

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Eighteenth Legislature
18th Day

Tuesday, December 9, 1975.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

STATEMENT

Oral Question Period

MR. SPEAKER:— Before the Orders of the day I should like to make a statement. Before the Orders of the Day yesterday two Points of Order were raised regarding the oral question period.

The first Point of Order was to the effect that only Opposition Members can ask oral questions. The two books on parliamentary procedures, Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice and Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms" both outline the oral question period by referring to Members and Cabinet Ministers. No distinction has been made between Government and Opposition Private Members.

All Hon. Members will agree that it has been a long standing practice of this Assembly that all Private Members can ask the Cabinet Ministers questions in the Committee of Finance or in the Committee of the Whole or can ask oral questions before the Orders of the Day. Mention was made yesterday to the fact that a previous ruling from the Chair restricted the right of Government Private Members to ask oral questions. I have checked the records and can find no such ruling.

I refer all Hon. Members to pages 72 and 73 of the Debates and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1974-75, whereby Mr. Speaker, confirmed the practice that all Private Members have the right to question Cabinet Ministers. I would agree that Government Private Members infrequently ask questions during the oral question period but under the practices of this Assembly it is the right of any Private Member to ask oral questions before the Orders of the Day. All oral questions by Private Members will be counted as part of the four allowed per day.

The second Point of Order which was raised yesterday, sought clarification on supplementary questions. The Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) asked the Government a question during the oral question period. Upon receiving a reply the same Member rose and asked a further question on a different matter. The second question was interpreted by me as being a separate question and not a supplementary. I remind all Members that a supplementary question must be precise and to the point and is raised to seek clarification of the answer to an original question. Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, page 357:

If a Member rises under the guise of asking a supplementary question when the second question does not deal with the answer to the original question, it, therefore, must be considered to be a new question and not a supplementary question. Henceforth this second question will not

be permitted until other Members' questions are dealt with provided there is room for further questions.

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to your ruling, just to clarify one aspect of it. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) rose yesterday to point out this practice about Opposition Members and I'm afraid he rose on my advice which later turned out to be incorrect. I wish to apologize to the Leader of the Opposition for that.

The situation I was thinking of, Mr. Speaker, arose I believe last year when we had the Member for Saskatoon University, I believe, Mr. Richards, on several occasions he rose to ask questions just before the Orders of the Day as an Opposition Member and I think the practice arose at that time, (we only had three questions at that time) that when Mr. Richards did ask a question, by leave, the Opposition was allowed to ask another question. This appeared in the Debates and Proceedings and I believe it involved my present desk mate, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). That is, Mr. Richards asked the third question, Mr. Wiebe then rose to ask a question and at that time Speaker Dewhurst ruled him out of order, the Government then allowed Mr. Wiebe to ask the question by leave, so that the three questions were there for the official Opposition. I hope, Mr. Speaker, we'll certainly abide by your ruling, but I hope that the Government will, if they practice in the future of having their backbenchers ask questions of the Ministers that at the very least they will allow us to have four questions in the period before the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

Increase for Leased Lands

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):— Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Is it true, Mr. Minister, that a letter from the Land Branch has gone to lease holders throughout the province under the signature of Mr. Wright, advising them that as of January 1st the hard-pressed cattle producer in the province will be requested to pay a fantastic increase in all leased lands which he now holds through the Department of Agriculture? I also should like to ask the Minister what is the percentage of the increase and why does this Government feel at this time that it is necessary to again kick the cattle industry in the teeth when they're down?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):— Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the letter that the Member refers to. I certainly will be looking into that and I will let him know tomorrow.

Priority List for Highways

MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current):— Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). Does the Department of Highways have a priority list for the construction and maintenance of highways in the province?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways):— Well, that's a fairly simple question which requires a fairly detailed answer. Certainly the Department of Highways has a long forward look at the total highway system throughout the province and it would be strange if it were otherwise. However, if you are asking me if there is a detailed and specified plan that highways x, y and z will be constructed at a certain time during a certain year, the answer is No. And for obvious reasons the answer is No, because there are several conditions that could develop. Excessive rainfall in one area could almost be prohibitive to building roads in any certain year or likewise that plans might have to change in maintenance because of excessive rainfall and bad weather conditions that these roads might fall into disrepair sooner than others which were estimated to be in need of repair earlier. With the extensive highway system that we have in this province I say it is unpredictable to say just exactly which highway shall be built and what the program will be each year. Secondly, it depends a great deal on current budgets. The budget will determine a great deal as to what the programs and priorities will be.

MR. HAM:— I wonder if the Minister would consider providing this House with a program or the policies in that regard then?

MR. KRAMER:— I would think you might put the question on the Order Paper and I would take it under advisement.

Premier's Visit to New York

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— I see the Premier is back from New York. I hope he didn't give Abe Beame the mayor of New York any of his keen financial advice, they have enough trouble down there all by themselves.

However, I should like to direct a question regarding the Premier's visit to New York. Is it a fact that there was what I might call an advance guard of people who work for the Government, civil servants or advisors to the Government, people like Morley Meiklejohn or people involved in the financial matters for the Government or, as I say, advises the Government, who went to New York sometime prior to the Premier's visit to test the wind, to ascertain what the attitude would be of the financial circles in New York towards the loaning by way of great loan or debenture issue to the Government of Saskatchewan or guaranteed by the Government of Saskatchewan, for the purposes of taking over a part or all of the potash industry? If so, what kind of money, what are the outside limits of the kind of money they were talking about, roughly what kinds of costs, interest rate or total costs of the money. I recognize you can't say the exact interest rate until you borrow money or float a debenture but I'm sure that if advice were given to them or to you the question of cost would also come up. I wonder if you could tell us?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Hon. Member's question, strictly speaking is No. No group went for the purpose outlined.

I can perhaps give a little more lengthy answer. There has been speculation that our visit to New York was for the purpose of raising money for potash acquisitions or to promote the specific public issue of Saskatchewan debentures. That is not accurate. I have said both in print and verbally to the newsmen that that is not accurate and has not in fact been the case.

Some time earlier this year, it seemed to us that our capital requirements would be larger than had previously been the case. At that time, the thought was that those might or might not involve some activities in potash, whether it be a mine or an acquisition. The mine was the thought at that time as far as there was a thought. But, leaving aside all potash acquisitions, it would still have been true with respect to power, telephones and other capital needs. In order that we might have the best information on which to make judgments we wish to open up our options with respect to capital financing. One of the important capital markets of the world is the United States public market. Other provinces have been borrowing regularly in that market. Saskatchewan has not borrowed in the United States public market for a very long time. I don't know when the last time was, but certainly not for 40 years. Over the years we have occasionally borrowed privately in the United States as some people will know, but not on the public market. In order to establish this option, earlier this year officials of the Department of Finance held preliminary talks on public issue procedures with a number of prominent United States financial houses and the bond rating companies. Our visit to New York last week was for the purpose of continuing these talks. I had a dangling invitation from the Canadian Society of New York to speak on some occasion when I was down there and it seemed appropriate to accept that invitation at the same time, because the Canadian Society is a group which includes senior members of the United States' financial and business community who come to the meetings as guests of the Canadian bankers and bond dealers.

At the Canadian Society Dinner, I was joined at the head table by Mr. Saul Rae the Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Bruce Rankin, the Canadian Consul General in New York. Mr. Rankin was good enough to thank the speaker. Following that we met with a number of financial people. I had a dinner hosted by one of the large investment bankers in New York and we also met with representatives of the two main bond rating services. That is what I did in New York. I admit, even before he raises his point, to the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) that this answer is extended. That is what I did. I hope I made clear that the purpose was not to go down there to the United States to raise a specific sum of money, not to go down there to promote a particular issue but to open up the possibility, to put it no higher than that, of going to the United States market for funds I would expect we would pay rates equivalent to that paid by other Canadian provinces. I have no reason to believe otherwise.

MR. STEUART:— A supplementary question. I'm not sure if I caught the kind of invitation he said he had, dangling invitation. One is tempted to feel that some of the U.S. capitalists might have been interested in dangling him on the end of a rope, but I'm not sure what that means, a dangling invitation.

I appreciate the Premier's itinerary of his social visit to New York but what I should like to know then, you did not

discuss with anyone, or you are not prepared to inform this House of any outside limits - I understood there were some press reports talking about amounts of \$300 million or \$100 million or some vast sums of money. I should like to know exactly if you did discuss some outside limits? We were having a great deal of difficulty in your absence and I hope this will be cleared up now that you are here, finding out how big a poke you are asking us to buy in this potash situation. We might be able to clear that up now. And when exactly did those officials visit New York, at what time earlier this year, before or after the election?

MR. BLAKENEY:— The answer to the latter question is that I do not know. Offhand, I don't know when they were down. The answer to the former question is, No, I did not discuss any sums of money, any outside limits or any sums of money. There were press reports which referred to various figures. I saw one which had \$100 million, another one which had \$200 million. Wherever these figures were obtained they were not obtained from me and I did not discuss any particular sums of money with any particular banker, or investment house or anyone else.

MR. STEUART:— A supplementary question about the visit by the officials. Surely you are aware if it was before the election last June or after the election. Surely you can pin it down. You don't have that many visits by officials to New York, if you are puzzled by that.

MR. BLAKENEY:— No, I think I can't tell you that. I suspect it was after the election but . . . No, I simply don't know. The possibility of needing extra money for Poplar River and others was there. I tell this House what I suspect the House already knew, that we were also considering the possibility of a potash mine operated by the Government of Saskatchewan which would have involved, and might yet involve expenditure of very large sums of money. And a very large sum of money is the figure. The possibility of substantial capital requirements was certainly in our minds many months ago. The question of when we wish to open up the option of the United States public market, I frankly don't know when they went down there.

Just so I will forestall any questions by Members opposite, I was in Britain this summer, and I discussed with some bankers in Britain the possibility of opening up markets in the United Kingdom and Europe for money. These discussions were also in very general terms. That is the nature of our pursuit of possible areas for raising money up until, I believe, the fall when we began to pursue specific amounts in the Canadian market and elsewhere.

Negotiations Re Potash Industry Becoming Crown Corporation

MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):— I have a question the general gist of which I put to the Attorney General last Thursday and it has to do with the state of negotiations between the province and the Federal Government in regard to the potash industry becoming a Crown corporation. At that time I received an answer to the effect that there were no negotiations and none expected. I wonder in

the light of the recent statement by the Federal Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Macdonald, if I could put the question again and ask the Attorney General what contacts have been made by the Saskatchewan Government with regard to negotiations?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I would repeat to the Member again that certainly no contact has been made to my department, that is perhaps not particularly unusual. I am advised by my colleagues, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) and others that we have not received any formal communication from the Minister of Finance of Canada or anybody else from Ottawa on this matter.

The question of comments and the questions that are raised here basically stem from news reports of speeches that are made at such functions as the Liberal Party convention and the like. Notwithstanding the desire of my friend, we don't yet view that as a formal communication to negotiate or discuss.

MR. PENNER:— I am not surprised at the response, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder if I could ask a supplementary. If you do not pay any income tax are you prepared to pay the equivalent of an income tax?

MR. ROMANOW:— I think again, Mr. Speaker, as I have said to this House before and I repeat again, this is a very speculative question. I think I can tell the Members that we feel, certainly I feel, that our legal position in a matter of straight law is sound. We have predicated our policy in other actions based on that sound legal position and we are proceeding. We have not received any communications or requests from anyone to the contrary. I suppose that the answer to the question really is, we have to wait and see what, if any communications are made to us by federal authorities.

MR. PENNER:— Second supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Since there is obviously a difference of opinion between where the province sits on the matter and where the Federal Government sits on the matter, I wonder if the Government is prepared to put the matter of passing this legislation aside until negotiations are complete and until the implications of these negotiations are clear?

MR. ROMANOW:— I think I can answer that in a very short phrase by saying, No, it is not the intention of the Government to put aside Bill 1 or Bill 2. For us to do so based on as I say nothing more concrete than newspaper reports or statements made to this House by Hon. Members opposite would be wrong. In any event, if any such formal request was made, it would not be the basis upon which these Bills should be postponed. Policy decision that is taken by the Government will be there regardless of any subsequent requests for negotiations or discussions which the Federal Government may or may not ask us. As I said earlier, I believe it was in response to some questioning a couple of days ago we are not adverse to the idea of discussing if such a matter is to be brought about, but as of this date there is none. As I say again, we think we are proceeding on sound, legal and moral political footing, and are going to continue to do so, notwithstanding the continued opposition of the Liberal Party opposite.

Limit On Money For Expropriation Of Potash

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview):— Mr. Speaker, I wonder before the Orders of the Day in view of the fact that the Premier has been unavoidably absent from the House for the last few days - I am not suggesting there is anything wrong with him being absent - in view of the fact that he was absent, and there are a number of questions that we would like to ask about potash and other things, would he be prepared to answer another question and perhaps a supplementary?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MALONE:— My question then, Mr. Speaker, is: in view of the fact that you have now had an opportunity to discuss with the financiers in New York, the public market or the private sector, (I am not sure I understand the difference) in view of the fact that you have been down there and now have some knowledge of the availability of money in New York, and I take it from your earlier remarks some knowledge of the availability of money in the United Kingdom, are you prepared at this stage to give us in the Opposition an approximate outside limit as to how much money the Government is prepared to risk or to spend in its efforts to comply with the provisions of Bill 1, that is, the expropriation of the potash companies?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I think I have on a number of occasions indicated what we think the financial framework is. I think that there are many variables, and accordingly one can not be positive. But I have indicated that I thought that the obligation which might be incurred would fall within the range of \$500 million to \$1 billion. That figure I have given. Clearly there are a good number of variables depending upon the assets which are acquired and the terms on which they are acquired, more particularly whether it is cash or part cash and whether or not potash is to be part of the payment price. At this time I think that is as accurate as I can be. I hope that will be of assistance to the Hon. Member.

MR. MALONE:— A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There certainly is a lot of room between \$500 million and \$1 billion as I am sure the Premier will acknowledge. My supplementary question is: are you prepared or are you prepared to have the Attorney General when Bill 2 reaches committee stage propose a House amendment to set a limit on the borrowing power of the company and of the province to \$1 billion (which is the position in all other bills dealing with Crown corporations) that is, an outside limit is set in the Bill?

MR. BLAKENEY:— I am not prepared to acknowledge the last point made by the Hon. Member, that all the other bills contain borrowing limits. I think that there are, in fact, a number of statutes which do not contain a borrowing limit. I think that the time for consideration of that is clearly in the committee, if the Bill gets to committee. I don't see any particular desire on the part of some Members opposite to get the Bill to committee. They seem to be more interested in debating what they consider to be the principle of the Bill

which is the creation of a statutory corporation out of an Order-in-Council corporation, I would have thought this was a principle which might have been grasped fairly quickly even by Members opposite. I think that the other points about limits are surely matters for committee and I think we can consider it then. I will certainly give no undertakings but we certainly will consider any representations made.

MR. MALONE:— A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I would be very interested to hear from the Premier what the Crown corporations are that don't have a limit on their borrowing capacity set out in the statute that creates them. But be that as it may, I am sure the Premier when he was the Provincial Treasurer became well aware of the contents of The Saskatchewan Loans Act and I am sure he is well aware that in that particular Bill which covers government borrowing and which covers borrowing by Crown corporations through other statutes, that the Bill clearly states that there must be an appropriation by the Legislature for the money that is to be raised. And I would suggest to the Premier if he is not familiar with that Act, that he has another look at it. I think he will agree with me that that Act clearly states that the sums of money must be appropriated by this Legislature. I would ask him to bear that in mind and comment at this time if he wishes to do.

MR. BLAKENEY:— I'm not sure what the Hon. Member is saying and obviously I have not looked at that statute for some years now, but my recollection of that is that there must be 'an' appropriation, not an appropriation in the amount that is borrowed. And I believe, and I stand ready to be corrected on this, relying on the memory of years back, that if there is an appropriation of \$10 for some purpose for which money can be borrowed under The Saskatchewan Loans Act, then \$100 million can be borrowed. You are not limited, I think, to the appropriation. That is my recollection of the way that Act works, but that would be subject to my recollection not being faulty.

AN HON. MEMBER:— . . . By supplementary!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Well, it may well be that one has to do it by supplementary although I am by no means sure of that. Those are not appropriations in the technical sense of the word. They are statutory appropriations and if they are not voted it doesn't really matter. I will look into that and take some advice from my financial people and see what comes from any further garnering of information I can get.

Unemployment Tripled Since September

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):— Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan has tripled between November, the actual unemployment not the seasonally adjusted figure, the actual unemployment rate has tripled since September in Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY:— No, I'm not. The figures which are before me suggest

that the figure is now 3.8 per cent for November. I think I have a September one here if I look at it. Yes, 1.3 so it has not quite tripled. May I say, as I have said on many other occasions, that I put no great stock in the single month's statistics. The statistical base on which Saskatchewan unemployment figures are calculated is unreliable from the point of view of a three-month or a six-month trend. Members of the press corps will have heard me give this little comment on many occasions and I give it . . .

MR. STEUART:— Only when the figures are against you!

MR. BLAKENEY:— No, I'm fairly cautious in that regard. When they are particularly low I want to make that point so that I can call it to my aid at a time when they are now extraordinarily high. They are up to 3.8 per cent which for a province, other than a Liberal province, I look at Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Oh, oh!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Oh, sorry, sorry. Well, there is Quebec at 7.2 per cent. I say that the rate at 3.8 per cent or seasonally adjusted at 4 per cent is higher than we would like to see it. I think it should be indicated that the labor force increased significantly from October to November, or at least by 1,000 which is an unusual increase during that time of the year. It strikes me that the figures, in order for them to prove anything, ought to be looked at over a period of two or three months.

MR. COLLVER:— A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier not agree that there are large numbers of unemployed citizens in Saskatchewan in November as compared to September and to what does the Premier attribute this increased unemployment besides the additional 1,000 that he has mentioned that has been included in the labor force?

MR. BLAKENEY:— One of the things which has been true has been the substantial influx of people into Saskatchewan and that continues apace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— I think that under those circumstances we are going to have some unemployment indicated by the figures.

MR. STEUART:— . . . Rush in and get seats for the adjusted unemployed!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Yes. But once again I think we would be unwise to put too much reliance on the single month figures. May I just indicate that in November 1974 the work force was said to be 360,000; in November 1975 it was said to be 373,000, an increase of 13,000 from November 1974 to November 1975. If you can say that each employee represents one other non-employee that would represent a population increase of 25,000, which simply hasn't

taken place. The increase is rapid but not that rapid and I suggest, therefore, that one of the figures is out a thousand or two and it makes a big difference in the unemployment figures.

MR. COLLVER:— A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier suggesting with this manipulation of figures that perhaps we are importing unemployed citizens into Saskatchewan. And secondly, would the Premier agree that perhaps a little more attention might be devoted to the unemployment situation in Saskatchewan vis-à-vis the potash issue.

MR. BLAKENEY:— First, I am not suggesting for one moment that Statistics Canada manipulates these figures. I want to reject that proposition right now. They do the best they can with a very small statistical base. The figures are not meant to be accurate to the extent of a thousand or two in 373,000, and if in fact this figure was not 373,000 but 370,000 then the number of unemployed would not be 14,000 as it is said to be, but 11,000. Then the unemployment figure would be about 2.8 per cent and not 3.8 per cent. These are very, very small adjustments which produce very large differences in the percentage figures. So I don't think there is any manipulation. I think that people are coming into this province because unemployment rates almost anywhere else are considerably higher than here. I think that it is possible that there has been a modest increase in unemployment. This is not surprising in November when people get seasonal farm work in October and are no longer working at that in November. That is not at all unusual but I think that nothing suggests that any heroic measures are necessary by the Government at this time with unemployment rates running at well under 4 per cent actually, or only 4 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis. Those are figures which almost any other province would envy.

STATEMENT

Apology Re News Release In Swift Current Sun

MR. HAM:— I would like to apologize to this House and particularly to the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) for any inconvenience or embarrassment that I may have caused him or the House in my statement to the Swift Current Sun last Tuesday, with regard to the statement on Bill 1. I should have used the words Throne Speech, not Bill 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 33

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

The names of all barristers and solicitors employed by the Government of Saskatchewan, its boards, commissions, corporations, and agencies during: (a) 1973, (b) 1974, (c) January 1, 1975 to June 1975.
(2) The names of all barristers and solicitors in private practice

retained by the Government of Saskatchewan, its boards, commissions, corporations and agencies for the calendar years 1973 and 1974, and from January 1, 1975, to June 30, 1975, and the sums paid to them for legal services rendered.

Perhaps I might make a comment or two with respect to the questions that I have asked. I have asked for two pieces of information. One is with respect to the number of lawyers engaged in the public service in Saskatchewan in the three-year period and the number of lawyers in private practice who have been engaged from time to time by the Government in each of 1973, 1974 and part of 1975.

I regard this information as routine kind of information. I was a bit surprised that the Attorney General made the return debatable, and assume from that that he would want to say something in opposition to giving us this kind of information. May I say if that's the Attorney General's intention, I'm not particularly interested in what this House may have done in 1948 or 1964 or 1971 or any other period. What I'm interested in is today and tomorrow with respect to the information we seek and in the practice of the House. I say to him that it's routine kind of information. There is no good reason to withhold it. It is not a question of public interest and may I remind him that the practice in the House of Commons very clearly, with information of this kind is to give it and give it readily. Many times in the couple of years I spent with the Department of Justice, we had questions of this kind on the Order Paper, very many of them, dozens upon dozens far more extensive than this. Those questions were answered always and answered readily because it was seen that this is the kind of information which people in government are fully entitled to get. There is no good reason to withhold it, whatever the practice may have been in the past, it's routine kind of information which we expect to have.

May I say if it is not forthcoming I will personally continue to press the point until we begin to get this kind of information. I hope the Attorney General will give it to us.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Hon. Member that there is no suggestion on our part that this information will not be supplied, that it will not be given. We have done so in the past and we think that it is a legitimate area for questioning. I'm not sure that the comments made by him respecting the practice in Ottawa, while I've not been in Ottawa, are as accurate as he would say, particularly as to the speed with which the answer is given. I happen to have seen one return which took some several months indeed to finally table in the House of Commons as a result of questions similar to this and I'm not attaching any blame to him or to his department when he was there at the time. It simply is that there is quite a bit of work involved. Because after all the question does ask for a list of all the lawyers who acted for the Government on boards, commissions, corporations and agencies and goes back two and one-half years and then asks for sums paid. You have to go and compute the individual accounts very frequently and so forth and it's not that simple to give.

The reason for the debatable and the reason for my request to adjourn, which I'll be making in a moment, is that I have not had an opportunity to examine this question and to discuss it with my department and to determine if it can be answered in this form. Very frequently a question is asked which if made into an answer or Order for Return is difficult to answer because of its particular wording. I want to have the chance to review this with the people in my department before deciding what tack to take.

I can tell the Member that we have in the past amended this to give answers to similar questions to those that are posed and also amended it to go back into the previous practices. While the Member may not be interested in what went on in previous practices before 1971, frequently in questions and answers it's to the advantage of all the Members of the House to compare the practices today as it was, to take an arbitrary period, say pre-1971. I think this is a very useful exercise very often. I'm not sure that's the case here. I recognize this to be a legitimate request for information. I see no difficulty in passing this and providing information as quickly as we can to the Member, but I want to have that opportunity of just checking with my department officials before I can agree to that, if I may put it in those terms. Accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2 - Rail Line Abandonment and Crow's Nest Rates

MR. J. L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North) moved, seconded by Mr. D. H. Lange (Bengough-Milestone):

That this Assembly requests: (1) that no railway lines be abandoned without full consideration of all economic and social costs involved; (2) that the Federal Government be required to maintain the statutory Crow's Nest rates for grain movements, in return for which the railways have been granted substantial concessions; and (3) that immediate steps be taken to compel the railway companies, either separately or through their joint efforts, to provide efficient rail service to Saskatchewan communities without unreasonable delays.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the basis of our rural and urban western Canada society has been built on the social relationship we have had with our neighbors. We have had to do this because of our scarcity of population and a real need of co-operation both socially and economically. In those early days, and even today, Mr. Speaker, we have a great dependency on our rail lines and a great amount of interdependence was and is still required to make our communities viable and economic for the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary that no abandonment be allowed until a comprehensive program of transportation and rationalization be developed, taking into consideration the roots of our communities and the social and economic effects of any abandonments. Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that in Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Advisory Council on Transportation

has been set up and developed which has as its main purpose to bring about a rail line rationalization which will take into consideration the social and economic benefits of each community and all those things that may affect a community if in fact rail line abandonment would be brought about.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary that we do not have a piecemeal abandonment because this could well mean there would be many errors made in that type of piecemeal abandonment and already our society and our country has been plagued by errors in our transportation system and we do not need any more of that at this time. Therefore, it behoves us to object most vigorously to any abandonment in our transportation system which will have adverse direct effects on our rural and urban communities.

To elaborate somewhat in the three areas of the motion, Mr. Speaker, before us, I should like to put on the record some thoughts I have and some observations made by other concerned citizens, regarding our transportation system.

Government, and transportation policy makers should know of the crucial role railroads play in the economy and that railroads are the most efficient and important mode of transportation. However, public policy continues biased against railroads with branch line and passenger train abandonment receiving support from some government, private and public sectors, even though the efficiency and effectiveness of railroads in conserving energy and minimizing environmental impact has been proven by many, many studies.

Government must assume the responsibility in this important field recognizing that public ownership is paramount in establishing an overall efficient transportation system encompassing railways, pipelines, airways and waterways.

Saskatchewan and Canada is currently saddled with a transportation policy and system that threatens the economic, social and political life of the country. One only has to look about our country and our province of Saskatchewan today to realize that the very fabric of our communities are being threatened by this piecemeal approach and by this type of situation that people are completely unfamiliar with and that is the piecemeal abandonment of many, many of our branch lines. The monopolistic providers of services are not interested in any broad social considerations with the Federal Government only restricting itself to economic efficiency. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that can be proven by many press reports, many, many statements by the Hon. Minister of Transport, the Federal Minister of Transport to the effect that he is not that concerned with the type of retention of the economic and social fabric of the communities, but only with that which affects the corporations themselves.

The rail industry has been almost totally neglected, despite growing obsolescence and long-standing inadequacies in public funds put into highways, pipelines, water and airways, little has been done in the maintenance and improvement of railway lines and equipment on those railway lines.

December 9, 1975

Rail transportation must be recognized as a primary instrument for the development of an adequate social and economic interest structure within the provinces and within Canada.

Railways are largely responsible for the decline of rail transportation services, as they deliberately and methodically neglected to keep up with technological changes in equipment and ancillary services. Only through their nationalization can public funds be justifiably used for research and development into new equipment and the resurgence of rail-passenger traffic. We can go into many, many areas, Mr. Speaker, where it has been proven beyond question that millions upon millions of dollars were used in research and development in every area except rail research and development. In the public interest and in the interest of the development of our transportation, the profit motive must be taken out of the major transportation networks.

The publicly owned CNR must be reappraised for its position in this role and I believe one can only see in the position that they have taken most recently that they are most interested in buying out foreign shipping lines than in trying to develop a merchant marine of our own in Canada, and also in the development of research of our own publicly owned railroad in Canada. I have said many times, Mr. Speaker, that it's high time the Canadian National Railroad was renationalized because it is not doing its job at this time and it has to be apprised of that fact.

The railways are more energy efficient than any other mode of transportation in both freight and passenger services. For each ton-mile of freight and for each passenger-mile carried railroads consume one-half to one-fifteenth as much fuel. Studies show railroads to be a staggering 14.7 times more efficient than trucks. Airplanes and automobiles are inefficient compared with buses and railroads for passenger movements. Trucks and airplanes are inefficient when compared with the pipelines, autoways and railroad movement of freight. With one gallon of gasoline railroads haul a ton of freight 200 miles; while trucks travel 48 miles and airplanes only 3.7 miles.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, while automobiles consumed 53.3 per cent of transportation energy, trucks consumed 21 per cent and air 7.5 per cent, railroads only consumed 3.3 per cent of all energy consumed by transportation modes. The railroads consumed less than 4 per cent of the energy, they moved more than 40 per cent of the inter-city freight. Other figures and examples all within the major urban quarters increase the importance of the energy efficient case for railroads.

In the first Arrow train, as an example, that we have any evidence and documentation for, Mr. Speaker, between Chicago and Detroit, 250 people were transported for a fuel expenditure less than that which would have been required for two Cadillacs in that distance between Chicago and Detroit.

Railroads haul passengers 2.5 times farther on each gallon of gas than automobiles and 5.7 times farther than airplanes.

The Boston and Maine Railroad, again, is an example: in 1972 it carried 4.1 million revenue tons of freight, more than 1 million truck trips would be required to move the same amount

of freight. If trucking were to undertake this task, 26.1 million additional gallons of fuel would be required, enough fuel oil to supply the annual electricity requirements of more than 40,000 households. For trucking to carry the daily freight of Northeast Railroad we require an additional 20,000 trucks per day, using at least 350 million additional gallons of diesel fuel a year.

Railroads, Mr. Speaker, produce four to six times less pollution and some 10 times less noise pollution as trucks and other highway vehicles. Jets emit 2.7 times more pollutants than high speed trains; private cars 27.3; buses 21.8 times as much as the diesel locomotive. Railroads provide the only logical means of satisfying transportation needs while achieving air quality goals at the same time.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, which many of us forget about and that has to do with land use, and which has to do with the motion that we have before us, insofar as the social and economic effects on the individual communities. The railroads and use of land should be recognized as far less than any other use of land. Railroads require seven times less land in fact, Mr. Speaker, per roadbed than highway freight. A billion tons of freight on an annual basis can be moved by rail on 4.7 square miles, while trucks require 34 square miles. And this is in an age, Mr. Speaker, where we are talking about trying to keep our agricultural land, trying to keep agricultural land for the benefit of the people and the development of the agricultural economy and quantities that we do need.

Land consumption becomes an important issue, especially in the major urban quarters with land values reaching as high as \$500,000 in certain areas, and we can use a comparison here in this area of exactly what it would cost to use that 34 square miles in order to bring that one billion tons of freight on that particular distance in this particular area.

Land consumption, Mr. Speaker, also becomes crucial when considering the cost to government of compensation and relocation of individuals and businesses in the path of a new right of way. Also to be considered is the tax revenue lost when homes and businesses are paved over with concrete. As the joint concerns of energy conservation and environmental protection continue to press hard on decision-makers, the overwhelming advantages that railroads provide in energy efficiency, air and noise pollution abatement and land use will need more careful consideration. And I'm suggesting these areas are not given the consideration which they should be given at this time, nor have they been given the consideration in the years gone by.

Mr. Speaker, the intention of the two major railways of Canada, Canadian Pacific and Canadian National, is to abandon some 5,525 miles of rail line in western Canada, of this mileage, at least 2,910 miles are located in Saskatchewan. If this massive scale of abandonment of rail lines should become a reality the consequences in tax dollars to the people of Saskatchewan to maintain roads for a grain gathering system would be disastrous. Such a massive program of abandonment would have dire social effects on some 94 communities each with a population of over 100 people, the direct loss of employment to elevator agents involved and the loss in tax revenues that have not as yet been estimated.

Both railways have been in the past, and still are, recipients of many millions of dollars of Federal Government taxes, this to maintain the buoyant economic position, which in turn provides a transportation system for Canada shared and paid for by all of Canada. Wholesale abandonment of branch lines is completely unrealistic and would involve heavy transfer of costs from the Federal Government to farmers, municipalities and the Provincial Government and would be particularly disastrous from a social point of view. There is an overwhelming advantage railroads provide in energy efficiency, air and noise pollution and land use, which in this particular regard is not being considered insofar as our social point of view is concerned.

Government must realize that railroads are the major carriers of a nation's freight and they are crucial to the nation's energy conservation and environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of grain handling and transportation is not only a matter of concern for farmers. If the rail system in the province is abandoned, as the railways have requested, the whole population of Saskatchewan will be directly and detrimentally affected. If rail line abandonment proceeds according to the railways' requests, a great many jobs in rural Saskatchewan will disappear as I have mentioned. These jobs now provide direct support for an even larger number of people. In some cases a particular employee may be able to transfer, but the job will disappear. Rural communities will lose those people who actually assist those communities to the greatest extent, and will suffer a severe blow. Farmers will have to haul their grain many thousands of extra miles by truck each year. Small farmers will be driven out of business by the cost involved. Our roads will need much more maintenance, as the result of much more heavy traffic. Saskatchewan taxpayers must pay for these roads and the municipalities affected know what that means. The amount of energy consumed to transport wheat will be greatly increased. Many more trucks, instead of one train, actually will be required, and the farmers will have to pay for the gas for those many, many more trucks and it will finally result in commercial trucking insofar as grain is concerned. Many of the small communities on these lines will disappear. The people will have to flock to the cities and again we have problems then competing for scarce jobs and scarcer homes or houses.

Mr. Speaker, the railways say they are losing money. And even if they are losing money hauling grain, the railways were originally given huge amounts of land, valuable mineral rights and so on, which I'll elaborate on in a few moments. These act as permanent subsidies to the railroads. Their corporate structure as a whole makes an incredible profit in the total amount of subsidies given to that particular corporate structure. Their permanent subsidies of land and mineral rights more than compensate them for the minor amounts that they may lose on that particular grain.

Mr. Speaker, rail line abandonment has no benefit for the people of Saskatchewan, the workers and the farmers; it does benefit the railway corporations and it does benefit multinational grain corporations such as Cargill, National, Bunge. Others like the farmer-owned co-ops will have to abandon their existing delivery systems and build new high throughput elevators. This will put them in the same position as the multinationals because the co-ops will lose the advantages of their fifty

years of constructive development for the benefit of those individual communities. And the hauling costs of their own members then will go up and of course then the only ones to benefit will be the multinationals like Cargill, Bunge and the National.

Rail line abandonment forces farmers especially towards the inland elevators that the multinationals are backing and in this irreversible trend the farmers will be caught in a cycle of ever-increasing costs for grain delivery, which will steadily eliminate all but the largest farm operator.

Mr. Speaker, an equally serious problem exists in the prairie provinces and especially Saskatchewan, as it pertains to the recent action taken by the Federal Cabinet and supported by the Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, and now the Minister of Transport. That Minister is forging ahead with plans to effectively eliminate thousands of miles of trackage in the prairies, supporting the building of private inland elevators, which will hasten the demise of small villages with farmers having to haul grain 100 to 150 miles to fill that particular capacity. It will increase the cost to all farmers, as their branch lines are abandoned, farmers will have no control on commercial truck rates with the increase in the price of gasoline and diesel fuel.

At the same time, the Hon. Minister of Transport, has suggested that we do have to take a look at the Crow's Nest Pass rates, and I would suggest by taking a look at something that has benefited the people of this province we are really saying then that we are prepared to make amendments to the Crow's Nest rates and in that particular regard it can do nothing but harm to the agricultural producer and to the farmers and the community.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of what hauling grain by track really means, last year there were from 70 to 85 trucks a day with capacity of 800 to 900 bushels hauling grain to the government elevator at Moose Jaw, and I expect the same thing applies to the other government elevators at the other points. These trucks are covering distances of up to 125 miles from Moose Jaw. This represents an amount of approximately 70,000 bushels a day for 35-2,00 bushel boxcars or 21-3,500 bushel hopper cars. The question one has to ask is: why subsidize the railroads to the extent that we are doing and use trucks in this capacity? Can one question whether this is not a wedge to be used when certain branch line abandonment applications are made and the hearing held.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think at this time one has to question the real motive behind this, because it's quite clear. In the hearings on branch line abandonment put before the Railway Transport Commission, they show that the average hauling of grain on those branch lines has deteriorated. They will not say how much grain is hauled by truck off those branch lines, or from those elevators, they'll use the most economical, turn to the railroad. Of course that will eventually mean the granting of the application for abandonment of those truck lines. That is one feature that we have to protect ourselves against; one area that we have to know what really has been hauled from the individual elevators and off those particular branch lines to the larger inland elevators.

The second question one has to ask: Who is paying the cost of the rural municipal roads' upkeep and maintenance? Who actually is paying for the city of Moose Jaw's share of those streets being used by the trucks and who is paying for the roads used by 800 to 900 bushel trucks at this time? Is there any assistance from the Federal Government for the upgrading and maintenance of these roads being used by these trucks? Of course, we know there is not, Mr. Speaker. Yet the rural municipalities and the town and city councils say actually very, very little, and let the property owner pay the shot twice, once for the railroad subsidy and once to repair the roads. I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this efficiency?

Mr. Speaker, even the spokesman for the Saskatchewan Trucking Association said commercial truck grain hauling would use primary highways limiting damage to secondary highways. I ask you, who pays the shot for either primary or secondary highways? Of course, we know the answer. In Saskatchewan there is no doubt there could be some abandonment of some rail lines and joint usage of existing lines with both trucks and railway services.

In a survey that I conducted when I was a Member of Parliament the majority of the replies indicated a hauling distance of 15 to 20 miles was feasible at that time. It is also true that of the 10,000 miles of track in the prairie provinces 2,400 of them have light density and account for only 10 per cent of the 500 million bushels of export grain in any particular year. The railroads say they are losing money on the movement of grain because of the Crow's Nest Pass rates and it is still interesting to note that CP Rail reported a profit of \$4.2 million in the third quarter against the loss of \$2.1 million in the same quarter last year. I am asking at this time whether or not in fact that is really indicating a loss of profit insofar as the operation of that railroad enterprise is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, does this look as though the movement of grain at Crow's Nest Pass rates costs the railroads money especially with the system of subsidy we have on-line and off-line accounting? Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no sense trying to assess the on-line and off-line accounting if in fact there is more movement on the branch line, the railroads lose more money. That doesn't make sense, in any accounting figures but this is exactly how it works, if there is another 1,000 cars of grain moved off the branch line, the loss on that branch line is tremendously much higher than in fact if they only use about 300 cars in that particular year. The cost of moving the cars on the main line to the point of debarkation of course is where the tremendous increase in the cost of the movement of that particular car and that is on the off-line cars concerned.

How can we know if there is any loss when the railroads have steadfastly refused to divulge their financial operation information as was indicated before any freight rate increase could take effect. I understand now that there has been some relaxation on the railroad's position in this regard, and it could well be that they are possibly now offering some information insofar as their operating costs are concerned.

In turning to the passenger system in our country, Mr. Speaker, and particularly in Saskatchewan, I say that the

western provinces could establish a viable and efficient rail passenger service using new equipment such as the LRC. Alberta has already initiated studies into such a system with the assistance of some other people between Edmonton and Calgary. Even Mr. Marchand has admitted such fast service between Ottawa and Montreal would beat his favorite Stol service. Mr. Speaker, if you go from Ottawa to Montreal on the south shore of the Canadian Pacific at this time you can be in downtown Ottawa from downtown Montreal in a little over one hour with the new equipment that is available if this government were to consider rail transportation in lieu of the Stol aircraft that they are now talking about.

Why should we not have a transportation corridor serving Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Swift Current, Moose Jaw, Winnipeg with feeder lines to Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Lloydminster and other points? Why should there not be a service once again on the Edmonton Winnipeg line? Do we not realize the hundreds upon hundreds of students now attending school at Regina and Saskatoon would use this service. Why couldn't people leave their cars at stations and get on commuter trains in this day and age? To do this requires the transportation system developed as a public utility as there is no form of competition left.

Mr. Speaker, in order to develop an efficient rail passenger service, rail companies, government and regulatory bodies must rid themselves of a large amount of pessimism surrounding the movement of people by rail. The matter must be viewed in terms of a major public utility for transporting large numbers of people in the most efficient manner with maximum comfort. If passenger services are to approach desired levels of adequacy, capital funds must be made available to the service on the same basis as that made available to other services. Immediate steps should be taken to apply the most recent rail technology to the provision of passenger service across this country. This is not only for the sake of Canadian unity but also to ensure the most efficient utilization of transportation resources. The present transportation system effectively discriminates against Canadians with lower incomes who are unable to afford that rail-air service. The Government of Saskatchewan cannot tolerate this situation, and I am sure with the co-operation if there was co-operation from the Federal Government we could look at a rail transportation system that could serve the various areas of Saskatchewan with the interchanges at the various points.

Mr. Speaker, as an example, on October 31, 1969, the CPR applied to the Canadian Transport Commission to discontinue the Canadian which happens to be still in operation, the only mainline Canadian Pacific train in existence at this time. In accordance with the Railway Act they then made application for the abandonment of that train or the rationalization as they called it. Mr. Speaker, seven and a half months later and many months more after that, they then decided and presented a well documented case to the Canadian Transport Commission that there was no potential for marked improvement in the economic viability of passenger train services and that the Canadian was uneconomic and was likely to continue so. In place of discontinuation the CPR was directed to submit rationalization plans.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the regulations based on sections of the Railway Act require any applicant railway to provide among other things a statement as to the probable future transportation needs of the area covered by their rail service, and a statement as to the feasibility of continuing to operate all or part of the service by changing the methods of operation whereby inter-connection or co-ordination with other passenger services. Questions were asked whether or not the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific were actually looking at an integrated system of rail transportation. The answer was Yes by the government of the day. But still to this day, we have heard absolutely nothing about the plans that were supposed to be forthcoming from that type of investigation and consultation between the two companies. A sincere attempt to come to grips with a very important problem has not taken place. Actually it was realized that lower income and older people may be at a disadvantage in air transportation. They paid no attention to that whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that it has been said that the Canadian Pacific governs Canada, its power is paramount and the Canadian Transport Commission are mere puppets in its hands and dances whatever tune the company pipes. We do hope that with the Minister of Transport we have now from Saskatchewan - I have sincere questions about that - that there will be some type of rationalization insofar as rail passenger service is concerned, that there will be some studies or more studies completed that have already been started. Once the rolling stock is taken off it is too late to re-direct it back to active passenger service if future demand requires it. The action of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National in selling as much of its equipment as possible to the Regina Steel Mill for scrap is an indication that the Canadian Pacific wants to rid itself of its passenger equipment and then be able to tell the Commission that it will be uneconomic to have to provide new facilities if demand requires it.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to selling an amount of passenger equipment to the Regina Steel Mill it also applies insofar as the box cars are concerned. I'll refer to that a little later on as far as the amount of cars that are being disposed of by the Canadian Pacific.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Speaker, in the United States stated that the railroad companies had duped the Commission into allowing them to get out of passenger service and the recent Ralph Nader study concerning downgrading of railway passenger service should make the Canadian Transport Commission act decisively and with full knowledge of all the social and economic facts, so that in 19 years similar admissions will not have to be made in Canada. I am suggesting that there is no reason why in Canada we shouldn't have a Cantrack the same as they do in the United States with Amtrack which is really serving those areas now to good advantage and is something that everyone well appreciates.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, an article in the Globe and Mail said, "Comeback is claimed for World Railroads," from the Associated Press. What has really happened in this regard insofar as Canada is concerned? We know, absolutely nothing. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that in my reference to the amount of research and development that is going on insofar as the rail passenger service is concerned, we have only to look at the

enquiry that was conducted at Queen's University, where the now president of the Canadian National Railway, Mr. Bandeen at that particular time, got the headlines, 'CPR, CNR, Should Get out of Passenger Business, CNR Official.' At that time he was vice-president, now he is the president of the Canadian National Railway. It says, "Queen's to Research Transport Problems, 1970."

Canadian National Railways, CP Rail and the CTC will each contribute up to \$100,000 a year for five years and Queen's will provide accommodation to research staff. The purpose of that, seeking solutions to some of the problems that face the railway industry providing additional opportunities in research and education for students, university staff and employees, establishing a reference centre for guided ground transport to facilitate national co-ordination. He said initially most problems will come from present railway patterns.

I am asking today, Mr. Speaker, this is 1975, that was 1970, what have we actually heard from the Queen's University?

If we look at the other studies that are under consideration and actually try and find out what happened to studies and where have they gone. Here's one which has a lot to do with grain transportation, Country Grain Elevator Costs Study, completed 1970, carried out by M. R. Thompson. This was a study of larger country elevators capable of handling up to 3 million bushels per year. An Inland Terminal Study completed in 1970; Costs of Transporting Grain by Farm Trucks, 1970; The Value of Commercial Carriage of Grain, 1971. A study on Railway Costs prepared by the railways, but no formal report has been made. Others are Costs of Thunder Bay and Pacific Coast Terminal Grain Elevators, 1970; Farm Stored Grain on the Prairies, 1971; Grain Cleaning in Canadian Elevators, 1971; Grain Transportation in Eastern Canada, 1972; Economic Effect of Rationalization of the Grain Handling, 1972.

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in referring to these is the fact that we do have many, many studies under way in Canada, but if you really get down to it, these studies have never been completed, they are put on shelves to gather dust and there is absolutely nothing more done with them.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we have to realize that studies are absolutely valueless unless we take what is in those studies and put them into operation for our particular area. We know that the Canadian Transport Commission themselves are concerned with the transportation policy in Canada. Unless they are concerned to the extent that they look at the economic and social effects on the individual communities, then I am suggesting that their type of investigation carries very little weight.

Mr. Speaker, in referring briefly to the Crow's Nest Pass rates as contained in the motion, I won't belabor those opposite with too many facts on the Crow's Nest rates. I am sure that this House has heard those facts many, many times. Just to bring everyone up to date again, in 1897 the Canadian Pacific Railway signed with the Federal Government an agreement called the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement. We know what this provided for, we know that it gave the CPR a cash subsidy of \$11,000 a mile for railroad constructed up to a maximum of \$3,630,000 and that the British Columbia Government agreed to give a land

grant of 4,775,000 acres of land within British Columbia.

Rather than going through those things, Mr. Speaker, which the Canadian Pacific obtained for that particular concession, I'll refer to the fact of what the Canadian Pacific was supposed to then grant. The CPR Company agreed to the following government control over rate charges: a reduction in perpetuity of three cents per hundred pounds on grain and flour from points on Canadian Pacific lines then existing in the West to Fort William and points east; a reduction in perpetuity of varying percentages on certain commodities from points on the Canadian Pacific line then in existence in eastern Canada to points in existence on Canadian Pacific lines in the West. The reductions varied for these particular circumstances.

The Saskatchewan Government, Mr. Speaker, not too long ago said that the Federal Government had hoped to accomplish five main objectives in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific. The more rapid development of the highly promising mining area of southern British Columbia, the effective integration of this area in the Canadian economy and defiance of geographic facts despite American designs. The enlargement of the prairie and inter-mountain markets for eastern manufacturers by the provision of lower freight rates and the western movement of certain important products. In that particular regard some people forget what the real purpose of the Crow's Nest rates was all about when they go about the country suggesting that that should be done away with. It suggested the stimulation of agricultural settlement and general economic expansion in the Prairie Provinces by means of a statutory insurance of lower grain rates and of capital equipment and the acceptance by the Canadian Pacific Railway company of the principle of government rate control in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the acceptance by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the principle of government rate control in the national interest. Again I believe the Federal Minister of Transport seems to forget what commitments were made at that time by the Canadian Pacific Railroad and what was agreed to. All of these objectives were attained at that time. The prairie settlement boomed in the years after 1900 because of the Crow's Nest Freight Rate Agreement, and other favorable circumstances. The wheat economy developed and except for occasional fluctuations, wheat remains the principal agricultural activity in western Canada.

The Saskatchewan report said the Canadian Pacific Railway Company expected certain immediate and determinable advantages of a substantial nature on a number of more remote but unmeasurable and more valuable prospects for realization throughout succeeding years. The CPR got, for example, the cash subsidy which the company estimated was sufficient to meet about 40 per cent of the actual operating costs. But of the more remote advantages the Saskatchewan Government said this:

Tangible and great were the immediate benefits accruing to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pursuant to the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement; they formed a significant part of the central purpose involved for the early accomplishment for which the company got public assistance. This purpose was for the wresting of the economic life of southeastern British Columbia from American designs.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that because of the many areas of concern that were brought about in those days, we must realize that it is absolutely necessary that everybody in this province and particularly the Hon. Members opposite realize that the Crow's Nest rates remain part of our economic structure as far as the movement of produce in this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at some of the various areas that I referred to briefly and recap some of those particular points that I was making. I think if we look at the amount of money that is now taking place, I refer to an article by Mr. Doug Fisher, some people may recognize the name, insofar as the amount of research and development that is now going on, other than on railroad, he refers to it as political speaking. He refers to the Ministry of Transport and he is suggesting that he has a job ahead of him if he is prepared to do it. That all remains to be seen. He refers to the fact that most of the people that we have at this particular time make their decision not on any type of rail transportation but all on aero-orientation insofar as Canada is concerned.

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that we do now have a Minister of Finance, the Hon. Don Macdonald, who is quite concerned and refers to the fact that provincial resources are also a national resource. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that our transportation system is also a resource that the Hon. Don Macdonald seems to forget all about. I am suggesting that there must be some type of guarantee that western Canada must receive from the Federal Government to ensure that the benefits from our transportation resources is also shared by western Canada which is not the case at this time.

I am also suggesting that many people in the eastern parts of our nation are not all that concerned about the movement of grain out here but they are concerned about feed grains at a very minimum rate. I am suggesting that either the Hon. Don Macdonald or the Hon. Otto Lang, the Minister of Transport, are so determined to put the screws on the Saskatchewan people they are not prepared to look at the whole transportation problem as it should be looked at.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we also know as far as economic and social effects of the transportation system is concerned that we saw what did happen in Ottawa and we saw Ministers that purported to be representatives of the West try to pass a Bill in regard to grain at that time, that was the Stabilization Bill which was only based on gross returns and not on net returns. If that Bill had have been passed you would have then seen a further diminishing social and economic effects of the rural communities in this particular province and the western provinces in general. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we can't allow the Federal Government nor can we allow Federal Ministers who come into Saskatchewan and try and make determinations for political reasons only. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what is going on now. I am asking why at this particular time that these people are concerned about transportation policies. What about the third freight rate increase within a ten month period placing in excess of 85 per cent additional cost on our livestock producers? What about the things that we should be concerned about insofar as the movement of people and resources in western Canada that they are all concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that when we look at the type of program that is going on now by the railroads, as I referred to a short while ago, the number of cars that are being demolished at this time and I'll use a one-year program from up to February 28th, 1974. It may not interest too many people on the opposite side at this particular moment but now many rail cars of a type used for carrying grain have been scrapped by the Canadian Pacific Railway during the past 12 months and the previous 12 months. Mr. Speaker, for the calendar year of 1973 there were 1,253 cars scrapped by the Canadian Pacific Railway. For the calendar year of 1972 there were 1,228 cars scrapped by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, at this time whether or not this is in the best interests of those people in western Canada insofar as the retention of their rolling stock is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I am also questioning very, very much some of the approaches and the attitudes of those people opposite when we listen to some of the observations that are made insofar as the movement of grain is concerned and also about the inland elevators that we know quite a bit about. In fact it is rather interesting to see an article in the Nipawin Journal and it says on this question of inland terminals, it said then that the Hon. Leader of the Conservatives, the Member for Nipawin said:

He was not opposed to any concept to the movement or handling of grain as long as it was done by private individuals. Government should neither assist nor promote or run down the concept of inland terminals, he stated.

And that quote was of course back in June prior to an election date. I am suggesting that this, too, is a deliberate attempt by Members who wanted to be elected at that time to do away with the only orderly marketing agents that we have in Canada and that is the Canadian Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG:— Mr. Speaker, I would also like to suggest that if, in fact, we are interested or concerned to a great extent with the movement of grain and the efforts that have to be taken for the movement of grain, then we have to realize that the condition of the trackage in this particular part of the country is deplorable, we have to realize that when trains go out onto branch lines to spot cars for movement of grain many, many of those cars come back into the mainline terminals unloaded because of the door sills and the type of things that should be fixed before they ever go out. There is absolutely no effort being put into the upgrading of the rolling stock of the company, there is no effort being put into track improvement, in spite of subsidies. There is no effort being put into the type of back tracks that these cars must operate on. In fact, most recently there have been many, many injuries insofar as the elevator agents are concerned with the type of equipment that is now in existence. And if anyone is interested, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of pictures here that I am sure would be most beneficial to those people here who haven't been out on the right-of-way more recently to see exactly what type of cars we have, what type of trackage we have and the condition of the box cars that never loaded but are returned. I am

suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that these Ministers of the Federal Government, the Hon. Minister Otto Lang, if he was really interested insofar as the type of grain movement is concerned he should find out what is going on.

I am also suggesting that the speed limit on the branch lines at this time is deplorable. You are down to the vicinity of about ten miles per hour on many, many lines and if that is the movement of our resources to export markets and our most expedient method, then there is not such a thing in existence in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that there should not be any railway lines abandoned without full consideration of all economic and social costs. I am suggesting that there has to be a comprehensive program brought about with the involvement of every segment of our society in that type of a program. I am suggesting that the individual communities will suffer both economically and socially if, in fact, the rail lines are abandoned in the piecemeal method that they are now working at. I am suggesting that there has to be a comprehensive program that will not allow individual branch lines to be abandoned because in the future those individual branch lines may be required to bring about that type of rationalization and that type of integration of individual lines. I am suggesting that our present system of grain gathering, our present system of elevator companies is adequate to do a job which has been well proven. I am suggesting that those people opposite seem to believe that we need a new system of gathering grain and they, in effect, are denying the fact that our present system is adequate if it was upgraded. I am saying that the Federal Government should maintain the Crow's Nest rates for grain movement. The returns are there for the companies, we know that the returns are there and also the concessions that have been granted in the past are well known to everybody here. I am suggesting that there must be adequate steps taken now by both railroads to again provide efficient rail services to Saskatchewan communities without unreasonable delay.

I am saying that the environmental pollution and the land use are some of the main reasons why this could be done and there would be millions upon millions of dollars saved if this was taken into consideration and the research development that should be undertaken.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South):— I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, relatively briefly to the Resolution. I must say when I first saw the Resolution I was impressed essentially with it, in the sense I thought it was fairly sensible. But having now heard the remarks of the Member in support of his resolution I am not sure I'm not persuaded against it, having started initially with a willingness to support it.

I think in the end I tell the Member for Moose Jaw North I'll still support his resolution on the undertaking we don't send along his speech with it. As a matter of fact it is one of the best arguments that I have heard advanced in a long time

for a decision taken by the Federal Government a year ago. I wish the Hon. Member had been advancing the same argument two years ago and perhaps it wouldn't have taken the two years to get the decision we got one year ago.

I want to say that we certainly support the first part of the Resolution that no rail line be abandoned without the full economic and social cost being taken into account. And of course I say that is a little redundant because that's what Hall and Snively are all about. As the Hon. Member will know the Hall Commission was established about a year ago now with five members. A commission that we in Saskatchewan should be particularly proud of and we ought to support particularly strenuously in view of two things: (a) the commission of five members is staffed by three people from Saskatchewan and, (b) because of the high calibre and independent nature of that Commission. You know the chairman of that Commission is Mr. Justice Hall who was a Saskatchewan jurist of tremendous renown and respect, a long-time personal friend of Mr. Diefenbaker. In fact it was Mr. Diefenbaker who appointed him to the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan and finally appointed him to the Supreme Court of Canada. It was that same Mr. Justice Hall whom the Attorney General called upon some short time ago to do a study of the provincial court system. I know the Attorney General shares our respect and indeed the respect of the province as a whole for this particular Saskatchewan citizen.

Two other members of that Commission are also Saskatchewan people including Lloyd Stewart who is known to some Members of this Assembly of the Rock Glen area, a farmer and a rancher and in his own area very highly respected in the same way.

The Commission has in fact three farmers on it which we should be particularly pleased about and four people in addition to Mr. Justice Hall who are completely politically independent and who were appointed without political consideration and that is obvious from the makeup of the Commission. They have indeed been charged with the responsibility for taking a look at 6,000 miles of branch lines in the three prairie provinces that have not been put into the permanent network as have the 12,000 miles, and in doing so have been charged with the responsibility of looking at not only economic considerations but social questions as well. They will be considering which lines of the 6,000 miles that remain to be studied should be continued and be scheduled for upgrading and which should be abandoned when you take all questions into consideration. As they do that they will also be having an interest in how the abandonment of a branch line would affect communities on that branch line. They will be looking at the question of whether or not in the period between the time a branch line is abandoned and the farmers establishing new delivery points whether or not some trucking subsidy program ought to be given or provided for farmers to assist them in the transitional period because newer and larger trucks will be required.

The Hon. Member referred briefly to the lack of expenditure of money that is now going into the rail system and going into equipment and upgrading of lines and to some extent that is true. I think that to some extent at least the railways are to be faulted in this respect. There is, however, one fault that should not be laid against the Federal Government. I say that for good reason because you may remember, and the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North may indeed remember, that it wasn't

very long ago when the Federal Government undertook an expenditure of \$40 million or \$50 million or \$60 million to provide 2,000 hopper cars. That was money which came from the federal treasury and belonged to all of the people of Canada, but which the Federal Government spent on behalf exclusively of the people of the three prairie provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Then only a short time ago an additional 4,000 hopper cars were provided at a cost again of something in the neighborhood of \$120 million. A lot of the Members know that half these cars are aluminum, half are steel. These cars are now in production and some of them are just going into service. That was an expenditure of something in excess of \$200 million of Canadian people's money spent by the Federal Government for the advantage of this region alone. And that was in addition to the roughly \$60 million a year which the Federal Government spends each year in maintaining branch lines in the three prairie provinces. So I say while there may be some fault with the railways, I don't think one can reasonably fault the performance of the Federal Government in this respect.

The Member for Moose Jaw North will remember, too, that a year and one-half ago the Federal Government spent again some millions of dollars in a box-car repair program. You may remember the Canadian Wheat Board and others were getting very concerned because we used to have in this country some 90,000 general purpose box cars which had gone down to 45,000. The board was concerned because it was getting more and more difficult to get these general purpose box cars for use in transporting grain. There were a substantial number of those that were again destined for the scrap heap when the Federal Government stepped in and prevented each the CNR and the CPR from scrapping those box cars and again spent some millions of dollars in repairing them and putting them back into service. The Federal Government's record in those respects is very good indeed.

The Hall Commission which I referred to earlier as some Members know, has already met with the elevator companies, the railways, the government, including the Provincial Government, various farm groups of all kinds, and it has now begun its regional hearings in the country and my understanding is by the time it completes its work, it will have conducted in excess of a hundred enquiries.

This is an operation which we certainly endorse fully. A major decision is about to be taken and public hearings are provided in advance, so that people themselves can go before the Commission and make the arguments for their communities. A principle which we have said to you people opposite, you ought to be extending in respect of your major decisions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I want to refer briefly as well to the Snively Commission which again the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North will be familiar with, but perhaps some of the other Members opposite are not.

When the Hall Commission was established a year or so ago, the Federal Government said, let us come to grips once and for all with what it costs in this country to move a bushel of grain. Everyone but everyone from us, to people in elevator companies, to farmers, to everyone else has always had to guess as to what it really costs to move a bushel of grain. In appointing Carl Snavely the Federal Government has chosen a financial expert of international renown who has long been associated with railway costing. It gave him the resources and the jurisdiction to enquire fully into it and report back within a period of six months, the genuine cost of moving a bushel of grain on the prairies and to other parts of the country. He is now engaged in that study and once and for all, for the first time in many years, I think we may finally get a handle on what it is really costing the railways to move grain. Again, a decision taken by the Federal Government.

I want to comment on one other decision which the Federal Government took a short time ago and I say in fairness to the Attorney General it was one that he had long pressed upon the Federal Government. It arose earlier at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, about three years ago. The Federal Government gave its commitment to do it and it's a commitment and an action which again is of particular significance to the western region. I refer to the decision it took, to bring legislation before the House of Commons which I think is now passed, if it isn't it will shortly be passed, to at long last force the railways to open their books so that we can have a look at their costs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— That is in addition to the study undertaken by Carl Snavely.

So again, as a result of Federal Government action we will be coming to grips again at long last with what it really costs the railways to move grain in the country. So the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw won't have to guess about it and none of us will have to guess about it and so that these figures will be made available to those people in communities now making their submissions to Mr. Justice Hall.

I wanted to comment on one other point, that the Hon. Member made which I have often heard Hon. Members opposite make. I'm not sure if they are right in what they say or whether they are not. But in saying it they are saying something in contradiction to people who have spent a good deal of time looking at it and people who are particularly qualified to have a look at it. That is the point that one necessarily assumes that because a branch line goes it affects adversely the communities on the branch line. That may or may not be so. There are some communities to which one can point where the community in fact has experienced a period of growth following the abandonment of a branch line. There are other communities one can point to that have declined, following the abandonment of a branch line.

A fairly recent study conducted by the University of Saskatchewan, transport section, came to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that the abandonment of a branch line in itself is a fairly neutral factor. That those communities which are strong

and are growing tend to remain strong and tend to remain growing even though the branch line is removed. On the other hand those communities which are on the decline are not likely to be saved by the existence of a branch line. So I say, one can't say with certainty one way or another. We can't be sure and we would remind Hon. Members opposite, neither can they. It's a point to raise in the country and it has tremendous emotional and political appeal, but again, the fact is not as clear as the political pitch that's made in respect of it.

One of our concerns here on this side of the House, is that in this whole piece, when we have rail rationalization, we don't want to be left in the position where a rail line continues to exist and is saved only to find that it's useless because all the elevator points on it are abandoned.

As you know the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has indicated that it intends to reduce its delivery points from something like, I think they had a maximum of 1,600 down to 400 delivery points. Other people are in the same rationalization process. Of course, they are feeling the same difficulty that everybody else is feeling in respect to the system. That is a system that was built so many years ago, can no longer be maintained efficiently because of the tremendous cost escalation in respect of it.

What I want to do in this respect is to suggest to the Hon. Members as they know the railways are not entitled to abandon without first applying to the Canadian Transport Commission for permission to do it. The Canadian Transport Commission is then obligated to hold public hearings in respect of the proposed abandonments. The people can come forward in that community with their arguments to the Canadian Transport Commission. The same kind of mechanism is not available in respect of elevator abandonment and many times an elevator abandonment is just as important as a branch line abandonment. We on this side of the House think that a mechanism similar to that of CTC with respect to rail line abandonment should apply with respect to elevators and their abandonment . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— So that when it is proposed to abandon in a locale an elevator, people in that locale will have the opportunity to appear again in a public hearing and put forward their point of view and that the elevator delivery point not be abandoned until all social and economic considerations have been taken into account.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am about to propose an amendment to the motion of the Member for Moose Jaw North. I move, seconded by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) that Resolution No. 2 be amended by adding thereto a further paragraph as follows:

(4) that no elevators be permitted to be closed without full consideration of all social and economic costs involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):— Mr. Speaker, is the debate to be confined strictly to the amendment or the amendment and the original motion concurrently?

MR. SPEAKER:— I would suggest to the Members that the debate would be confined to the amendment at this time because the amendment does not propose an alternative to the points raised in the resolution, but merely provides an addition. Consequently I would propose that the debate be confined to the discussion of the amendment at this time.

MR. WIEBE:— Well, Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on just the amendment, let me say that it is with a great deal of pleasure that I second the amendment as proposed by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron).

This amendment certainly adds to the original motion and we on this side of the House are prepared to support the original motion as presented by the Member for Moose Jaw North. We would ask as well that the Members on that side of the House support our amendment to make this particular resolution more meaningful, not only to us as legislators, but more meaningful as well to the people of Saskatchewan.

I must say, however, that I am rather disappointed in the reaction of some of the Government Members to what is happening in rural Saskatchewan regarding our elevators. Comments have been made that our concern which we have expressed is being used as a smoke screen, something to hide what the railways are doing.

Let's for a moment just take a look at what the elevator companies are doing in Saskatchewan. Railways have been preserved until the year 2000 and I suggest that 60 per cent of the railways in Saskatchewan are now permanently preserved up until that point in time. Yet we turn around and find that one of our major grain handling companies within Saskatchewan is proposing to abandon 70 per cent of its elevators. They are proposing to abandon 70 per cent of their elevators while we will be maintaining 60 per cent of our branch lines. To me, regardless of how you look at it, it's going to cost somebody an awful lot of money to build and maintain roads in this province.

Let me give you one example. The particular line to which I haul my grain is operated by the CNR. It's scheduled for abandonment. South of us we have the main line operated by the CPR. Both lines are presently operating and operating extremely well. Yet you go to the town of Glen Kerr, which is along my particular branch line and for the last three years they have not had an elevator, they had one up until then. The people in that community are now hauling all their grain to the community of Morse, located on the main line. I hope the Legislature will excuse my English, but that 16 miles of road from Glen Kerr to Morse is in one hell of a mess! It's not because of something that the railway did, it's something as a result of what an elevator company did.

You move 12 miles farther West along that line, you come to a community called Gouldtown. They now are hauling their grain to Herbert, along that main line. The rail line is still there

but the elevator companies have abandoned many points; you go on to other points along that same line and other lines within the province and a lot of elevator abandonment has already taken place.

I would suggest to the Members opposite that you do take into consideration the problem that we are all faced with in Saskatchewan, in light of the proposals being made by our elevator companies. I suggest that the Members opposite wake up, go back to 1960. You weren't concerned at that time about what was happening to the railroads in this province and because of that lack of concern and because of the fact that your heads were buried in the sand, some of our branch lines in this province were abandoned and communities were forced to live without any rail lines. Finally after that period of time, you realized the problem that was there and decided to show some concern for our branch lines. I suggest that we have the same problem today, in the proposals that all of our elevator companies are making, whether it be Cargill, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, United Grain Growers, Pioneer, Paterson and so on. Each and every one of them is proposing that some of their elevators be abandoned and I have said one elevator company has even proposed that 70 per cent of their elevators be abandoned. That's a fantastic amount of elevators. That is over 800 points within this province will be left without an elevator. That's going to cost somebody an awful lot of money.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I'll be supporting the amendment and the main motion and I urge the support of all Members opposite, for the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):— Mr. Speaker, I had intended to discuss the resolution that appears before us, not understanding of course that an amendment was to be added and with your ruling to speak to the amendment, I shall try to confine my remarks exactly to that amendment that has been added.

This House will well remember that not too long ago the Member for Morse did introduce a similar motion which, if I remember correctly, was discussed and then adjourned. I believe that at that time it called for a study of elevator abandonment and perhaps not as specific as this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we support this resolution and unfortunately like the Member for Regina South I don't know whether it was advisable for the Member for Moose Jaw North to go into all the long details that he did.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad in this House that matters such as the one under consideration at this time, matters that affect people from Big Beaver to Big River from Maple Creek to Moosomin that they have to take on in our discussion the political ideologies which end up in a hassle in the House and really don't in the end benefit the real people or the recipients of the discussion and that's the people of the province.

The amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to be brief. From where I live, the town where I live

and I want everyone in this House just to consider this point for a moment. Let's say that every rail line that exists at the present time stays intact. Not one tie is lifted, not one railway is lifted in any way. How far is the individual farmer going to have to haul his grain if in fact we allow the grain companies at their own discretion to simply close an elevator? The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) mentioned about roads. Let's say that all the rail lines stay as they are. But if the elevators along the rail lines close you have exactly the same number of roads to build as you would if the rail lines were lifted. The Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) considered it to be a fair and just resolution because it did in fact favor and support the concern of the people in rural Saskatchewan, but if I remember correctly the Hon. Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy) took great exception to that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no one can question this that wholesale rail line abandonment is not in the best interests of Saskatchewan. When I look down at a branch line south of Rosetown and in the last four years see the last three points on the end of that line, all at one time grain receiving points, simply disappear. Then the Member for Moose Jaw North has the gall to say in this House that it was the railways that are responsible.

I am not here to justify the railways. I am not here as a voice for the railways. But surely we are not so politically blinded in this House that we can't put the blame where the blame belongs when it comes to the right time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAILEY:— The railway line is still there. The elevators have forced those people at the end of that line, Mr. Speaker, so they are now hauling their own grain, some 22 miles. I have every reason to believe that future towns along that line and elevator points will be abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need to get into the history of the railways and the great railway booms and so on. I think all of us on both sides of the House know that concessions were made to the railways. I think Members on both sides of the House know that the railways had committed some terrible things against western Canada. Nobody is going to deny that. I think that the Government at Ottawa has attempted at least to make some amends for that. Let's not get involved in this thing at this particular time. Let's look at Saskatchewan now. Let's deal with that which is facing the farmers of Saskatchewan now. Let's not get embroiled in a political debate of ideology and try to cover up an issue that is before us right now. And that is that as long as grain companies are allowed simply to close an elevator at will without any discussion with the people who have hauled their grain to that elevator, without consulting them in any way.

Mr. Speaker, rail line abandonment won't mean a thing unless we tie this amendment to the resolution. We must tie this amendment to the resolution. We are prepared, the Members of the Conservative caucus, to support this resolution and we are equally prepared to support the amendment to this resolution. Let any one in this House stand now and say that this

amendment does not equally affect Saskatchewan farmers as the points which the Member for Moose Jaw North has made, that person would have to be naive or completely politically stupid, because that is the case in Saskatchewan today.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think resolutions of this nature need to take on the grand and glorious bit of rhetoric that has transpired in this House this afternoon.

Therefore, I am not going to prolong my speech, only to say this: I beg of Members on both sides of this House for one moment to cast aside their political ideologies, cast aside all other things but the interests of the people that they represent and those people are Saskatchewan farmers and the people in the cities and everybody who is affected by rail line abandonment. Let's look at this together so that when you study points on one, two and three and indeed the amendment, then we can vote in a very positive manner and maybe, maybe we can bring everyone, the railways and grain companies to the realization of what they are doing to Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words before adjourning the debate, particularly with regard to the comments from the Member for Eston-Elrose (Mr. Bailey), who laments the fact that political ideologies are being brought into this debate.

It seems to me that political ideologies are certainly being brought into the debate as far as rail line abandonment and indeed elevator rationalization is concerned when we consider that there is certainly a difference in political ideology, if you like, between the perspective that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which has people of all political persuasions in it, the perspective that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has, or the perspective that the Canadian Wheat Board has with regard to handling of western Canadian grain, and the perspective that Cargill or Continental or Bunge Company may have. There is a great difference in political ideology between the two. Consequently, it is necessary for political ideology to be introduced into the debate on elevator rationalization and/or on the debate on rail nationalization. And perhaps there hasn't been enough of that kind of political ideology on a sophisticated level introduced before the Hall Commission to this point.

The Wheat Pool, for instance, as a farmer-owned co-operative is not particularly concerned about how it is going to rationalize its elevator system. It made a mistake in the case of one particular point in my constituency, where it wished to abandon an elevator system. The delegate, through his membership responded and the decision was reversed as recently as only three or four months ago. So we do not particularly have to worry about the type of rationalization that will occur through farmer-owned co-operatives in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We do have to worry about the kind of rationalization that may occur if those co-operatives are eliminated. We do have to worry about whether or not those co-operatives will be eliminated by further manipulation and coercion from the railway companies in Canada.

December 9, 1975

I will have a great deal more to say specifically in this regard in the future through a resolution that I will be introducing myself and also when I continue to speak on this resolution. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 12 - Repeal Certain Sections of The Proceedings against The Crown Act.

MR. E. C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview) moved, seconded by Mr. J. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to repeal Subsection (7) of Section 5 of The Proceedings against The Crown Act, Chapter 87 of the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1965.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before moving this Resolution I have a few brief remarks to make and unless provoked by Members on the other side, I will try to keep them as brief as possible.

The Section that I am referring to, subsection (7) of Section 5 of The Proceedings against The Crown Act, Mr. Speaker, is a section that in effect allows the Government to be above the law. There is some historical background and historical reason for this section and other sections of the Act to be in existence.

At one time as we all know the Crown could do no wrong. After we evolved parliamentary democracy and parliamentary government, it was discovered of course that this concept would just not work in a democracy. As a result, Acts similar to The Proceedings against The Crown Act were passed, I believe by all provinces in Canada.

The Acts mainly deal with giving rights to people in disputes with government authorities which of course is now the Crown. That is the Government of Saskatchewan represents the Crown in its capacity as government. There are many sections of the Act which without those sections would take away basic rights from individuals of Saskatchewan to sue and so on and so forth.

However, there is one section in the Act which I find and I think all people will find with a sense of distaste and that is subsection (7) of Section 5.

The section permits the Government of Saskatchewan to pass legislation which at a later date could be found to be unconstitutional and the government does not have to bear the burden of having passed that improper legislation. That is, legislation can be passed by this Government to put an improper tax on farmers or individuals and later on when the legislation was turned over in the courts and held to be unconstitutional, the Government could take the position, because of this particular subsection that it would not have to pay back the money that is collected improperly.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the Members opposite I forget which one, I think it was the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Nelson) the other day was talking about laws being passed

by the people of Saskatchewan by a government which represents the people. He is quite right in as far as he goes but what that Member (I think I have the right Member) and other Members should be well aware of, is that in Canada we have a constitution. And in that constitution certain rules are laid down as to what Provincial Assemblies can do and what the Government of Canada can do.

The Government of Canada's powers of course are much wider than those of the provinces for obvious reasons. The provinces are restricted in what they are allowed by the British North America Act or constitution to do. It must, when it passes any law, whether it deals with railways or taxes or farms, or potash, make sure that they are acting within the restrictions put upon this Government by the British North America Act.

While the Member for Yorkton may feel strongly that the people of Saskatchewan want certain laws and therefore it is up to the Government to pass those laws, what he must understand is that this Government can only pass laws that are allowed to it by the BNA Act. If people feel strongly about certain things that are happening in our province, it may very well be that the only authority that those people can go to, to have their wrongs remedied or to have their particular problems solved is not the Government of Saskatchewan but the Government of Canada. So I make that point just to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members understand that there is this guideline that is imposed upon this House, which is, as well, imposed upon the Parliament of Canada, in that when each of those legislative authorities, that is, the House of Commons or the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly pass laws, they must do so within the framework of the British North America Act.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, the Government because of this particular, curious provision in the Proceedings Against the Crown Act, is in a position to act unfairly, that is, I say it is unfair to collect money illegally and not pay it back to the people that it is collected from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada that maintains such a law on its statute books, it is patently unfair, and it offends everyone's standard of justice as far as the Members on this side are concerned.

Surely the Crown or the Government of Saskatchewan which represents the Crown as the source of justice in the province and as such it should maintain and encourage the highest standard of honesty and fairness in its dealing with the citizens of Saskatchewan, whether they be corporations or individuals, if for no other reason than to set an example for everyone in the province.

Many people will say, well, obviously the law is unfair, it is unjust, it offends everybody's standard of fair play. But no government would ever use that law. No government would be foolish enough to risk their position by enforcing a law that is so patently unjust. I think, Mr. Speaker, until recent events that this has been the case. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the other provinces, the other Legislative Assemblies have repealed this provision that was in their statute books

at one time. Only the Province of Saskatchewan maintains this provision on its statute books. Only the Province of Saskatchewan so far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, has sought to enforce this particular section, and enforce it vigorously in their battle with the potash companies.

What this Government has said to the potash companies, Mr. Speaker, and they have said it time and time again. They have said it through the Premier, they have said it through the now Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan), the then Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley) that they were going to enforce the potash reserve tax. Even if that tax was found to be illegal in the courts, they were not going to return any of the money that was collected under that tax which amounts to millions and millions of dollars to those who had to pay it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that position is completely untenable. It smacks against every person's sense of fair play, every person's sense of justice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE:— May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe situations have arisen in the past where this law could have been put into force by other governments. I believe it arose under the Thatcher Government. I believe at that time the Thatcher Government assured the other parties involved that if indeed the provincial legislation was attacked successfully, that any money collected under it would be returned with interest. That is the position that the potash companies of Saskatchewan asked the Government to take this summer. They asked them privately, they asked them publicly. They finally went to court to see if they could get a judicial determination directing the Government to take this position. They of course were unable to do so because of the provisions of this Act.

They then asked the Government if they would permit that any monies that were collected under the reserve tax be paid into court and be held by the courts, so that when the matter was finally determined and that if the potash companies were unsuccessful in their attack, the money would be there for the Government together with interest. If they had been successful in their attack the money would still be there with interest for the companies to recover.

At no time as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, did any potash company say they were refusing to pay the tax. One did on the basis that it simply did not have the money to pay the tax. Every single one of the other companies as far as I am aware agreed that they must pay the tax because it was the law of Saskatchewan and they were going to obey the law of Saskatchewan. All they asked was for fair play from the Government who sits opposite. The Government who sits opposite was not prepared to give them any fair play.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the remarks of a learned judge of the Court of Queen's Bench of Saskatchewan who had to deal with this particular section in another case. These are remarks from Mr. Justice Fred Johnson, who I am proud to say at one time was a Member of the Liberal Party, and a candidate. I think all Members will acknowledge that once anybody, either Conservative, NDP or Liberal is appointed to high positions, past political favoritism is ignored.

Mr. Justice Johnson in finding for the Crown, for the Government, had this to say.

In these proceedings the plaintiff is placed in a most difficult position . . .

I heard one of the Members opposite groaning about the fairness of the courts. If the Members opposite feel that way about the courts of Saskatchewan, let them get up and say so, let them name people if that is the way they feel. I say to the Members opposite, the one thing we have in this province that has a sense of fair play, has a sense of decency and has a sense of justice are the courts . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE:— . . . not the Government!

If I could continue.

In these proceedings the plaintiff is placed in a most difficult position and an individual litigant would fare no better.

If the plaintiff pays the levy under the Act it may by reason of the proceedings against The Crown Act be unable to recover those sums if ultimately it is found by the courts that they were illegally collected.

Exactly the position the Government put the potash companies in.

If it does not pay the levies then it faces the possible cancellation of Crown leases on which it has expended money and obtained production.

This is the Cigol case involving oil leases. The same position with the potash companies and the potash leases.

As far as I can determine, a provision similar to Section 5(7) of the proceedings against The Crown Act, is not found in similar legislation in any common law province in Canada, it is peculiar to Saskatchewan. It appears to permit the Crown in the Right of the Province of Saskatchewan to assert its rights under legislation which might be beyond its powers and thereby achieve the same results as if the legislation were to be found valid.

In another case it was stated:

The defendant being an emanation of the Crown (that's the government) which is the source and fountain of justice are in my opinion bound to maintain the highest standards of probity and fair dealing comparable to those which the courts which derive their authority from the same source and fountain imposed on the officers under their control.

That is all we in the Liberal Party ask the Government to do, Mr. Speaker.

For the Crown to use what Lord Shaw called in another case:

... Its enormous leverage against all competitors or subjects is not consistent with the concept of justice which has prevailed in our land.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, what this particular subsection does is put the Crown (the Government of Saskatchewan) above the law. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that anybody in this House including the Members opposite, including government Members feel that this is a proper thing that anybody should be above the law.

I would ask the Members opposite to consider this when we come to vote on this particular motion. I am not so naive to think, Mr. Speaker, that the motion will be voted on and passed. I am sure one of two things will happen: either one Member opposite, probably the Attorney General will get up, make a speech, not dealing particularly with the motion and then ask to adjourn debate; then stand the matter off the Order Paper. This has happened time and time again in this House. Or, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that some Member opposite will try to amend the motion so that it completely loses the basic content that it has.

I would ask the Members however, before doing so, not to do this because they must admit that this provision gives them powers that are now unprecedented and are not needed.

The Premier when I introduced this resolution a week or so ago, yelled across the isle, "Well that Act was on the Statute books when you were in the government!" That's quite right, it was on there, it was on there when the CCF was the government and I suspect it was on there many, many years ago when the Conservatives formed this government. But the difference is, Mr. Speaker, is that none of those governments sought to enforce this particular legislation. If they did they were wrong. If they do it now, they are still wrong, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE:— Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I so move this resolution seconded by the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane).

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Romanow.

Resolution No. 18 - To Amend The trade Union Act, 1972

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin) moved, seconded by Mr. Katzman (Rosthern):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to amend The Trade Union Act, 1972, to ensure that upon certification or decertification and upon strike votes or back to work votes that if a significant minority of union members are dissatisfied with the accuracy of the vote taken in the usual way that they may apply for a vote supervised by the Labour Relations Board.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be extremely brief. The rationale for this resolution that I am about to present will give the Members opposite the opportunity to prove once and for

all that they really are for the working man, and for the individual working man. The reasons for this motion will be presented by the seconder. I so move.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):— Mr. Speaker, I rise to my feet to speak on this motion. First of all I must say that I am pleased to be in this House representing hard working people in the constituency of Rosthern.

Today I will talk about another hard working type of people the union people, the people of Saskatchewan, of whom I am very aware. Being a member of a trade union, I can understand their problems and their concerns. This motion concerns me because it is the majority of the people it concerns.

The Trade Union Act of 1972 seems to be lacking in the two areas mentioned in the motion, that the majority of a certain size being concerned that a vote was not properly taken may be able to request a supervised vote. This does not show disrespect for the union leaders, it only will show that when the vote is done and supervised properly that they were either right or they were not. It actually will act as a vote of confidence, I believe.

I have asked the Pages to pass out the suggested amendments that we are proposing. I suggest to the Government Members that if they look closely at them they will see that it does not take away the rights of the executive of any of the unions. But what it does is make them covered by law not by constitution. An example I will use is the union of which I am a member. By constitution if we are not pleased with a vote or anything the executive does, ten members sign calling for a meeting, within seven days that meeting is held, then the vote will be taken if we agree or disagree. Once again, we the union members get to speak.

The same happens in the municipal Act, that if 5 per cent of the voters are concerned with something the council has done, they sign a petition and they are required to have a vote. With that thought in mind, we have suggested 10 per cent of the union members re certification, if the vote was done correctly and the proper count was done.

Further in the Act you will find, in The Trade Union Act of 1972, there is a figure of 25 per cent referred to. In the second portion of our suggested clause (5), we refer to that 25 per cent again.

Somebody once told me years ago if you have a point to make, make it short, make it brief and say what you have to say and don't muddy up the issues.

I ask Members across to give due consideration to our motion and to show their concern for the working people of Saskatchewan within the union movement so that those who are not covered by a constitution will be covered by a law. That is my concern and that is why I am pleased to second this motion for the majority, that they have a right when they believe the vote was not proper, that they have the right to ask for a supervised vote. In most cases I personally believe it will be a vote of confidence in the union and the executive.

I listened to the Member to my right making his usual remarks. I think the best way to handle those are ignore them.

There was a gentleman earlier in the audience today who I wish would be here now, a gentleman from the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. I think that he should be concerned that this is good legislation, this is not usurping the power of the executives, it is only another way to show confidence in them.

Once again I make another reference. In The Companies Act if a minority of the group, 25 per cent wish a vote or wish to have information, they can request it. Once again this is the backing up of the figure 25 per cent of the workers. As I said, I will be short and brief and to the point. I ask you to look at our suggested amendments and vote in favor of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I will be asking leave of the Assembly to adjourn this motion. Before I do, I should like to make one or two comments. The Member for Rosthern says that this motion reflects a concern for workers and that he urges all Members of the House to show concern by adopting the proposal which is submitted here.

With all due respect, I think there is a first step which must be established to the Members of the House - certainly in my own view and that that there is a problem, there is a concern, something which I think the Hon. Members in their speeches fail to demonstrate. But apart from general references to concerns, I couldn't help but note the absence of examples which would demonstrate that type of concern of which this motion seeks to deal with. The Hon. Member for Rosthern, to be fair to him, alluded to the concern in terms of a certification where a union has no constitution. I am sure the Hon. Member for Rosthern will know, on reflection, there can be no such certification unless there is a filing of a union constitution for the Labour Relations Board to accept or reject.

In that circumstance, if that is the only ground upon which the concern is based, I think, one would have to go a little bit deeper than that.

The other general remark that I would make is, on the question of the business of passing a law, in effect a law which would supersede a union constitution. That is basically what this proposed draft amendment would do if it became law. I think one of the fundamental questions that has to be asked, is the belief or attitude in which people in our society, organized people, are approached by governments? The assumption that a law should be passed to supersede a constitution, I think carries with it the implied assumption that the constitution and those who operate under it, namely a trade union for the purposes of the discussion of this motion are: (a) not autonomous or (b) not capable or (c) have not followed the rules of a union constitution. Would the Hon. Member for example, say that we should so similarly extend this law to, say the employers' associations in the construction field, whenever there is a certification or whenever there is a union contract for acceptance or rejection when there is a 25 per cent majority of those who feel that a contract should have been accepted by the employers' associations in the construction field, whenever

there is a certification or whenever there is a union contract for acceptance or rejection when there is a 25 per cent majority of those who feel that a contract should have been accepted by the employers' councils. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition is nodding his head in disagreement that he should. I'd like to see such a statement embodied in the motion. The unfortunate thing about the motion is that, in my view, it is all one sided. The Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) thinks there is apparently a need - and he is nodding his head in agreement - as an example, employers' councils to be similarly superseded by a law as he would have the Trade Union Movement superseded by a law. And that may be so, but I can't help but ask myself why, in nodding in agreement, you agree to that position, that was not the subject of the motion at the same time, because the motion talks of as I read it, in terms of unions only. So the point that I want to make here in the second area, is that while we have to examine this very carefully, the requests and the comments made by the Conservative Party, I think we would like to consider it.

AN HON. MEMBER:— You're saying that now . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— No, I say that very sincerely. The point that I should like to make in this area is that I am disturbed that the motion seeks to take away the independence of trade unions. In any event, there has not been any demonstrated need. And secondly, it is apparently one sided on trade unions only without indicating that they apply equally to employers or employer councils.

I think a lot more thought has to be given to this. There are some aspects of this which have to be further thought out and, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 20 - Multi-Dwelling Housing Units

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Mr. Malone (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to pass legislation providing interest assistance to encourage the construction of multi-dwelling housing units.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to call it 5:30. I might be some time, not an unduly lengthy period of time, but certainly longer than the eight or nine minutes that remains.

MR. ROMANOW:— I am not arguing about the 5:30. Mr. Speaker, am I not correct in saying that the Hon. Member does have a motion I believe on divorcement of retail outlets and oil companies which is currently under debate and stands adjourned in the name of the Leader of the Opposition and he now has a second motion, which is Resolution No. 20?

MR. MALONE:— Mr. Speaker, once the mover is named, he is then free to put another motion.

MR. ROMANOW:— Well, maybe, but I don't think so. I think it has to be disposed of. You can't keep on coming in every other day with these motions.

MR. MERCHANT:— On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I was only going to suggest that one of the reasons that you said yesterday that all parties consent to having two motions on the Order Paper would not be allowed was the very good point that you raised, that it would then be possible for one Member to take over the entire motion paper. Now we are in a situation where the matter is part of the adjourned debate and could stay there for some length of time at the behest of the Government. If the position of the Hon. House Leader were upheld it would place the Opposition in the position of losing the opportunity to place motions before the House and give to the Government the tools to adjourn and delay matters thereby precluding all or certain Members of the Opposition from placing new motions before the House.

MR. ROMANOW:— Speaking to the Point of Order. If that logic applies against the Government, it equally applies against the Opposition, because there is nothing by way of standing or any other ruse that the Opposition seems to imply to the Government that is not open to you people. You can ask for an adjournment and stand them just as much as we do and we give you the courtesy of doing it as you do to us. So it is very possible that the clogging activity would apply to any of the motions that we have tendered which stand in your name and I would simply say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the principle in my judgment, subject to Your Honour's ruling, is that once a resolution is before the House it is the property of the House, to be dealt with by the House and that the ruling, as Your Honour indicated the other day, is that another motion cannot be put on until one of them has been dealt with. So I think that the arguments advanced by the Members opposite don't apply against the Government, they apply equally against anything they might do.

MR. SPEAKER:— I think that the matter I was discussing the other day was with regard to Notices of Motions and at that time the Member for Wascana had two on the Order Paper. I believe that the one is not the property of the Member any more, it is the property of the House and consequently doesn't prevent him from discussing Resolution No. 20 which is before us at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— Now, I would have suggested had the previous motion been adjourned in the Member's name then he would have had two items before the House, but at this time I don't believe it has been pointed out that it has been adjourned in his name or anything of that nature. Therefore, I would assume that he could proceed with Resolution No. 20.

MR. ROMANOW:— I am not going to challenge or dispute that ruling because I believe that it is well thought out and I accept it, but I can't help but say as a passing comment that . . .

MR. MALONE:— Is the Member speaking to the Point of Order?

MR. ROMANOW:— I can't help but make as a passing comment, Mr. Speaker, that in the light of Your Honour's earlier remarks of a few days ago, the object could still be achieved by any Opposition Member or any Member for that matter, the very object of which Your Honour's ruling was made a few days ago, namely one Member clogging up the proceedings of the House by numerous motions. It is conceivable under this interpretation, which I am prepared to accept, that one Member could have 20 of them, all of them adjourned and standing under various people's names. I simply say that the inconsistency to me is something which Your Honour might want to consider on reflection. If not, I am prepared to abide by your ruling.

MR. MERCHANT:— Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, if it is a Point of Order. It seems to me that a Point of Order in general would be the tendency of the Hon. Attorney General to rise and lecture the House as though he were the Speaker of the House and not the Government House Leader.

MR. ROMANOW:— I can speak any time under any Order that I want.

MR. MERCHANT:— Speaking to the references that the Hon. Member has made, the simple way that the Government can handle the removal of these matters from adjourned debates is to allow the matters to come up expeditiously. And I suggest to you that it is not an appropriate suggestion to you that an Opposition Member or the Opposition could then clog the Private Members' day. Private Members' day is designed for this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, in many ways.

MR. ROMANOW:— I wish the Hon. Member would stop lecturing us.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! Private Members' day is reserved for the Private Members, regardless of which side of the House they are on.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:— At 5:30 there was some question raised whether the Member for Wascana could go ahead with Resolution No. 20 on the Order Paper. I want to clarify the situation, if I can, by directing to the attention of Members the ruling that I made on December 2nd in the House, and to the Journals of last year, March 25, 1975, page 101, whereby the Speaker said, and I quote in part:

He quoted from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, page 162 as follows: 'No Member

shall have more than one Notice of Motion at a time on the Order Paper.' Mr. Speaker pointed out that the rules pertaining to Notices of Motions did not apply to adjourned resolutions.

And consequently I would say that the Member for Wascana is in order to proceed with Resolution No. 20.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT:— Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the Resolution I think it fair to suggest to the House although I don't like to make - see what an obedient person I am, my Whip speaks and I immediately obey.

Mr. Speaker, I won't be lengthy in presenting this Resolution but I was going to suggest - and I suggest it in good faith - that it seemed curious to me that both on this Resolution, the Hon. Attorney General for whom I have great respect and whose rancor I clearly would not want to raise because of his obvious mastery of this House, both on this Resolution he thought it inappropriate that I speak and similarly yesterday on Bill 2 seemed to think that it was inappropriate that I address myself to Your Honour. I won't go further for fear of raising his rancor and proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us now a Rent Control Bill and I won't make any reference to the Rent Control Bill, although it certainly affects the question of apartment scarcity in Regina, Saskatoon and Saskatchewan at large which is already out of hand and I suggest can only get worse.

This Resolution suggests to the Cabinet that they take further action, that they take action to solve the problem in long term. If rent control solves the financial difficulties with whatever injustices for some tenants in the short term, surely appropriate action has to be taken in the long term to ensure that we have an adequate and proper supply of rental housing in this province. The situation in Regina and Saskatoon has, as the Minister has indicated in the Rental Control debate, reached a vacancy rate which is effectively zero. We, in Regina and Saskatoon are, according to DBS, absolutely in the worst situation in the entire country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution itself refers to the Government providing interest assistance to encourage the construction of multi-dwelling housing units and what does that Resolution refer to?

There are two specific programs which I suggest to this House, two programs which need not be called by those names but two programs which now exist in the Province of Alberta. In Alberta they have a Core Housing Incentive Program. It is available only in major urban centres, available only in major urban centres only because the nature of the funding is so specific and so ample that only where the Government would be absolutely assured that it could get back its equity could it be suggested that this is an appropriate kind of funding system. The Core Housing Program provides 8 per cent financing on loans, provides 95 per cent of the funding required and provides that money on 15-year term loans.

Now, what you may ask, what does the government get in that province for that kind of a program? That program is not dissimilar to the Section 15, Limited Dividend Program of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation except that rather than keeping the government perpetually involved in the housing project what the Core Housing Incentive Program does is that one-half of the units are then rented at cost and the government actually maintains control of 50 per cent of the units as far as those rentals go. It means that unlike Section 15 loans where the government stays involved and is setting the profit levels in perpetuity, in the Core Housing Incentive Program the government has control and is able to assist in low rental housing through apartments which it actually controls. That's one kind of proposal that this resolution suggests and the resolution I suggest would not necessarily require that a program like the Core Housing Incentive Program be brought in but something along those lines.

The second program, again from the Province of Alberta, and a program which I have been pressing upon the government since the 2nd of September of this year, is what the Alberta Governments calls the Modest Apartment Program, and that is simply a direct loan program for smaller cities and towns by which they lend 90 per cent of the value of an apartment on an interest controlled basis with no strings attached.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to this House that what rent control will do is dry up construction in Regina and Saskatoon. I fear that we have a mounting problem in any event and it is an area not where government should step in on its own with housing but an area where government should step in and assist the free enterprise developers who are now in the market ready to go to assist them with low interest loans or guaranteed loans. It is not necessary in passing this Resolution for the government to assume that they would actually be providing loan money, instead they might choose to interpret this Resolution to mean that the government would lend its power, its borrowing power to private individuals in much the same way as the Federal Government under farm improvement loans and the like, such as student loans to assist people to borrow money at lower than average interest rates. Lower than average interest rates with strings attached so that we would start to turn back the mounting problem that we have over the scarcity of construction in multi-dwelling units.

I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the government Whip saying, as he was reported in the Press, some six weeks ago that he thought that it was time that the Government should be getting into house building. I am very concerned when I heard the Minister of Housing talk of government going into apartment construction. I don't think that's the answer. I'm concerned that a tough Rent Control Act may have the effect of freezing out completely private development and rather than see the Government go in in a direct way, I suggest that the Government should be assisting private enterprise to continue to provide the apartments that are required.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) Resolution No. 20.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleague for Regina Wascana on this particular motion or resolution. It is very interesting that all of the legislation or most of the legislation that exists in this province dealing with housing or rental accommodation or the supply of shelter comes from the Government of Canada. Of course, under our constitution technically the matter of housing should be within the field of real property and exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces. Now either by reason of failure of the provinces to take adequate action or the lack of capability of the provinces to be able to take effective action, the field of housing has been basically pre-empted in the Province of Saskatchewan anyway, by the activities of the Federal Government.

It's interesting that in the supply of housing in Saskatchewan the only program that the Government of Saskatchewan has is the Senior Citizens Home Repair Program to an extent, I believe, of \$500. The rest are all programs which are 75 per cent federally funded.

Now, I think that the Government of Saskatchewan is abrogating its duties by its failures to take any initiatives in the field of supply of shelter or rental accommodation or housing of any nature. I think it's shameful for the Government opposite to be prepared to commit, if we can take the Premier's words up to a billion dollars to buy potash mines, when you are not prepared to come up with one new program to supply housing or rental accommodation to the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:— We are faced, Mr. Speaker, with as has been indicated, a zero rental accommodation position in the Province of Saskatchewan.

My colleague has indicated that the Province of Alberta has shown some initiative. Why can't the Province of Saskatchewan show some initiative? I think it's shameful that with this situation existing in Saskatoon and Regina, you don't have one new idea, you don't have one new program and you don't have one new proposal on the Order Paper for the people of Saskatchewan to take any action to solve or alleviate the problems of lack of rental accommodation and the shortage of housing in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I think that the actions of your Government are to be condemned, because all you do in the field of housing is harp and cry to Ottawa that they are not giving you enough money, when in fact, you are wasting money with some programs and you are mis-allocating your resources, especially when you intend to commit this province to at least \$1 billion in potash takeovers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:— How can any government in its right mind stand up when we have an obvious problem that they are crying about lack of rental accommodation and do nothing about? We've been in this Assembly now going on a month and surely if the Government

opposite was really concerned about rental accommodation, we would have had legislation before this Chamber. The people of Saskatchewan should have been advised already as to how much is going to be committed by the Government opposite. But no, we having nothing.

The Member for Regina Wascana is the first one to put any positive suggestions before this Legislature with regard to the problem that exists in Saskatoon and Regina, of a lack of rental accommodation and supply of housing. I think that's shameful on the part of the government that that should happen. Surely you are not blind to the problem, some of you have even spoken about it.

But you have by your inactivity pre-empted in Saskatchewan, all activity in the supply of housing to the Federal Government. You will force the Federal Government to take all the action in this province and on that you stand to be condemned and you certainly stand to be criticized.

The comments made by the Member for Regina Wascana, that the government should participate with the private sector to supply housing is certainly a valid one. Any consideration, and I understand the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation is considering the matter, any consideration that the government go into building its own apartment buildings or setting up its own construction company are foolish to say the least.

First of all you can be considerably more effective by using the leverage of government loans or government grants into expanding the amount of rental accommodation. Surely to use and combine the resources of the private sector with a grant formula or loans subsidized loans to the private sector would be considerably more effective than the government taking the same amount of money and being forced to put it into one, two, three or four apartment buildings, when in fact, they could probably be assisting private enterprise in the private sector into building 20, 25 or some reasonable multiple of what the government doing it solely, could do.

The idea that the Government opposite has, that in the field of housing the Government only must build the rental accommodations itself, as I said, I think is fallacious and I think it's specious. I think that the Government opposite is missing an opportunity to show some leadership in the field of supplying reasonable shelter for the people of this province and supplying reasonable rental accommodation and they have failed and they have failed miserably to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more words to say on this Resolution and beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Motions for Returns

Return No. 7

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview) for Return No. 7 showing:

- (1) The number of wells that were drilled by Saskoil from November 1, 1974 to November 1, 1975.
- (2) The total cost in each case to have the well drilled.
- (3) The further work that will be pursued in each case.
- (4) The number of wells that had been drilled by Saskoil as of November 1, 1974.

HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— Mr. Speaker, a brief comment with respect to this one. I think in my view this question, as I believe was indicated previously by the Attorney General, is more properly asked in the Crown Corporations Committee and I'm certainly prepared in that committee to answer the question of how many wells we have drilled, whether they've been successful on a gross basis, etc.

So therefore, I would ask the Members to defeat it and refer it there.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I think you realize, exactly what the Minister is asking Members of this House to do, is to deny all Members of this House and all the people of Saskatchewan any information about Saskoil as of after March 31 last year because the Minister knows very well that in Crown Corporations he'll stand up and say it is not in the year under review.

One of the most important aspects of Saskoil and a Crown corporation in which the people of Saskatchewan are investing money is public information. That is why this is not a subject of the Crown Corporation only but a subject of this Legislature at this time. The Minister well knows that the year under review will not cover the question as asked, and if he refused to give us this information at this time, through this method, it's a denial of information and I wonder if the people of Saskatchewan will ask why.

Certainly Saskoil is now in its second year, it has bought out a great deal of existing production, from what a lot of people say, at a very high cost. It is supposed to have provided for the exploration demise of private sector of the economy. We now know that the number of wells drilled is 50 per cent of what there were a year or two years ago before Bill 42 was passed. Now the Minister is completely denying this House and the public of Saskatchewan information and I say if the NDP do defeat this motion, it's a complete denial of legitimate information that belongs to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, one further comment. I am a little disappointed in the Minister when he supposedly stands up on

behalf of an open government and now makes it clear that the people of Saskatchewan are not to obtain certain information. I don't know what the Government opposite has to hide with regard to Saskoil. Everybody knows that the thing was mismanaged and was a total disaster from the outset and I don't know why the Minister responsible just doesn't make a public confession and clear the air and get this burden off his back.

Mr. Speaker, we'll have some more comments and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 12

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mrs. E. G. Edwards (Saskatoon-Sutherland) for Return No. 12 showing:

(a) A copy of the letters sent out by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to the 13 major hospitals outlining the approved patient days, for 1976 budget preparation. (b) The number of approved patient days for each of the 13 major hospitals for 1975.

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

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

sample copy of the letter sent out by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to the 13 major hospitals outlining the approved patient days, for 1976 budget preparation. (b) The number of actual patient days for the 13 major hospitals in 1973, 1974 and 1975 (as of November 1). (c) The number of approved patient days for the 13 major hospitals in 1975 (as at November 1) and the recommended patient days for 1976.

MRS. E. G. EDWARDS (Saskatoon-Sutherland):— Regarding the amendment, Mr. Speaker, each of the 13 hospitals have different rated bed capacities and therefore a sample copy of the letter sent out by SHSP would not give the detailed information requested.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Robbins) in his remarks prior to making the amendment, brought certain facts and figures to the attention of this Assembly. The Minister of Health said that during the period 1973, 1974 and in 1975, hospitals reduced their occupancy and operated at an occupancy rate lower than the recommended rate of SHSP.

The Minister of Health went on to say that in order to establish a new base line for global budgeting SHSP has submitted to hospitals a proposed occupancy which was based on the hospital's actual experience of 1973, 1974 and the projected experience of 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of this House some of the reasons a hospital's actual experience is lower than the recommended occupancy rate by SHSP.

December 9, 1975

Hospitals are considered to be running at full capacity and, in fact, cannot be safely managed if they run higher than an 80 to 85 per cent occupancy. The reasons are that of the different kinds of beds. For instance, adults cannot be admitted to cribs, children cannot be admitted to adult beds. Male patients are not admitted to the maternity ward. Coronary and emergency care beds must be kept available. Then there are summer slowdowns when staff is not available and budgets cannot cover summer relief help. There is a great variance in the length of patient's stay for many reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if the 1976 recommended rate is lowered to the actual experience of the previous year, it will prove to be a cutback in the services that major hospitals are able to provide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. EDWARDS:— Mr. Speaker, the hospitals in this province are financed by public money and the financial picture, the per diem rates, the rate of bed capacity, for each or any hospital should be matters of public information.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Health (Mr. Robbins) would supply the figures requested for each of the 13 major hospitals it would give this House and the public a more accurate picture of the quantity and quality of acute care each hospital will be allowed to provide in 1976.

For that reason, I would support the Motion but not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— I just want to say that this amendment is very bad. It is an example of the Government trying to hide the deteriorating health care in the Province of Saskatchewan. Every hospital in the Province of Saskatchewan today is running a deficit. For example, we've got a Base Hospital that's over there, and how much did we hear last year, and it's still got about 130 beds occupied out of 400. A multimillion dollar hospital, built by the taxpayers of this province and still the Minister of Health and this Government refused to operate it fully when people are crying for beds and crying for hospital care and hospital services. And now, this letter from the Government and the Minister of Health, he's now again trying to lower the bed capacity of the major hospitals in the province and once again deteriorate health care.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say about this and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Resolutions

Resolution No. 7 - Re-Examine the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Anderson (Shaunavon):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately re-examine the priorities, goals, methods and personnel of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

MR. F. J. THOMPSON (Athabasca):— Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this Motion I am reminded of the saying that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and in the hands of the Member for Shaunavon this lack of knowledge is a misguided missile. Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the Member for Shaunavon for his lack of knowledge, I think when it comes to the North the entire Liberal Party suffers a lack of knowledge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— I would have assumed that the Liberal Party would have re-examined its own priorities and goals following the NDP sweep on the North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— However, I suppose it is not an easy thing to do considering that both Liberal northern members were defeated in the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Saskatchewan made it very clear that they approved of the goals and priorities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Certainly there are some problems in DNS but the people of the North have indicated that they do not believe the Liberal Party can provide the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— I can assure the Members opposite that the goals and the priorities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are still the same and that they will not be changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, recently in the House we have been treated by Members opposite with history lessons. I should like

also to participate in these lessons. I urge Members opposite particularly the Member for Shaunavon to take notes. They certainly didn't learn any lessons from the recent election, if their views on the North are any indication.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has an uncanny ability to remember precisely all that happened in Saskatchewan up until 1964. They then suffer a memory lapse, and do not recall anything until 1971. I believe psychologists would term this a memory lapse. It appears to me that the Member for Shaunavon has inherited this memory lapse.

The years 1964 to 1970-71 were years of dire hardship and frustration to the people of the North. Let me cite a few statistics that existed in 1971 when the NDP assumed office.

1. Incidence of disease in the North were 35 times higher than in the South;
2. The drop-out rate among students was approximately 80 per cent higher than in the South;
3. Welfare cases were the highest in the history of northern Saskatchewan;
4. The Liberals built an average of 25 to 30 new houses per year under their program.

Mr. Speaker, when the NDP assumed office in 1971 they pledged to change these statistics. More health facilities have been put into northern Saskatchewan. More doctors, nurses, full-time dentists. The drop-out rate in the school system has changed dramatically since the NDP Government has taken over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, the welfare cases have also dropped drastically and northern people are very proud of this.

MR. LANE:— How many:

MR. THOMPSON:— I'll get to that. Under the northern housing program, under the Liberals, they built 25 to 30 houses per year; under the new program in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan the NDP Government is building on an average, 125 houses per year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, when I speak of the 125 houses per year I am speaking of 125 public houses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— This has nothing to do with houses that are used by civil servants. These are strictly for northern people who live and were born and raised in northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, when the Government established a Department of Northern Saskatchewan the Members opposite called for its abolition. Now, for the first time in history the people of the North have an opportunity to develop their potentials and the potentials of the North as they see fit and the Liberal Party calls for an altering of the goals and priorities of the North.

As I stated before, the goals and the priorities of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan will remain the same and that is to develop the North with the best interests of northern people in mind.

If the Member for Shaunavon wishes to deal constructively with the problems of northern Saskatchewan I suggest he first examine his own position and that of his party. Seven years of inaction and four years of distortion and misrepresentation of the North are not a solid base from which to lodge criticism of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON:— Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment, seconded by the Member for Cumberland (Mr. MacAuley) that Resolution No. 7 be amended as follows:

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

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for implementing a major development program in Northern Saskatchewan that has to date resulted in -

- (1) (i) unprecedented growth and quality of housing for northern residents;
- (ii) the first officially elected Northern Municipal Council and Northern School Board;
- (iii) the first community based medical and dental clinics with increased services across the North;
- (iv) the first northern based child care program with northern community based care facilities;
- (v) the first northern magistrates, legal aid and Community Corrections program;
- (vi) the first northern based comprehensive alcohol rehabilitation program;
- (vii) the first comprehensive, northern based, recreation program with locally elected recreation boards;
- (viii) unparalleled opportunities for northern employment; therefore reducing social assistance recipients and payments 48 per cent and 43 per cent respectively (January 1973 to December 1974);
- (ix) extensive upgrading of northern educational facilities and services;
- (x) the establishment of a government department with operations and staff located in Northern Saskatchewan.

- (2) This Government regrets the continuing unwarranted attacks by the Liberal and Conservative opposition

December 9, 1975

against northern people, northern programs, and the personnel of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

MR. R. L. COLLVER: (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):— Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment I find myself speechless . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER:— . . . at the inaccuracies of the particular amendment. Therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Motions for Return

Return No. 13

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Malone (Regina Lakeview) for Return No. 13 showing:

- (1) The amount of money that has been accumulated in the Saskatchewan Energy Development Fund.
- (2) (a) The amounts, if any, that have been paid out of the fund; (b) the purposes for which it was paid.

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

That all the words after the word "Energy" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

and Resource Development Fund to March 31, 1975. (2)(a) The amounts, if any, that have been paid out of the fund; (b) the purposes for which it was paid.

And the proposed subamendment thereto moved by Mr. Steuart:

That all the words after the word "to" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

October 31, 1975. (2)(a) The amounts, if any, that have been paid out of the fund; (b) the purposes for which it was paid.

Subamendment negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS - 17

Steuart	Cameron	Merchant
Stodalka	Edwards	Thatcher
Lane	Nelson	Collver
	(Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)	
Wiebe	Clifford	Ham
Malone	Anderson	Katzman
MacDonald		Birkbeck

NAYS - 27

Pepper	Kowalchuk	Cowley
Bowerman	Robbins	Matsalla
Smishek	Mostoway	Skoberg
Romanow	Larson	Vickar
Messer	Whelan	Nelson (Yorkton)
Snyder	McNeill	Allen
Byers	MacAuley	Johnson
Lange	Shillington	Thompson
Faris	Rolfes	Banda

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the House and the people of Saskatchewan, this is the fourth resolution tonight that the Government has denied information to the Opposition and to the people. It is interesting that all four of those resolutions have to do with resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— At a time, Mr. Speaker, when this whole Legislature is now sitting to discuss resource development and resource confiscation and expropriation.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, Return No. 7, the number of wells drilled by Saskoil and all that information asks about the experience of a Crown corporation of two years ago. Item number six, on the feasibility study relating to potash. Once again stood by the Attorney General. The next one, item number seven, all reports, studies, commissioned by the Government, its Crown corporations, boards, denied again. And now, Mr. Speaker, this last one, item 18, on the amount of money from the energy fund that will be used and has been expended to date and how much is there.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is using its power to stand motions on the Order Paper to ask the majority to deny information and defeat motions. Mr. Speaker, if there is ever a time when the backbenchers should recognize their responsibility - to have the Government frontbenchers give this information - this is supposed to be an open government. If ever a time that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to information on resource policy of this NDP Government is right now. Surely to heavens, that you as the people of the Government of this province have a genuine and a serious responsibility to be honest, forthright and straightforward with the taxpayers in this province in relation to watch your policy, what the information is in regard to the Crown corporations in this province and particularly those related to resource development and the studies and information relating to costs.

Mr. Speaker, I draw it to the attention of the House, the attitude of the Government in this particular motion, the attitude of the Government in the previous three and all of them are related to resource development. They directly relate to potash and the people of this province have a right to information on resource development, resource policy, and resource expenditure by this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! May I just beg the indulgence of the House for a moment or two to relax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— Might I ask the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, my records show that you spoke on the item before.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, in all honesty I thought I spoke on the main motion and not the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:— The debate previously was on the main motion and the amendment. The debate that was not concurrent was on the subamendment.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, may I ask then, did I speak prior to the movement of the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:— I have you as speaking on December 2, you seconded the subamendment. But you didn't speak to the subamendment to the best of my knowledge. You spoke to the amendment and the motion. So I would suggest that the Member according to my records, was out of order.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, would you like me to take back all those words and all those ideas that I gave to the House. They were so important, Mr. Speaker, that I am glad I did break the rules of the House by accident so that the people of Saskatchewan will know.

MR. SPEAKER:— The Member may take them back if he does it as silently as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):— Mr. Speaker, in speaking against this amendment, I can sympathize with the Members opposite in their belief that perhaps the Members to my right are asking for too much when they suggest that detailed information pertaining to the acquisition of potash mines through expropriation proceedings be revealed to the people of this province and more specifically to the gleeful boards of directors of these potash mines prior to any expropriation that takes place by the Government.

However, I cannot understand the reluctance of the Government opposite to release information to this Assembly as it relates to already existing energy funds. I cannot understand

why we are not entitled to know how much money has been accumulated through a negotiated arrangement that the Government of Saskatchewan has made a year or year and a half ago. Why are we not entitled to know how much has been accumulated in that fund to this date?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER:— This surely is not information that the potash industry can use in developing its idea as to how much you are going to pay for expropriated mines if you decide to expropriate them. Surely they are not going to use this information. And for that reason I cannot understand why you refuse to release this to the people of this province.

HON. E. L. COWLEY (Minister of Saskatchewan Potash Corporation):— Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate with a great deal of pleasure. I don't know whether or not, Mr. Speaker, the rules permit me to refer to the illegal, or out of order at least, speech made by the Member opposite. I can understand why the Member opposite couldn't remember whether or not he spoke in the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY:— His remarks are usually so profound that everyone forgets them, including the Member opposite. I noted that he made two or three errors in the course of the evening. He has had two or three opportunities to speak. One would not expect him to do anything else than that.

He spoke on the motion when he had already spoken on it. That was out of order. He said that item number seven, Return No. 8 had been defeated, and it was passed. So one of his four examples was wrong. He ranted and raved about Saskoil and the fact that last year the year end was March 31 and the Government didn't give any information. I submit to those Members opposite and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) at least was one of the Members on the Crown Corporations Committee. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition will verify that we did give information with respect to Saskoil after the year end.

MR. MacDONALD:— Not in the year under review.

MR. COWLEY:— Yes, we did, after the year under review right up until the date when the Committee was meeting. I indicated when I spoke on that particular resolution a few moments ago that I was prepared to give such information with respect to Saskoil as was asked in the question again this year.

Mr. Speaker, I think if the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley gets his facts straight on the next debate he will at least have scored in one out of four tonight which would be rather good for the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

Mr. Speaker, I think the case has been put rather well by the Acting Minister of Finance, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Robbins) and I think the Government's position with respect to this particular resolution is well known.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Merchant debate was adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana) moved second reading of Bill No. 17 - An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act (No. 2):

He said: I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have an opportunity to move the amendment to the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act and explain that amendment which is simple and the purposes of that amendment to the House.

The amendment simply deals with the definition of a child but that of course has far-reaching effects on the operation of the legislation.

Let me begin by setting the scene in the way The Deserted Wives' Act operates. I am sure that no one on either side of the House would argue with the proposition that when there is a marriage breakdown if anyone is at fault certainly it is not the children. They are blameless in the very sad and very unfortunate situations which tends to arise. I don't believe that we put enough effort into the reconciliation process.

I believe that governments spend too much time and energy considering how to deal with broken marriages and not enough energy and don't give enough consideration to how to keep the marriages from becoming broken. If governments give too little time and too little effort to avoiding marriage breakdown in the first place, that perhaps is a discussion for another day.

In that regard, however, I am pleased to see that The Family Court Act was passed in this province and I hope that soon a unified family court may be in operation in this province with the reconciliation provisions which exist in that legislation and the reconciliation provisions which exist in other jurisdictions.

In any event, coming back specifically to this amendment I repeat again that as far as the children are concerned if there is a marriage breakdown for whatever reason, they certainly are blameless. Our law has said that a child is entitled to support. The assumption of our law in The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act is that the husband is the primary provider and that although it is increasingly less so the case in the vast majority of Saskatchewan families is that the husband should bear the primary responsibility. Ordinarily the mother ends up with custody of the children, the father moves out and usually the father is saddled with some share of that support. He is required, and rightly so, to support the family.

Even, Mr. Speaker, where a mother is living separate and apart for reasons which dis-entitle her to support, the children are still entitled to support if they are with her. In short, regardless of the way the separation occurs, the children are

entitled to be supported by the father. That's the way it has always been, and that is the way it should be, I suggest, in the future.

The question then comes to what age is support granted and to what age should that support be granted. That is really what this amendment turns on. Ever since this legislation came into effect in this province, we have limited the age for the support of children to 16, support continues until the child exceeds 15 years and 11 months. That age limitation grew out of another period of Saskatchewan history. I suggest that age limitation simply no longer fits the pattern of current Saskatchewan life. Some 20, 30 or 40 years ago it may have been appropriate at a time when different practices took place with our youth. That is not appropriate any longer.

Someone leaving the educational process now at that young age is an exception to the rule, yet there is no provision to support a child who continues to acquire further training. A child may now receive support up to the age of 16 provided the child is not receiving food or other necessities from some other source. That distinction in our legislation is important. The courts apply the rule to mean that if the child is working or if the child perhaps by some freak has inherited a large amount of money for whatever reason, if the child is able to support himself or herself then support is not given under this legislation.

In the ordinary course of events, of course, quite as one would expect, all children who are not working are found to be deserted and entitled to the support of their family. Ordinarily a child who is not married gets the support from his or her father.

There is, incidentally, provision under our legislation for a mother to be ordered to pay support for a child, the deserted wives' legislation is not so archaic as to suggest that a woman might not be ordered to pay support in a situation which would arise if a mother's child ends up in the hands of municipal authorities or something of that nature. In the situation under Section 2(3) of the Act it is possible to apply to the court to compel the mother to support the child. Although I have found in my experience which in this area is very broad, that that seldom if ever comes up. The usual situation is that the husband is supporting the children.

This amendment simply takes into consideration the changed expectations of the current generation and the changed educational patterns. It is far more common for a child today to continue with his or her studies to the age of 18 and indeed beyond. Indeed when you consider it, 18 only gives a child Grade Eleven or perhaps Grade Twelve, though they may not go on in the classical education, may not go on in high school and some sort of trade training is taken beyond the age of 16.

Under the divorce legislation and this anomaly is important, children are supported to the age of 16 with a specific provision similar to the specific provision which exists under The Deserted Wives' Act, but in addition, children are entitled to support well beyond that time if, as in the words of Section 2 of The Divorce Act, the child is unable by reason of illness, disability or other cause to withdraw himself from his parents' charge or to provide himself with the necessities

of life. That provision has properly been very widely interpreted by the courts. It was intended I suggest to have wide application. How then does the divorce legislation operate in practice?

Ordinarily a child going on to university indeed taking a first degree to 22 or 23 will obtain support from his parents pursuant to the divorce legislation. Indeed there are cases which have held that going on for some sort of trade training well beyond 16 would entitle the child to support certainly into his early 20s. Because the wife ordinarily has the children, deserted wives with this anomaly in our law, are now faced in this province with forum shopping. This means they have the tendency on the advice of their lawyers to look for the court which has the power to deal most generously with them. Whereas in this province the divorce court has a far wider discretion to grant support, women in not infrequent numbers find it financially compulsory for them to obtain a divorce simply to obtain the corollary relief that goes with it. They may well find themselves launching a divorce in order to get the additional five or six years of support for their children. Families who would not perhaps be ordinarily divorced, perhaps because of religious views, a position with which I personally agree, for instance, may find that they must proceed to obtain a divorce to gain the corollary relief which goes with it.

I, for instance, in my practice have from time to time had to threaten that we would seek a divorce simply to convince the other lawyer that support should voluntarily be paid beyond the age of 16. I have on other occasions had to proceed to obtain a divorce solely to get into a court which then has the added power to grant support beyond the age of 16. Mr. Speaker, if it weren't for the difference in the jurisdiction of the court under The Divorce Act and under the Deserted Wives' Act, a wrong might exist in our law, but an anomaly wouldn't be staring deserted wives in the province in the face.

I am proposing in one bite to bring the deserted wives legislation up to the standard of the divorce legislation, although frankly I consider the divorce legislation to be more appropriate and more in tune with the view of fairness which I suggest would be held by most Members of this House and the vast majority of Canadian people.

I don't suggest that we go the whole way but we should move in that direction. I believe that this House should bring Saskatchewan law closer to the accepted standard of the country and closer to the accepted educational and training patterns of the province.

I want, Mr. Speaker, as well to include some comparison with other jurisdictions. I have ended the comparison that we have with the federal jurisdiction. The particular problem as I have mentioned with the federal jurisdiction is that they have concurring jurisdiction over the same people within this province. But how, you might ask, does Saskatchewan law compare with similar legislation across the country?

Every province in Canada has an Act very comparable to our legislation except for Quebec, they operate under the Code Civile and in this regard it is very different. But when you compare the other provinces across the country, you find that our legislation is the skimpiest and the most archaic.

Newfoundland provides support to the age of 16 and then support to the age of 19 with certain exceptions. The Newfoundland legislation essentially provides that if the child continues with his or her education and is unable to provide for his or her support, then maintenance must be provided by the parents to the age of 19. When you compare the other sections of the Newfoundland legislation to ours, you find that as the two Acts operate, Newfoundland support under their Act would run to the age of 19 in similar situations while ours would be cut off at the age of 16 as the law now stands.

The Prince Edward Island legislation defines 'child' by using the words infant children and you have to look to The Children's Protection Act for that definition. Infant children in that jurisdiction means under 17. So, Prince Edward Island is mid-way between what we have now and the 18 which this amendment proposes to you.

Nova Scotian legislation simply provides for support to the age of 18. So that legislation is identical to the way that I believe our legislation should operate.

New Brunswick provides for support to the age of 16 and further support to the age of 19 if physically or mentally disabled. New Brunswick is the skimpiest legislation other than Saskatchewan in looking after the rights of children and in looking after the rights of deserted wives.

Ontario, the largest jurisdiction in Canada grants support under 16 as ours does, but up to the age of 18 if the child continues to attend school on a full time basis. When you view that with our requirement a child must have a need for food and other necessities, the Ontario legislation again would be the same as our legislation if we amend it. Although their definition of child goes at it in a different way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the NDP haven of Manitoba. That says under 18 years without exception. That should be the direction in which we move.

And lastly let us look at the legislation in British Columbia. Under 19 years in British Columbia, without exception. Good leads I suggest for this House to follow, good leads for the NDP to follow in viewing what their NDP cousins to the West and East now do.

I hope this House will pass this legislation and amend the Act which I believe the Government should have done many years ago. As I said in starting, I need not be unduly lengthy in presenting the matter to the House.

If the House however turns down this Act, or if the Government adjourns the Bill from time to time without dealing with the legislation then I call on the Press particularly to faithfully report to the people that the Government is refusing to do what is right simply because it chooses to avoid some perceived minuscule political advantage in not passing an amendment proposed by an Opposition Member. I say minuscule because clearly the Government takes the credit for whatever legislation is passed and the Government takes the blame for the bad legislation which in my submission now exists in this province.

This proposition is extremely simple, it is uncomplicated and it is appropriate, so appropriate that I cannot image any right thinking man or woman in this House in this province voting against the amendment. For the Press, I believe they must not just watch out for the reappearance and the defeat of the Bill, which is unlikely. They should watch to see that the Government does not deliberately delay and put off this Bill for the purpose of never passing the proposal now before the House. This I suggest is a different class of suggestion than the suggestion that I made the other day with a resolution when I indicated to the House that a Bill would be proposed. This cannot be in any way a contentious piece of legislation. It is a simple piece of legislation, something that the Government should have done a long time ago. I suggest to the Attorney General, in what he calls the new spirit of co-operation while he rams the potash Bill down our throats that he might just slip the amendment through and allow it to pass in the House.

I take pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill to amend the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. L. M. LARSON (Pelly):— Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Hon. Member's outline of what he said about deserted wives, abandoned children, potash and what have you. I had great difficulty to relate one with the other. I really couldn't understand how he could bring potash into deserted wives and abandoned children.

I should like to have an opportunity to look at some of the things he said and see if I can tie them together. I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

STATEMENT

Return No. 13

MR. SPEAKER:— Before we go on to the next item I find that I owe the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) an apology for any embarrassment I may have caused him. I do have him recorded on a Return No. 13 as having spoken, but I find upon checking the records again that he spoke on the sub-amendment and therefore was in order to speak on the amendment as it was dealt with.

I am sorry the Member is not here to hear my apology first hand, but I think the apology should be done where the misdemeanor occurred and consequently I do hereby apologize to the Member. I am sure the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) will be quite willing to withdraw any remarks that he made that may be out of order as well.

MR. MERCHANT:— Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I wonder if the Hon. Member for Indian Head, having taken the abuse of the House could be brought back in to make another speech and to gain the advantage of a second . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— I doubt if that's a Point of Order.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 1 - An Act respecting the development of Potash Resources in Saskatchewan be now read a second time.

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South):— Mr. Speaker, I tell you not to feel too badly about that slight error. Your record, Mr. Speaker, for the day on calling the shots of the House is twice as good as the Attorney General's. From time to time I think he begins to wonder if he doesn't exercise the control of the Speaker in the House. Your Honour will remember he made two decisions today in the course of debate and he was wrong on both counts. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, your record is better than his.

I am wanting, in joining the debate for the first time on Bill 1, which is one of the most significant Bills to come before this Legislature in a very long time, to address myself, Mr. Speaker, to five principal areas in connection with that Bill.

I want to talk about the matter of principle involved in the Bill and the shoddy way in which this government treats principles; I want to talk about the three or four points, and that's all, that have emerged from the addresses of the Members on the other side. I want to refer to the historical chain of events, thirdly, that were described in the two and a half hour address by the Attorney General, (which I note no one described as a filibuster); and I want to refer to the constitutional questions, fourthly, which the action brings; and I want to speak lastly of the economic folly of much of what is proposed in the Bill. I intend to say all that, may I say in less than the two and one-half hours that the Attorney General used to introduce the Bill.

Let me turn first, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of the principles involved and the attitude of this Government toward some very fundamental principles of this legislation.

Now we have heard in this House a good deal about how some 20 or more years ago we sought out and welcomed to this province mining people from around the world to develop a resource that we ourselves could not. We had neither the money, nor the expertise to do the job. We knew that it took tremendous skill, tremendous knowledge and tremendous sources of capital, which we didn't have. Indeed, it took very high risks in those early years despite the predilection of the Members on the other side who make the point that there was no risk involved. And I was amazed indeed the other day to listen to one of them who wasn't a backbencher, but who is a Minister of the Crown, make this silly statement, talking about risk. He said, "Why what's the risk in developing another mine; what's the risk taken in the expansion of a mine?" Of course, when the industry is established and twenty years later, twelve mines have been drilled and the techniques learned, it's a very different matter when you come to risk, not to count the markets that have since been developed. That kind of reasoning that you occasionally hear, even from Ministers on the other side of the House, leaves you wondering, Mr. Speaker, very often about the wisdom of this Government's move.

It took millions and millions of dollars to develop this resource. Enormously high risks, as I referred to, and not only did someone have to discover the techniques by which to mine and market the product, but markets themselves had to be developed and won by people who knew what they were going.

All considered, to get at this resource, to mine it, to retrieve it and to market it, took tremendous courage, enormous sums of capital and expertise drawn from around the world. Indeed, from France and Germany and the United States, as some Hon. Members will remember. To put it simply, we knew we had the product in tremendous abundance, millions upon millions of tons, but we didn't know how to get at it. We didn't have the knowledge, we didn't have the knowhow and we certainly didn't have the money. So, what we did in those early years, is we welcomed people from outside our borders. We offered them incentives and guarantees and encouragement and they responded. They came with their money and they brought with them the best engineers you could find in France, in Germany and elsewhere, and they tackled the job.

What we in turn did, Mr. Speaker, is we gave them a couple of solemn commitments on behalf of our province. First we said to them, if you will come here and do what we ask you to do and help us develop this resource, we will negotiate with you a rate of royalty, and having determined what that rate of royalty will be we will freeze it until the year 1981. First commitment. The second commitment we made as a province was not to interfere unreasonably with the operations of the companies if they got going. We certainly gave them our solid commitment, not to nationalize the industry.

I want to refer Members opposite to the Saskatchewan Sub-surface Mineral Regulations, if they wonder where the commitments came from. I read from the regulations, the governing one:

The royalty payments herein provided shall be in lieu of, and in substitution for all taxes, all levies, or impost of a nature similar to a royalty, that are based on the separation of the ore from the earth or the production of such ore.

That is an exact word for word, faithful quote from those regulations.

Some Hon. Members, no doubt, in their confusion will say that that was Liberal Government folly, a giveaway of our resources, as they have done so often. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, without those kinds of assurances, without those two guarantees and fundamental commitments of which I have spoken, the industry would never have located in this province, and the resource would still be sitting in the ground never having been tapped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I want to remind them also that those regulations from which I have just quoted which said that the royalty rates that were frozen until 1981 were in lieu of, and in substitution for all taxes, were passed in the year 1960, and that's a significant year for the Members opposite, because they know that when

those regulations were passed it was Premier Douglas who occupied that chair that now Premier Blakeney occupies. These were guarantees given by your own Premier. They were guarantees unfortunately, in a sense, given on behalf of all of us. As a people, we gave these assurances in the most solemn manner. Premier Douglas didn't give these people an oral assurance on the side he didn't do it by letter, nor did he even stop at giving it to them by contract. He did that, but he did much more. The assurance was given by him standing indeed in this very Assembly, with all its tradition and with all its significance behind him and speaking on behalf of all of the province, said I guarantee you if you come here and do these things we will not nationalize you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Then indeed he carried it a step further, because not only did he give the solemn assurance to this House on behalf of the people of this province and the generations hence as well as those present then, he went a step further and he enshrined his commitment in the law of the province by having passed the regulations I have referred to.

Mr. Speaker, that solemn commitment which he gave, not only for himself and his government and his party, he gave for us too. That commitment, today, is shredded and tattered. Indeed, we as a province have welched.

If there is anything the men and women of Saskatchewan don't tolerate very readily, it's a welcher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Make no mistake about it, we have welched on our word with this Bill 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Members opposite may applaud that, Members opposite may find all kinds of ways to justify it in their own consciences but the fact remains, we welched.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I want to remind Hon. Members that the generations before us, and their fathers and their fathers before them were taught, while in rather rustic terms at times, nonetheless very effectively. They had burned into their consciences one simple truth by which they guided themselves. While it was a simple truth, expressed in simple terms for simple people, nonetheless it was true, and it was "a man's word is his bond."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Indeed generations of simple Saskatchewan folk learned their basic ethics in that one sentence, a man's word is his bond. Once given, a commitment was to be valued and adhered to, however tempting it might be to do otherwise. For a man's

word was his bond and to welch was to invite disdain and distrust. This Premier has done exactly that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Members applaud, some Members say hogwash. I say to you, rather than applaud, I say that you ought to be perhaps a little ashamed, as we are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I ask some of you too, because there are some of you over there, including the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) who in your own dealings and in your own private relations, would be ashamed to conduct yourself in that kind of way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Whatever your standards of behavior are, and I know that some of you have other standards, certainly our standards privately are that when you give your commitment and your assurance to a person you don't go back on your word later. Now how can you people, I ask you, accept from your Government a standard of conduct that you yourself would never accept in your own private dealings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— In a very real sense, Mr. Speaker, this is what they do when they rise in support of this Bill. As I said, no amount of rhetoric, no manner of justification, nor form of excuse will ever erase the fact that those of you who rise in support of this Bill stand amidst a broken promise. You stand with leadership that was welched in respect of the word of Saskatchewan. I can you that no Liberal will ever support that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Mr. Speaker, I said I wanted to discuss a number of areas and I consider that one to be of tremendous importance, and I ask some of the Hon. Members to address their minds occasionally to the area I have just talked about.

I want to turn to the second area I said I would discuss and that was the several points that have emerged in many of the speeches from the other side.

Repeatedly some Members opposite have made essentially three points - points which one might characterize, I think fairly, as negative points, and points which I think too one might fairly characterize as a lot of nonsense.

The first of those is that we on this side of the House, because we choose to differ from you, are somehow therefore to be put on the side of the multinational corporations.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Agreed!

MR. CAMERON:— The Member says agreed.

Secondly, you say that these multinational corporations in themselves, by virtue only of being multinational corporations are to be despised. I hear they agree. Thirdly, you say that we are against the notion of Crown ownership and Crown corporations. The Attorney General will no doubt say 'agreed'. It seems to be his pet argument.

I wish to speak, Mr. Speaker, briefly to these three points each in turn. Not because I expect that I'm going to convince very many Members opposite to a different point of view, but at least the people of Saskatchewan will understand that those three arguments are so much "malarkey".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I turn to the first of these: Because we differ from you in view, we are said to be the friends of the multinational corporations, the friends of business, the friends of foreign interest. I hear 'agrees' to the three of them. Then I ask you, who said in New York last week why Saskatchewan is a great place for American companies to invest in?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Your own Premier. And who stood in this House not two weeks ago and said with some satisfaction with respect to uranium development in the North, "Why are we walking hand in hand with them. We have joint ventures with companies the like of Gulf and other multinational corporations?" Again your own Premier. We notice in the annual reports that we received regularly, references with pride and satisfaction to working alongside Simpson Timber, MacMillan Bloedel, and other large companies in the North. Annual reports which are prepared by you people and speak in those prideful terms of getting along with those big multinational corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I ask you too, to whom did the Minister of Mineral Resources the other day address himself when he stood in the House and he talked about additional incentives for the oil industry, if it wasn't to Exxon and to Gulf and to Texaco and a whole lot of other large multinational oil companies?

What in fairness, Mr. Speaker, one makes of all of this is simply that we recognize and that you people recognize the need for outside capital and expertise to come to this province and to develop resources that we ourselves can't do for the advantage of our own people. We say that if it is to our advantage as a province to have corporations from outside our borders, whether they be Canadians, American, French or German, or Europeans, or multinationals, or whatever they are, if it's to our advantage to have their ability and their money why we will take it. We say, come and work with us, we welcome you, irrespective of where you are from.

MR. SKOBERG:— Don't forget the Canadians!

MR. CAMERON:— I did say the Canadian, my friend, you weren't listening!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Now I ask you why aren't you people prepared to say and to say it candidly and honestly as we do, that your position in that respect is not very much different from ours. It doesn't follow because you work in the North with these companies, or you talk in prideful terms about getting along with MacMillan Bloedel and Simpson Timber and Gulf Oil, and rattle them all off, it doesn't follow from that that you were the particular friends of the multinational corporations and nor does it follow that we are the particular friends of the multinational corporations when you and we have essentially the same policy and when we have an argument which happens to coincide with the companies.

The fact is these multinational corporations are not some mindless, malevolent or sinister enemy that some of you make them out to be. They are people. The Member for Saskatoon Centre scoffs. It shows his lack of any understanding of any kind of corporate or company enterprise. Who do you think established these companies and corporations if it isn't people? A multinational corporation is simply a gathering of people from various countries with a common enterprise and a common purpose. They are shareholders, they are managers, they are employees, they are people, that is what they are, gathered in some joint enterprise. And they are neither bad nor good in themselves, they are in themselves neutral. And why the Members opposite, and particularly those of you who are reasonable and that isn't all of you, I appreciate, but those who are reasonable, can't begin to understand that simple fact of life. I ask you, and I ask the Member for Saskatoon Centre particularly, the Whip on the other side, he seems to think, along with the Member for Regina Rosemont, he's another one of those, continuously makes the point that multinational corporations are in themselves malevolent and evil. I ask you then if they are not as I say they are, if they are in their essence as you say, huge mechanical predatory evils, then I ask you how are they different today than they were when your Premier Douglas invited them here. They are no different essentially. What you are saying, which is the height of illogic, is that they are one thing when you expropriate and they are another when you are together in joint ventures with them.

Of course, even the Member for Saskatoon Centre the Whip on the other side can understand this if he would open his mind. The fact is that they are not as they are so often described. They are exactly the same in essence and nature when you work with them in the North in uranium, as what they are when you expropriate them from potash in the South. Why do we hear these constant references, therefore about these multi-national corporations and how evil they are. That has been given as one of the rationales for the expropriation, which is just so much nonsense. I wish Members on the other side of the House would give a little more thought to some of the things they say in those references.

We hear it again and again. They say because some of our arguments happen to coincide with some of the arguments of the potash industry, that we are their spokesmen, that we are their friends, that we are tied to them in some sinister way.

MR. SKOBERG:— . . . suspicious.

MR. CAMERON:— Oh, yes. The Member knows that this is the most mischievous technique of debate. I remind the Member for Moose Jaw North, he may not know this, but it is a technique of debate that was long ago despised by reasoning and large minded men.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— So the Member for Moose Jaw North makes the point because a lawyer defends a murderer he himself is some way guilty. Because the Attorney General who studied under the Federal Minister of Transport is somehow not to be disassociated from him. As though the Premier - it is the same kind of argument - as though the Premier because he happens to originate in the Maritimes, rather than having been born in Saskatchewan as we were, is therefore for that reason somehow less committed to Saskatchewan's cause than we are. Now, you know that that is the most mischievous kind of debate that one can engage in. If you don't know it now you have no excuse for not knowing it and I hope that we are not going to hear a great deal more of that kind of debate in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— It is the kind of approach which is worthy of the severest criticism. It is deceitful and it is contemptible. Those of you who chuckle, sit back and think about it for a little while.

Now I am not so naive as to think that we have heard the last kind of that sort of an appeal in this House. We shall hear it again, unfortunately, from time to time. But I hope that those who persist in peddling this kind of argument and this kind of muck will at least themselves begin to feel some shame because they most certainly ought to.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the several negative arguments that have been advanced. This one, as I say, seems to have been the particular friend of the Attorney General, that we are somehow here philosophically opposed to the notion of Crown corporations. The Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) dealt with that particular argument rather well and I don't intend to cover it very fully. Suffice it to say neither the philosophy of liberalism nor the practice of that philosophy in government has ever led anyone, except those whose minds refuse again to look at the logic of the situation or the obvious to any other conclusion, that we are not opposed as a philosophical notion to Crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Again it is the same smoke screen of which the Member for Maple Creek spoke. I know again we are not going to hear the end of that one, we will continue to hear it. I don't suppose we will continue to deny it, it becomes fruitless after a while, but at this stage, at least, we want to make it clear that what he says in that respect is wrong. It could not

be more wrong despite the fact that we will hear it again and again and again. Each time you say it from here on in the red light will flash, wrong, Mr. Attorney General, wrong!

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to another of the principal areas I said I want to discuss and that is the chain of events which the Attorney General spoke of in his two and one-half hour address, the chain of events which he said led inevitably to the takeover of the potash mines, some or all of the potash mines in Bill 1.

I should pause for a moment to remind the Attorney General that I have thus far made no reference to the remarks of the Member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange). I have refrained from doing that because I noticed while he was delivering his address he seemed to have done it to the distinct displeasure of the Attorney General, making the point he kept making that this was a socialist Bill, by a socialist government. I refer to the Member for Milestone-Bengough. Either he failed to listen to the Premier in the Throne Speech when the Premier said that this was a Bill that was based on economic reasons and not dogmatic reasons, or else he listened to the Premier at the NDP Convention in Saskatoon when the Premier stood to great applause and said, this takeover of the potash industry is the great challenge of socialism in the '70s. The problem with the Member who made that address is that he hasn't yet learned. It is all very well to repeat what the Premier says as long as you repeat it in the forum in which he said it, because he may say one thing in one forum and another in another forum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— By and large in the Attorney General's fairly lengthy step by step dissertation on what led to Bill No. 1, he was fairly fair, although in some respects, particularly in conclusion, rather illogical and I will deal with that. And in some respect, at least, notable for some omissions. But apart from those two criticisms it was at least one of the serious efforts and I think it was the only serious effort that we have heard from the Ministers on the other side, to give us some reasons for what is the most major Bill that has ever been laid before us, before this Assembly. He spent two and one-half hours in doing it. His speech was divided essentially into three parts. The first part was a reasonable and reasoned I may say, dissertation on the steps. The second part dealt with the details of the Bill itself which was helpful I may say. The third part, which wasn't particularly helpful but in respect of which we don't condemn him was his political summation.

Interestingly, when he said the Government had considered several options, he said option No. 2 was to control the industry by regulation and by legislation. He said the Government had tried that option. He said and I quote, "We failed in this course. The inevitable result was Bill 1." I don't argue with him when he says they failed in that course because clearly the Government did fail in that course. As a matter of fact the Attorney General may remember me observing in the House before he made his address, I said the Bill to take over the potash industry amounted to a fairly clear and straightforward expression of failure on behalf of the Government and that's what it amounted to and I was pleased that the Attorney General confirmed it. Where I differ is when he says the inevitable

result of that failure was Bill 1. I say having failed and you admit you did, it isn't inevitable that you produce a Bill. In fact the more reasonable thing to do is back up and say where did we err and how can we being again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— And in the process to admit you made some mistakes and to sit down, as I said before, with the industry and the Federal Government and work a solution out and not to resort to this drastic step of nationalization.

He said the potash companies had challenged the Government at every turn. He said in that sense they themselves had authored Bill 1. And now I ask you to pause and examine for a moment that conclusion, the attitude particularly that that demonstrates. Government is never an easy process. All governments in dealing with powerful groups in society whether they are labor groups, business groups, social groups, other groups have got problems on their hands. Tough problems that require skill and patience and judgment in solving. The mere fact that the Government is challenged, the fact that it has problems, is the very stuff of government and you don't react with your ultimate power in every situation that you are challenged as you have done in this situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I remind you of the challenges at every turn that the Federal Government is receiving on the Anti-inflation Program. Challenged by the unions as the Members opposite know, challenged by some businesses and challenged indeed by this Provincial Government. Now how does it respond? Does it say, we are challenged at every turn and therefore what we have to do is strike down the unions, do away with those businesses that challenge us or take them over, to say to this Provincial Government - out, we will no longer talk to you. Of course, they don't do that. You don't use the ultimate power that you have in those situations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Again and again we have heard this same suggestion. The potash companies dared to challenge us or they took us to court. Of course they will challenge and I don't know of any individual or any company or any group in society that doesn't have the right to challenge government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— And I say woe betide the day we ever lose that right. It is time you recognized it in greater terms than what you do. You don't respond with the ultimate force of government every time you are irritated or frustrated or put a little bit to the wall. That's indeed government at its worst. That's failure when you resort to the last power you've got to solve a problem. That's a failure in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— You talk about the potash companies challenging you at every turn and getting you frustrated and angered. I ask you to look at the other side of the coin for a moment. The Attorney General well knows the action to challenge the validity of the prorationing scheme carried with it an action against a Minister of your Government. It was an action on behalf of the potash company that took that thing to court for illegal intimidation by the Minister. The potash company said that the Minister threatened us illegally with an action he had no right to do. They sued that Minister for \$2 million. They got judgment for \$1.5 million. The court said, yes indeed, the Minister in writing and the deputy minister in writing as they did to that potash company were wrong, they were exceeding their authority, they were acting illegally and it amounted to a legal intimidation for which the potash company got judgment for \$1.5 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— So don't tell us it is all one way because we know better. The Attorney General said, too, in his summation of the reasons that led to Bill No. 1; he referred to the introduction of the potash prorationing scheme in January of 1970 as one of the first significant steps along the way. We agree that it was, of course, just that. He went on to say, and I noticed the Premier had said this too and there were one or two other reasons, to correct the record in this respect. He said, the Liberals responded to the potash companies and at their request and urging introduced prorationing. I want to correct that. I ask the Attorney General to pay attention to it. That government in 1970 in bringing in prorationing was not responding to the urging of the potash companies. It imposed prorationing on the potash companies. It imposed it first because the industry in its cut throat competition was endangering the very existence of some of the mines in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— It did it secondly because the potash companies were dumping the Saskatchewan product at \$10 or \$12 a ton around the world and the cheaper they sold it, the less money was returned to the Treasury of Saskatchewan. We began with a product which was more than the \$10 or \$12 at which stage we got in 1970. Of course even some of the Members opposite will understand the more they sell of the product for the more money that will accrue to the Provincial Treasury and the less it is sold for, the less accrues. When they in their cut throat competition had managed to reduce the price to \$10 or \$12, it meant the dollars being returned to the people of Saskatchewan were correspondingly reduced. That is the second reason why that government of that day imposed prorationing on the potash companies.

The third reason they did it was because Saskatchewan jobs were being threatened. If that kind of cut throat competition was permitted to continue what would have happened is that some of the newer mines would have been sacrificed to some of the older mines because the older ones had established

markets, the newer ones didn't because the older ones had been in operation longer. Some of the newer mines would have been driven out with a consequent loss of employment in the province. Those were the three reasons for that prorationing scheme.

I want to remind Members opposite as well that in bringing in that scheme, that government had all kinds of tangles with the potash companies. Many of the companies were as much opposed to the prorationing scheme as they have been in respect to many of your kind of schemes. It took the government of that day, very hard and effective work to get the potash companies to accept that scheme. Premier Thatcher and the then Minister of Mineral Resources, spent days and months negotiating with the industry. They negotiated in New Mexico, they negotiated in Washington and in Ottawa and in France, Germany, Russia and around the world before that scheme was adopted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— I want to remind Members opposite too that when that plan was finally implemented after all those negotiations, it became known around the world for having injected some sanity in an industry that was coming apart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Indeed it became known as the Saskatchewan Plan.

Other nations including even Russia, referred to it at the time as a brilliant piece of government work. Industry at the outset didn't like it at all. Nor did Ottawa like it very much and everybody challenged it at every turn to begin with. But little by little with good government and good management and serious and tough negotiation and solving problems as they were elected to do, that agreement wound up with a very excellent plan, recognized throughout the world as a tremendous plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— May I say before I wind up my remarks in that respect that it may well be that Hon. Members opposite who have referred, including the Premier, to that prorationing scheme as having been introduced at the urging of the potash companies and again in some sinister way linking the government with the potash industry, as though the government of that day were working in concert and hand and hand with it. I have said this to put the record straight, that it just wasn't so. No amount of talk to the contrary by the Members opposite, including the Attorney General will ever take away from that government the tremendous governmental work it did at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Of course, it's the kind of hard work that is demanded of good government. It's the kind of job that we say you ought to be doing instead of angrily responding with brute force and running the risk as you've done with your nationalization Bill, which is an angry response, of breaking the province financially.

The Attorney General came to step eight of the May 6, federal budget disallowing deduction of provincial royalties as an expense in computing income tax.

I'm going to take a moment again to talk about that one at a little more length than what the Minister of Mineral Resources certainly, if he were here, would like me to talk about. But again I've heard several references, rather twisted references, to what happened in that respect and heard one in particular from the Minister of Mineral Resources the other day.

When the price of oil in the world was skyrocketing from the traditional \$3 a barrel level to \$11 a barrel, the eleven governments of this country sat down and agreed to a formula, the Attorney General will remember very well, of \$6.50 a barrel across the country.

That program was funded by a revenue derived by a federal export tax. So the oil that was going from the producing provinces outside the country was taxed by way of an export tax. Those funds were used and transferred to other parts of the country that had to import oil and in that way we arrived at a \$6.50 Canadian price.

At the time that agreement was concluded among the Premiers and the Prime Minister, our Premier of Saskatchewan came home and he recognized fairly quickly a loophole in the scheme. He recognized that he could himself increase the premiums or the royalties that were payable in respect of oil, increase his own take. He was a little brighter actually than was the Premier of Alberta, Premier Lougheed. He was! I give him credit for it. He actually wrote a letter to the Prime Minister shortly after the Ottawa conference which finally came to the agreement. He hinted at increasing the royalties on Saskatchewan production. He got back, from the Prime Minister, in pretty certain terms, a letter that said if the province raised its own royalties it would upset the historical relationship of tax return to each level of government; it would erode the federal tax base and the Federal Government wouldn't stand for it. You ought to have known that they were likely to use that power and not let you take advantage of the loophole that existed. That's the sensible realization, having been warned don't do it. What did the Premier do? He said we had the constitutional power in Saskatchewan to raise our royalties. He was right about that. He apparently concluded that there was nothing the Federal Government could do to stop it. After all the Federal Government didn't have the constitutional power to force royalty rates down. So despite the warning that he had, not to do it, he took the oil royalties and he jacked them up enormously.

Of course, as I say he was right, the Federal Government didn't have the constitutional power to roll the royalties back. It had other constitutional tools at its disposal, but it didn't even have to use them. By one short, small, deft move by the Federal Government which was a little change to its Income Tax Act, it struck the feet from under the Premier of Saskatchewan in attempting to raise the royalties which he shouldn't have been doing at the time.

At that stage all they did in the Federal Government was to say royalties provincially were not deductible in computing income tax.

Again I say whether you think the Federal Government was right in what it did or whether you disagree with what it did, the fact is, it told you in advance it would do it and nonetheless you persisted when you ought not to have done it.

Again it's the same kind of response that we see with the potash industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Of course, eventually, you see what happened. In fact, it happened only a few days ago when the Minister of Mineral Resources rose in the House to announce a new incentive program for the oil companies. That is they backed off and the Premier should have known the day he increased royalties the time was going to come when he was going to have to back down because he was running into a power bigger than his own.

The sad part of it is that in the process, and this is the sad part, Mr. Attorney General, is that your response in your pique in those circumstances, and I say your Premier's, the problem is you knew in due course you were going to have to back off, the problem is it's a year and a half and you've now backed off but in the meantime the industry has come to its knees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say and I would ask leave of the Assembly to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Shillington that Bill No. 16 - an Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act, 1973, be now read a second time.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):— In rising to speak to the changes in The Residential Tenancies Act, I should like to emphasize first of all that the Members opposite and the Minister have referred to this as a rent control Bill. I believe so too of the Press.

I think this particular Bill does a great deal more than just control rents. It significantly changes The Residential Tenancies Act and significantly changes the rights of private property in the Province of Saskatchewan. This may be intended; one hopes that it isn't. I cannot understand why the Government has not divided their proposed changes in The Residential Tenancies Act from their rent control legislation. Why not two Bills? The Government knows that both parties on this side of the House are in favor of rent control legislation in concert with other control legislation as it relates to the wage and price controls legislated by Ottawa. Why then include in The Residential Tenancies Act significant changes such as taking away the rights of citizens to the courts; such as permanent rent controls? Why?

December 9, 1975

The Minister did not outline in his address to this Assembly the reasons why this was included in one Bill rather than two. I am sure all of us would be interested to know the reasons why. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say on this Bill. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:17 o'clock p.m.