going to go, the Member of Parliament and executive assistant to Otto Lang says no, it's not, it's not going to go, no such thing, no thoughts, we talk about rail line abandonment. But, Mr. Speaker, that leaves the people of Gravelbourg in a very serious position because they don't know

whom to believe. The Federal Government says yes, it's going to go, the Member of Parliament says, no, it's not. Mr. Speaker, who's not telling the truth?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You're not.

**MR. GROSS:** Would it be the Liberal Government or could it be the Member of Parliament or could it be the Liberal Party. I suggest all of them, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, then we saw some very classic liberal logic, classic Liberal logic and weaselling I consider it. They received the Pool program the other day on grain-handling and transportation rationalization and, Mr. Speaker, they have been out in the country for the last couple of months and they've been receiving flak and feeling the flak of what rail line abandonment is all about to do to rural Saskatchewan and they've now switched their horses. There was one Member quoted the other day, who was saying he was getting a little saddle sore. And they switched horses all right. Now they're supporting the proposal put forth by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Well, that's very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MESSER:** What did he say about the Wheat Pool and SARM?

**MR. GROSS:** Yeah, it would be very interesting what he said about the Wheat Pool and SARM.

Mr. Speaker, the great Liberal Party, the great defenders of the open market, the great defenders of free enterprise are now supporting a co-operative, the institution they fought for all their lives to destroy, the concepts of orderly marketing, the institutions they fought for all their lives to destroy, now they're supporting them, because it is politically opportune to support them. But, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at what the Wheat Pool thinks of Liberals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** In November the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool put forth their policy position in regard to the federal Liberals and this I would think applies to the provincial Liberals as well. The meeting passed the resolution asking that Otto Lang be replaced as Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

1

**MR. GROSS:** It supported the Wheat Board as the sole marketing agency for western Canadian wheat, oats, barley, rape seed and flax seed. But, J. R. Warrington said he was putting it mildly to say that there is widespread anxiety about Mr. Lang's actions and I would think that applies to the Liberal Party, Ottawa or Saskatchewan.

March 25, 1975

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very obvious that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has very little love for the Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MP. GROSS:** The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has had very little love for the Liberal Party at any time in history. But now with this new affectionate lover of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, let's look at what the Liberal Party provincially, we've heard of what the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool thinks about the Liberal Party federally, let's hear what the Liberal Party thinks about the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool when they are not in the situation.

Let's go back a bit in history to last fall to the Liberal policy setting convention. We find a very interesting quote and I quote from their own policy statement, the policy statement No. 10 on agriculture and rural Saskatchewan. This is the Liberal Party. Here's what the Liberal Party thinks of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Now get it right, now they're saying they like the Wheat Pool, they like the stand the Wheat Pool has taken, they figure that's their stand in an election, that's the one they're going to support. But what do they say in convention, when they got to a convention. They sing a different tune, fellows.

Resolution 10, now I'm going to read this very carefully and I hope Members opposite listen very carefully to their own resolution.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Go ahead brother, read it.

**MR. GROSS:**

Support for Otto Lang. Whereas the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool at its last annual meeting demanded that the Honorable Otto Lang relinquish responsibility for the Canadian Wheat Board and whereas this demand is completely unjustified and does not represent the view of the majority of people in Saskatchewan, Otto Lang is now representing all people in Saskatchewan.

Here is the clincher, fellows:

Be it resolved that this meeting go on record as unanimously, (not by vote but every one of them supporting the efforts of Otto Lang, Minister) supporting the efforts of the Honorable Otto Lang in his role as Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, it's on record, it's on record that the Saskatchewan Liberals support Otto Lang and the federal Liberals right down the line in agriculture policies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is running . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! I think a little more order would help.

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, it is clear to see that the Liberal Party is running scared, is weaselling, and is scared of the issue of rail line abandonment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** It's scared of the issue of Crow's Nest rates and in no way do they want to debate that issue in the country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, being a young politician as I am . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** . . . and being the first time in the Legislature . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! He's talking to the Member for Lumsden and will he remain quiet above all when he's not in his own seat.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying that coming into politics at an early age you don't have the experience that older Members have, but you always hear the public talking about politicians and what terrible creatures they are and I can start to appreciate that kind of comment, particularly when I see politicians state changes in their positions, changing their positions on very important key issues, key issues that affect every person in the Province of Saskatchewan and even their own constituents, changing positions that are not consistent with their party policy because it is now politically wise and I politically opportune to do that. And, Mr. Speaker, this issue in particular makes it very abundantly clear and should make it abundantly clear to everybody why people hate politicians and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, Liberals are going to pay for it with blood in terms of their misrepresentation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker . . . that's right. Farmers in history have sweated, sweated long and hard to build the kind of grain-handling and transportation system we have today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Fifty hard years went into the struggle for the Wheat Pool by honest, sincere people. Hard fought years that established the country elevator system as we know it today. A long hard fight put up to establish rail branch lines to service those points. Hard work went into this, Mr. Speaker, to establish communities, schools, hospitals and churches and now, today, that all stands to be lost. It stands all to be lost if we support the philosophy of the Liberal Party. Their philosophy is that we need a few huge large corporations to farm the

March 25, 1975

prairie landscape and replace the present family farming system.

It is their plan to create this through the destruction and erosion of the present transportation and grain-handling system. By doing this they will make it physically and financially impossible for farmers to deliver their grain.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. The problem is that Liberals are committed to destroy the family farm in favor of a different farming structure, namely a corporate farming structure.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GROSS:** Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I can only say that once branch lines are torn up they will not be replaced. Once communities are torn up they will be very hard to replace. But, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan want to make sure that this does not take place, there's only one alternative left to them. The only alternative that I can see clearly is to join the fight with the New Democratic Party, to join in the fight with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, to join in the fight with the National Farmers Union to ensure that rail line abandonment does not become a fact.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A. R. GUY:** (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, I think that the key statement that was made by the previous speaker was when he said that he was a young politician. I suggest he's a young politician now and I suggest he will retire young.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** The fact that he is a young politician of course, is why he doesn't understand the facts in the Province of Saskatchewan as they are in the record books of this province.

Farmers today, you know, aren't really concerned about 20 years down in the future or 30 years down in the future, they are interested about what happened in the past and what's happening today and they look at the record of the political parties over the years and they're looking very hard at the record of the NDP. And the young politician says that it's going to be an issue in the provincial election and it probably will be because today farmers are asking who has closed down railroads in the past because this, you know, this is the key of their thinking today because they know, they know from experience that they have to go by the record of a political party. No use going for the promises. They found that out when they elected the NDP in '44 and in '71. You don't buy the promises that are being made during a campaign.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** You buy the record. You buy the record and that's why they kicked them out in '64 because the record was poor. That's why they're going to be kicked out in '75 because the record is poor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** The reason we went in '71, they just didn't understand ours that's all.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** However, you know, the young politician said, we're going around saying that the NDP want to abandon branch lines. The farmers are believing it today because they know that it was under the NDP Government that the only rail lines in this province that were ever abandoned, that it was done then.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** And then the young politician says well, the Liberal Government wanted to abandon the lines. But the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan know again when they look at the record there hasn't been one rail line abandoned under a Federal Liberal Government. It was abandoned under the Conservatives, so the record is very clear and this is why the farmers are concerned today. There never was a rail line abandoned by the Liberals, federally or provincially so they're not concerned about our record.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** But I'll tell you they are concerned about the record of the NDP Government because they have abandoned rail lines and they're saying to themselves, if the NDP could abandon rail lines in 1971 and do nothing to help them, there's nothing to say that in 1975 they won't also participate in trying to get some rail lines abandoned.

The Premier says, oh, oh. Well, I'm glad he said oh, oh, because I want to read him a little article. I want to read him a little article if he can understand it from the mayor of Windthorst. He was talking about the fact Windthorst was on the line that had been abandoned by the NDP and the Conservative Governments, and one of the members of the committee in 1960 that was trying so hard to have the rail lines saved when there was a Conservative Government in Ottawa and an NDP Government in Saskatchewan said, Clint Sundstrom of Kennedy, an active railway retention committee member said, "we recall with a scornful laugh who the provincial government was that gave us a lot of lip service but very little help." The Federal Government was too busy and again who was the provincial government?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Tell us!

**MR. GUY:** Our friends over there. In fact I'll tell you the present Premier of the province was a part of the government at that time. 1961, 1960, certainly it was and even before when he came to find his way from Halifax, Nova Scotia into the arms of the socialist government of Saskatchewan. He was part, in fact I think he was on the transportation committee here in Saskatchewan, during the years of 1959 and '60. In fact he played a very important role in seeing that that government didn't do anything to save the rail lines in Saskatchewan.

March 25, 1975

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** Then, you know it was interesting this gentleman went on and he said he was comparing the committee's attempts in 1960 with the same fight in 1940 which successfully averted the abandonment, perhaps were favored in 1940 but both governments couldn't have cared less in 1960.

Let's look at who the governments were in 1940. In 1940 there was a Provincial Liberal Government and there was a Federal Liberal Government and that line was saved. The committee as successful because the Liberal Party in Canada and in the province had some sympathy for these towns. But, oh, it was a different story in 1961 because both governments had changed. There was a Conservative Government in Ottawa and an NDP Government in Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Shame, shame!

**MR. GUY:** And that's why the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan are concerned today, because they go from the track record of that Government. Then the gentleman who knows from experience went on to say - what amuses me today is the fact that the parties now against rail line abandonment gave us no help when we were fighting. Where were they when we needed them? That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the people of Saskatchewan are saying today. The record is clear. The Conservatives and the NDP are the abandoners, the Liberal Party, provincially and federally will save the lines.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GUY:** I would just say to the young politician when he said that when the lines are torn up they will never be replaced certainly should know because his Government tore the line up through Windthorst and it's never been replaced. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any question that the farmers today in Saskatchewan are concerned because of the record of the Blakeney Government, when they were the government before they had not saved the rail lines for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I support our Member's Motion.

**MR. E. OWENS:** (Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I wasn't really planning on saying very much but as a precedent has just been set by the last speaker, he didn't say very much either so maybe I can have a few words.

I'd like to refer, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to a couple of remarks made by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) when he spoke on this same Resolution on March 12th I guess it was. The sad part of it is that I have to agree with these two statements.

The first one, he says 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," and I'm afraid very much, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are afraid of, that the national government in Ottawa will make the decision.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. OWENS:** One more quote, he was referring back to an amendment he had made to a previous resolution and he said, "I introduce an amendment to the resolution proposed by the Attorney General, 'strictly on a political basis'." I'm quite sure that that quite frequently happens from over there. It's in the records, Mr. Speaker, if they want to read it. That's the way it reads to me.

Mr. Speaker, the rail line abandonment is a cause of grave concern for our people and even the areas that are least affected can foresee the calamitous effect the abandonment of the services to such an extent would have on our western way of life. The freeze must continue as proposed in this Resolution and abandonment allowed only after extensive study and consultation with the communities affected.

Rail line abandonment cannot be left as a prerogative of the railway companies. Rail line abandonment, just what does that subject mean today?

A few years ago rail abandonment was just that, folding up of a few rail lines that could be proved by the railroad to be unprofitable to their operations. Today abandonment includes many things, all of them affecting rail line operating costs and hence profits to the companies, but more important, affecting the operating costs of western agriculture and the very life of our total western economy.

To rationally consider rail line change, however it is accomplished, we must also consider the various and sundry side issues which include: inland terminals, high through-put elevators, variable elevator handling charges, moving grain by truck transport, federal feed grains policy, the proposed scrapping of the statutory Crow's Nest freight rates to be replaced with a "pot of gold" with, as yet, no definite distribution policy and also the "bottleneck" at export points.

A program that was proposed to increase the efficiency of the movement of grain, has grown into a mixed up jumble to change completely the service provided by the rail line companies to western Canada and particularly the western grain growers. The main purpose behind the movement is to create an operation that will be profitable to the CN and CPR. The provision of a service to western agriculture, at a price the agricultural economy can afford, seems to be of no concern to the planners, if that is the proper name for them.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that it is a concern to the farmers of Saskatchewan, to the grain growers of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan have been apathetic and slow getting into action, but I now sense a rising groundswell of concern. Farmers are gathering in small groups, assessing and discussing the situation as they hear it and see it, and realize the effect that drastic changes will have on their farming operations and future livelihood. Contrary to the belief of some people, farmers are smart and competent operators, prudent businessmen who do not buy a box of goodies without first knowing what the goodies are.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

March 25, 1975

**MR. OWENS:** I hope they do organize, I hope they do make themselves heard, I hope they meet with the planners and in their usual forthright manner enunciate their proposals as it pertains to present and future grain movement and how the efficiency of that operation affects future farm viability, in essence, the future economy of not only western agriculture but western Canada.

The railroad companies built the rail lines, where in their judgement at that time, they hoped to garner business and to make a profit on the hauling of farm produce. They designed the pattern of the grain delivery system we have now. If, in their enthusiasm for potential gains, they lost sight of efficiency, is that sufficient cause to load an unbearable burden of unnecessary and expensive change on users of the service today and tomorrow?

Certainly there must be change, the majority will agree. The question is, how much and where and who will make the decisions?

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, the extent of change and the effect of the change as suggested by the railroad for the constituency of Elrose, the area of the province I happen to represent. Whether other constituencies will be affected to as great an extent is questionable.

Elrose constituency contains one of the finest and largest grain growing areas in Saskatchewan, producing on a yearly basis approximately 25 million bushels of grain. Proposed rail line long term abandonment would remove the N line from Eston and Macrorie, the branch line from Eston to White Bear, the branch from Conquest through Macrorie to Beechy, the CP from Milden to McMorran and the branch to Matador. Mr. Speaker, this proposal would remove completely all the rail lines in the constituency, leaving the only choice of delivery points serviced by a rail line at Swift Current to the South and the Rosetown, Saskatoon, Kindersley line to the North, and the CPR from Rosetown to Outlook.

I am concerned, as are all Elrose constituents, about the delivery of 25 million bushels of grain. If the proposed abandonment were allowed this 25 million bushels of grain would have to be hauled a conservative average of 30 miles more than it is today. That is a very conservative average, Mr. Speaker, 30 miles. At the lowest possible hauling rates, this would cost farmers in the Elrose constituency at least \$2.5 million for delivery costs alone at today's prices. We must also consider such other costs as larger and more costly farm trucks and the building and maintenance of roads. One of the unanswered questions in my mind is, would the subsidy of approximately 12 million now being paid to the railroad companies for lines in the constituency be made available to the rural municipalities affected or the Provincial Government for the construction and upkeep of the necessary network of roads for the delivery of this grain? I am very sure I know the answer. Speaking of costs and hauling, Mr. Speaker, the movement of grain in Elrose, what kind of dollars would we be talking about? Twenty-five million bushels of grain would require approximately 3,000 truck loads with 900 bushel capacity. Damage to roads was demonstrated last fall by the actual use of a road at Yellow Creek where 90,000 bushels of grain was moved by 109 truck loads on an oil surfaced road. The repair cost to that road was \$2,072 per mile or \$19 per load;

3,000 truck loads with \$19 per mile, \$57,000 per mile. Have we any idea what the cost would be? I am afraid not.

Can you understand, Mr. Speaker, my concern when I see such astronomical costs for just one small area and for just one aspect of the proposed change? What will be the outcome of the variable handling charges that are now permissible for elevator companies to impose at various delivery points? We have been told that the closing of rail lines will depend on the use made by the producer. Elevator companies working in conjunction with the railroad could, by substantially increasing handling charges on a particular line, make it very unattractive as a delivery point, almost forcing the grower to haul a longer distance to save several cents per bushel. The resulting nouns by the producer would be shown as justification for folding up the rails.

Inland terminals are, in my mind, designed for this purpose, Mr. Speaker. The myth that they are tremendously more efficient is a strong selling point. I, personally, must support the Wheat Pool proposal of high through-put elevators, spaced to keep hauling distance at a reasonable minimum. But here, Mr. Speaker, is the crunch. An elevator company must know the future plan of rail line service before any definite construction program can be forecast. Rail abandonment has been bandied about for long enough, it is past time for action. Not action to tear up rail lines, but action to bring in a plan - a rational plan that could be accepted by reasonable people. I believe the first step should be the nationalization of the railway systems in Canada and then use that system to provide a service to the people of Canada instead of the present policy of profit to the railroads with no concern about service.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. OWENS:** Another storm cloud threatening to harass western agriculture has appeared on the horizon and this is a black one. I refer, of course, to the Hon. Otto Lang's announced proposal to scuttle the Crow's Nest freight rates, the last hope for western producers. Scuttle the last piece of legislation that provides any protection for grain producers, in exchange for what? In exchange for an escalation in freight charges to a point that could bankrupt agriculture on the one hand and pour millions of dollars into the coffers of the transportation companies on the other. Reference has been made to the provision of some type of fund to compensate for the extra costs for moving grain. No definite promise as to what the recompense might be. No indication as to how or on what basis a farmer could qualify. No assurance about anything - merely a Liberal promise. Mr. Speaker, does Ottawa really believe western Canada is prepared to accept such non-committal promises without a fight?

Rail line abandonment proposals, variable elevator handling charges, inland terminals creating longer delivery distances, the scuttling of the Crow's Nest rates, the prospect of building and maintaining a road system for the movement of millions of bushels of grain are some of the gigantic decisions being thrust upon the farm sector of our economy. The answer to these decisions will have a deciding factor on the future of agriculture in our province and in western Canada.

These massive proposals are the outcome of decisions made in the board rooms of our corporate society in the industrial

March 25, 1975

East and are designed totally and specifically for the benefit of the owners and shareholders of capitalist corporations.

Western institutions, such as the three prairie Wheat Pools, the Canadian Wheat Board and the affluence of the western farmers are posing a threat to their power structures. Backed by the Liberal administration in Ottawa and the commodity exchange in Winnipeg, we are witnessing a subtle movement to undermine our system of orderly marketing.

The first step was the foot-in-the-door act of the Federal Feed Grains Policy. The power-mongers are putting on the pressure for the profiteers. Western agriculture producers are reading the signs leading them to serfdom. Action is being generated as realization of their doom is surfacing. The farmer movement of 50 years ago, faced with a bleak future, created Wheat Pool grain-handling system and later the Wheat Board, in the face of tremendous odds.

Farmers of today are no less aggressive. With their combined support, this Government can further delay the rail line abandonment actions, until such time as a rational plan for grain-handling and transportation is devised. A plan that will provide a network of up-to-date facilities that service the needs of western agriculture at a price it can afford to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this Legislature to support this very important Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E. F. GARDNER:** (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, in listening to some of the Members opposite regarding the disappearing track record of the NDP, they talk about their track record but it's actually a disappearing track record. You know, my colleague spoke a few minutes ago about the railroad that was taken up in 1961, the Reston-Wolseley branch and I have lived on this branch line all my life. I was active at the time when we were trying to retain that railroad in 1961 and this was long before I was active in politics at all, but we had spoken to the government of the time and that was at NDP Government in Regina. They had a very callous and insensitive attitude as far as we were concerned. Their attitude then was, sorry boys, this is progress, this railroad has got to go and they did absolutely nothing to save our railroad, 120 miles of the Reston-Wolseley branch and the rail company came in with their equipment and just tore up the rails and abandoned those towns. The NDP Government in Regina at that time did absolutely nothing.

The people of this province are surely not going to forget that. They aren't going to forget also that the Liberal Government in Ottawa has continually deferred any abandonment at all. Every time there's an election we get the typical NDP scare tactic where they go around the province and talk about wholesale abandonment of rail lines.

You know, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) made a speech in this House a few days ago and he quoted line after line where there is a duplication of services. He mentioned more rail lines that had to go than any Liberal has in the past ten years, and it's all on the record of this Legislature.

I'm sure that everyone knows in this province that a vote for the NDP is a vote for a great number of these branch lines to go. Exactly the same as it was in 1961 and the people of this province are not going to be fooled by that.

You know, we had a candidate a few years ago, a federal candidate, and I'm sure he's familiar to some of the Members opposite, who campaigned on the fact that the Liberal Government was going to take out some railroads and this was a man by the name of Mr. Buck, and I'm sure that some of the Members opposite are acquainted with him. He went around, he had maps in all of our local papers and he wasn't even satisfied with some of the maps that had been printed by various researchers, he added a few lines of his own that he was threatening that would go, but it still didn't help him. Everybody knows what happened to him because down in our corner of the province you can't fool the people with an issue of that kind. They were there in 1961, they know that the only railroads that were ever taken out were taken out by the NDP Government and they know that that can happen again if they ever vote for them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. R. Romanow.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 6 - FAMILY INCOME PLAN**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. H. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):

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.

**MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY:** (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks the Federal Government to follow the leadership of this Provincial Government in setting out appropriate work incentives in future income programs. I certainly feel this is in order because this Government's Family Income Plan has been hailed throughout all of North America as being bold, imaginative and a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen headlines from newspapers throughout all of North America attesting to this. Surely . . .

**MR. STEUART:** Where?

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** I would show you if the Hon. Member could read. I would certainly show you. It is obvious that some of you can't write.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen headlines from newspapers attesting to this, as I said before. Surely this plan could be the basis on which the Federal Government could implement a realistic income plan for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I believe income inequity to be one of the unnecessary curses (and I believe there are some other unnecessary curses also, and I happen to be looking at a few of them) of our economic system which maintains and perpetuates inequity. Our system is geared to vast amounts of purchasing power being

March 25, 1975

kept in the hands of a few. It is geared to the majority working and maintaining this group at the top of our so-called economic ladder.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Why?

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** Well, I have heard that you are there, Hon. Member. Well, you are some place. You are either at the bottom or the top and I don't think you are at the bottom.

It is geared so as to almost insulate from reality this group which fights with cold precision almost every move which would help redistribute purchasing power more equitably. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is government's moral obligation to do something about this state of affairs. I believe it is government's duty to set up programs to assist in the fair redistribution of purchasing power. To this end I would suggest a guaranteed Annual Income Plan with built-in work incentives – a plan similar to the one recommended by the Special Committee on Welfare.

But before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I believe most Canadians will agree that to work, if possible, is honorable. But I find it amusing to find that very often those very people who urge us to work, are the very ones who don't do very much of it themselves for a variety of reasons. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how do you expect Canadians to continue believing in the virtue of work when we hear about central Canadian politicians, friends of Members opposite, ensuring financial benefits to their friends without any work ever really being involved? Or, consider those who use legal loopholes to prey on citizens. Mr. Speaker, Canadians want to work, they take pride in it, but their patience is slowly being tried by those in high places who pay lip service to it, only.

**MR. STEUART:** I hate those high prices.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** You hate those high prices. You mean for the ads you are putting in the papers? Well, a few million dollars should certainly handle them on any weekend.

Mr. Speaker, the various programs we have in Canada today are modelled on the all or nothing concept. Generally speaking our citizens are either working or they are receiving assistance of some sort. Very seldom do we find many who are working and receiving assistance at the same time, except in Saskatchewan where, thanks to the Family Income Program there are many who are being financially assisted while working.

Mr. Speaker, it is this all or nothing concept which needs to be overhauled. I say this because I believe it does not take into account those who, through no fault of their own, are not able to compete on the job market with the majority of Canadians. It does not allow those who are handicapped the flexibility which is needed in those situations. Nor is the administrative red tape which one finds in such situations conducive to promoting the fullest potential of those citizens.

Mr. Speaker, an income plan for all Canadians, with built in work incentives, would do much to ensure that those who do not now have the opportunity of contributing to society, would be

able to do so in a manner befitting their particular situations.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to spend a little time on why I feel there should be an income support plan covering all of Canada an income support plan, I believe, that should be handled by the Federal Government.

It is because I believe Canada can afford such a plan, call it what you like. I believe the cost of such a plan, which I prefer to call a Guaranteed Annual Income, would cost little, if any more, than the total cost of all the social security plans we now have in Canada. And this is particularly true if one considers the tremendous waste we now have from a duplication of services offered by the various provincial governments and the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, such a plan would provide untold benefits to countless Canadians. In the first place, it would provide the same security the various other plans now provide. It would allow flexibility insofar as work is concerned, particularly, as I mentioned before, to the disadvantaged. In addition to this, such a plan would allow the disadvantaged more easily to get into the mainstream of the economic life of Canada. It would also more equitably redistribute purchasing power with beneficial results for all Canadians, particularly the recipients of such purchasing power and the economic community.

Mr. Speaker, a Guaranteed Annual Income Plan with built-in work incentives is not out of reach for Canada. And when I hear Canadians say the cost would be prohibitive, I have only to remind myself that is exactly what was said when other programs, mostly New Democratic, were about to be introduced – programs like medicare, old age security and a host of others too numerous to mention here.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the Federal Government's commitment to seriously consider a guaranteed annual income plan with built-in incentives. I am also aware of a pilot project relative to this plan now under way in Manitoba. My only hope is that should the Federal Government decide the plan to have much merit, it will not give it low priority because it might not have the glamour and overwhelming public support that other plans have.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Federal Government to once again follow Saskatchewan's lead in implementing a comprehensive income plan with appropriate built-in work incentives.

I fully support the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, the intent of which I am aware. I mention this last point because I believe a printing error has been made. Therefore, I wish to propose an amendment to correct this error.

I move, seconded by Mr. Owens, that Resolution No. 6 be amended by striking out all words following "discrimination" and the following substituted thereto:

On the basis of disability or employability.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY:** (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this matter in a very few days and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:20 o'clock p.m.