

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
26th Day

Tuesday, March 29, 1977.

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. E. WHELAN (Regina North West): Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to the Assembly, 60 Grade Eight students from Sherwood School, seated in the west gallery. Their teachers, Bob Gingras, Sandy Johnson and Gordon Leachman are with them. We plan to meet them over a drink of chocolate milk about 2:45 today. Members join me I'm sure in welcoming these constituents from Regina North West. We hope their stay with us is pleasant and informative.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. W. LANE (Saskatoon Sutherland): We have with us today a group of 40 Grade Seven students from Cardinal Leger School in Saskatoon and I'd like to introduce these students to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly. They are accompanied by Mr. John Wandzura and I intend to be meeting with them after question period. I'd ask the Members to wish them a hearty welcome and that they have a very pleasant informative day in the House and that they have a safe journey home. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. D. H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a group of Grade Twelve students from Avonlea High School. They are sitting in Speaker's Gallery and are accompanied by Mr. Duncan McKellar their principal, and Mr. Ted Ursulescu. I'll be meeting with them after they leave the gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

HON. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale): Mr. Speaker, I too have some students from my constituency present today. This is a group of 26 Grade Seven Students, I believe, from Princess Alexandra School in Saskatoon. They are located in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Krause who is the principal and Mr. Lozinski. Members may know that Princess Alex is one of Saskatoon's oldest schools and I believe, still one of Saskatoon's finest schools. So I too would like to join with the Members in welcoming the students to the Saskatchewan Legislature and I hope they have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to welcome the students of Princess Alexandra School. I believe that some of them live in Saskatoon Centre constituency and, consequently, I am interested in them and, of course, the others. It's my hope that they are enjoying themselves today and that they will find proceedings in this House very interesting. Also a special hello to the two teachers, Mr. Lozinski and the principal, Mr. Krause. I certainly hope that you have an enjoyable trip back home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

QUESTIONS

LAND ASSESSMENT IN ESTEVAN

MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I was going to direct to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In his absence I think I'll direct it to the Premier.

Would the Premier explain why the land assessment for business in Estevan has increased as much as ten times as a result of the 1976 assessment?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): No, I'll take the matter as notice.

MR. PENNER: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if in taking it as notice the Premier would take a supplementary as notice too. The supplementary is this. Why are you or your Government suggesting that the percentage of tax paid by business should increase by ten times, while the property taxpayer of a householder is not increasing at a pro-rated rate in the same way? How does the Premier or his Minister, whoever answers the questions, rationalize this particular kind of action in light of a stated policy of the Government to try to keep small centres and small cities alive and viable?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case the Hon. Member is giving a great deal of information and asking for a little. I hope the answer that we give him is a good deal more reliable than the information he has provided to the House. I will take the question as notice and will provide a full answer to the House.

BAYDA INQUIRY

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier regarding the Bayda Inquiry. As the Premier knows there is mounting objection to the early hearings of the Bayda Inquiry and secondly, I think the Premier is well aware that many of the groups who propose to appear before the inquiry, with justification or not, depending upon your perspective, believe that they are underfunded to such an extent by the Government that they won't be able to hire the technical people and the lawyers to put them on a par with the large companies who will be

appearing. I wonder if the Premier would not agree with me that by having the inquiry so soon and by underfunding those groups, that the result will be that we won't really have a true look at the question and won't perhaps be any further ahead than if we'd not had the inquiry at all?

MR. BLAKENEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree that we will be any farther ahead at the conclusion of the Bayda Inquiry than we were at the beginning. It may well be that this Royal Commission as with many Royal Commissions will not answer all of the questions surrounding the general area to be investigated. I believe, however, that the Royal Commission will provide valuable information and valuable recommendations to the Government and accordingly I do not share what the Hon. Member believes, that we will be no farther ahead at the end that we were at the beginning.

MR. MERCHANT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier not agree that in relation to the fact that very many groups want to come before the Commission, that the amount that each group will be receiving will be something in the \$2,000 or \$3,000 range and that with that kind of money, the groups will not be able to commission any technical studies of any nature. Indeed, I doubt that they will even be able to afford to have counsel appear before the Commission, the result being that these groups, well intentioned as they may be, will in the communication arts, perhaps be out-classed by hired guns, I suppose, the lawyers and the technical people employed by the companies and that, again we won't really have a true look at the matter because there will be such an imbalance between the big companies.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I imagine the Hon. Member for Wascana is more familiar with hired guns than I am, he having practiced that particular art.

The point he raises deals primarily with the amount of funding available to people making submissions to the Royal Commission. I would point out to Members of the House that it is comparatively unusual for a government to fund people who are going to make submissions to a Royal Commission in any case. It is, I think, a step in the right direction at least in this case that funds are being made available.

Secondly, I do not now concede the point, it may or may not be the case, that 12 or 13 different groups, so different that they cannot combine their forces in making a submission, will be wishing to draw funds from the funding committee which is dispersing the funds in aid. It is true that when funds are available, no doubt 12, 13, 15, 20, 25 groups may wish to get the funds. But the question is whether or not there are 12 or 13 differing points of view which are so different that they can't use a common submission and common counsel. I would very much doubt whether there are, in fact, 12 or 13 sufficiently differing points of view that they have to be represented by a different counsel.

MR. MERCHANT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier would not agree with me that the funding is certainly not novel to this province. The Government assisted with Hall. The Australian study on the same subject, had assistance and with

the Burger Inquiry, the Government assisted, as I recall, to an extent of about \$1 million to ensure that the different groups were properly represented. I wonder if the Premier would not also agree that the reason that the inquiry is moving so quickly is that the Government, rightly I suggest, wants to ensure that the industry isn't badly hurt by undue delays. I wonder if the Government therefore might consider . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the Member can delete the debatable parts of his presentation.

MR. MERCHANT: Would the Government, not being (if I may put it that way) concerned about delay for the industry, not be better to allow the industry to go ahead and perhaps do the studies in a more complete and a better way, even if it means more time, lift the moratorium and allow the industry to proceed and get on with a better inquiry?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, that is one point of view which can be supported. I think Hon. Members should know that the study is essentially a two part study. Firstly, an examination into those environmental issues, using the term 'environment' narrowly, which would have been considered if the issue were not uranium under inquiry under The Environment Act. These are thought to be relatively short in duration, numbered in a period of weeks or at most months, not going on for years since an industry has to know if it is going to go ahead or not.

Secondly, an inquiry into some larger aspects of uranium development. It is arguable that they should be severed.

We reached the conclusion that they should not be severed since the severing of what is an environmental issue as it relates to Saskatchewan and an environmental issue as it relates to Canada and the world is not all that simple, at least conceptually. And accordingly we reached the conclusion that they ought not to be severed and reached the conclusion that we ought to proceed with all deliberate speed.

The Government is of the belief that we must have environmental hearings of the ordinary variety dealing with occupational health, public safety, with the impact on fisheries and wildlife and the like, on any major project like this and we must have it quickly, speedily and thoroughly. We intend to proceed on that basis.

The question of whether or not that inquiry ought to be coupled with a broader inquiry is debatable; we have decided to couple them and we have decided to proceed with as much speed as the situation permits.

METRIC SYSTEM ON FARM LANDS IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier.

On April 20, 1976, your Cabinet passed an Order in Council No. 57876, effectively imposing the metric system on all land, and particularly farm lands in Saskatchewan. Why was this policy implemented without consulting the people of Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY: No such policy was implemented. A simple visit to the Land Titles Office will show that land is busily trading measured in acres, measured in quarter sections; no policy of insisting that land transactions be conducted in the metric system has been in any way imposed. There are some provisions in that Order in Council dealing with surveying, but they certainly do not deal with land transactions per se.

MR. BERNTSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, any land transaction that requires a survey will be done in the metric system. In light of the strong public reaction against metrication, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, will this Government repeal the Order in Council and bring before this Assembly proposals for metrification so that they may be debated before implementation?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I am unable to give the Hon. Member a positive or negative answer. I will have to see what the practice is elsewhere in Canada. It will be known that the metrication proposal is not one initiated by our Government, but rather one initiated federally. Certain steps have been taken by various governments across Canada to accommodate this national policy. I do not know where we are with respect to surveys on this issue at this time. I will be happy to look into it and have the appropriate Minister, the Attorney General, report further.

MR. BERNTSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the policy in other jurisdictions is, Mr. Premier, will the Premier give this Assembly a chance to debate the metrication of farm lands in Saskatchewan or failing that, will he put the proposals before an intercessional committee as he did with the foreign ownership proposals?

MR. BLAKENEY: The problem that the Hon. Member presents is one which suggests that if Manitoba is on one land holding system, and Alberta is on the same land holding system, that it would be appropriate for us to be on a different land holding system. I think that is not without its difficulties, particularly if the appropriate government in Canada, the Federal Government, is acting to deal with grain and other aspects of farming on a metric system. I don't know whether these are proceeding. I can assure the Hon. Member that we have no proposal to introduce metrication to the farm economy of Saskatchewan unless, indeed, the circumstances created by other governments, be it with Ottawa or Edmonton, force the issue upon us.

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rose town-Elrose): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question on the same topic to the Minister of Agriculture. Has your Government, have you expressed concerns on behalf of the rural people in Saskatchewan to any one in your department, to the Federal Government voicing the concerns of the agricultural people within Saskatchewan?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this is a question which has been under consideration by our department and by our people. We take the view, as many do, that in order to eventually get into a proper metrification system that we can't blind our eyes to what is happening in the rest of the world. We are going to have to live with whatever system is imposed by the Federal Government. If we are going to have to deal with tonnes and litres, then I suppose we should become part of that system and learn it. I don't think the people in Saskatchewan are any more unintelligent than they are anywhere else in the world. I am sure they can learn the system as effectively as anyone else. I agree with what Mr. Lang has said with regard to the Canadian Wheat Board. They are going to use the dual system for a few years. I think that makes pretty good sense. Beyond that I think we have to be prepared to change.

COMPULSORY USE OF SEAT BELTS

MR. R. A. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): A question to the Minister of Highways. In light of the increasing debate among the people of Saskatchewan as to the benefits or detriment to be derived from the compulsory use of seatbelts, would your Government consider a plebiscite among the people of Saskatchewan before introducing compulsory use of seatbelts in your Safety '77 legislation?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the Bill that may introduce seatbelts is going to be introduced by the Minister, my colleague, the Minister in charge of the Transportation Agency. I think that question should be referred to the proper agency.

MR. COLLVER: Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, I will re-direct my question to the Premier since I gather that the appropriate Minister is not in the Assembly, in light of the increasing debate developing among people as to the compulsory nature of wearing of seatbelts in our province, is your Government prepared to hold a plebiscite about this very important issue before introducing it in legislation in this Assembly?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, we have made no decision with respect to having a plebiscite or indeed not having a plebiscite. Again I think we will have to be guided by the experience of what has happened elsewhere. I am led to believe that the Government of Ontario has introduced a compulsory seatbelt arrangement without a plebiscite with results which they say are very good. This is no necessary reason why we should follow their precedent. There are many things happening in Ontario which I would certainly not wish to commend to the people of Saskatchewan. But on the other hand there may be something to be gained and we will certainly take into account all the experience we can garner in this particular area and make a decision in due course.

LOAN TO BRIQUETTE PLANT

MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia Gravelbourg): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In light of the Minister's announcement yesterday of a \$207,000 loan to the briquette plant in Moose Jaw, I wonder if he could tell us what security was taken by SEDCO for the loan, what are the amounts for repayment, the interest rates that will be charged and the terms of the repayment of the loan?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce) I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that request.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I'll take the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

RIOT AT PRINCE ALBERT JAIL

MR. G. N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services. It was stated yesterday that your department is appointing an investigator from outside the Department of Social Services to investigate the riot at Prince Albert jail last weekend. My question is: have you made that appointment yet and if so, would you supply this Assembly with the name? If you have not made that appointment then what are the qualifications you are looking for in these investigators?

HON. H. H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any riot in the Prince Albert Correction Centre.

MR. WIPF: I believe that it was in the paper, call it what you want. A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. You know that it is public knowledge in Prince Albert that the guards at the centre refuse to get involved in disturbances for fear of being charged with assault and being suspended or demoted as in the case of Walter Kester. Was the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order: Next question.

BACK TAXES FOR DUVAL AND SYLVITE MINES

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation. As we were informed by the Government at the time of the purchase of Duval and Sylvite, the two companies would have owed, according to your figures, about \$40 million in back taxes. I wonder whether the Minister would indicate whether those alleged due back taxes are just written off or whether they were included in the so-called negotiated price and in fact you paid more if you assume that the back taxes were due, or

whether you just sort of sweeten the pot and when the negotiations are closed pat somebody on the back and say, hey, you can forget about the \$40 million?

HON. E. L. COWLEY (Minister of Potash Corporation): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wascana in keeping with many of his colleagues over there seems to have some difficulty in getting the facts straight. First of all, I am not aware of any statement made by this Government that said Duval and Sylvite owed \$40 million to the Government of Saskatchewan. I am simply not aware of that and I don't believe that to be factually correct at any point in time that those two companies, taken together owed those sums of money to the Government of Saskatchewan.

MR. MERCHANT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister so effectively quibbling with the figure. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether, regardless of the figure, the practice is to include those alleged back taxes that are due for whatever amount they may be in the purchase price? Can we look for a payment by Sylvite of a sum of money in back taxes or is that just forgotten?

MR. COWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Sylvite I certainly would hope that in winding up their affairs in Saskatchewan, in the event that the final purchase agreement is signed between PCS and Sylvite which I expect to happen, that the matter of outstanding taxes would be dealt with. I obviously can't assure the Member of that with respect to Sylvite at this time. We haven't signed the final agreement with them; I haven't checked with the Department of Mineral Resources to see as of this day if there is anything owing. They are continuing to produce potash, so obviously they will be continuing to incur some liability with respect to taxes. It is my belief that in the case of Duval that the taxes with respect to Duval have all been paid.

MARKETING BOARDS

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the Minister's endorsement of the marketing board concept and the evidence revealed in reports tabled by your department which indicate clearly that the small agricultural producers in Saskatchewan affected by marketing boards are being driven out of business, would the Minister not agree that there are various implications to producers regarding implementation of marketing boards?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, as usual the Member has his statistics out of order. I think we can recognize that there has been some reduction in the number of people occupied in hog production for instance, or poultry production. I think that it would be ludicrous to assume that that was because of a marketing board situation. I think many of those people who are now in the hog production business would have gone out had they not had some kind of support from the Hog Marketing Commission in providing for them a better assembly system when the Prince Albert plant folded up and when Intercontinental closed the

Regina plant. I am sure that had that Commission, not been in place to provide some transportation assistance it would have been much tougher for hog producers than it is now.

MR. BIRKBECK: A supplementary to the Minister. You are aware of the statistics which are before you, they are edited from your department. Not only do they show a decrease in the number of producers but they show a decrease in production as well. I think that is very clear in the hog and cattle production field. That is, very simply, that from 1971 to 1975 hog production has decreased 50 per cent. In that same period cattle production was increased 25 per cent. Mr. Speaker, are you totally disregarding the information provided to your department in your effort to impose marketing boards on the producers of Saskatchewan?

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, I see no relationship at all between the drop in hog numbers and the operation of the Hog Marketing Commission. I think he will recognize as well as anyone else if he was out on the farm scene at all that people are going out of hog production because there was a more acceptable living to be made in grain. At the present time if he will check more recent figures, he'll find that hog production numbers so far this year are 6 per cent over last year and the prediction is that they will go up 14 per cent.

SEATBELT LEGISLATION

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): Mr. Speaker, I will ask one more question of the Premier. Is it the Government's intention to allow any public debate about the compulsory use of seatbelts prior to their introduction in legislation anticipated as the Minister of Highways has said in this Session?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed there will be a public discussion about seatbelts prior to their introduction, if in fact they are introduced. There was some couple of years ago a Legislative Committee on Highway Safety which gave the widest possible opportunities for public discussion of these issues including compulsory seatbelts which were widely discussed. There were literally hundreds of briefs as I recall it, but many, many dozens in any case, many public hearings and there were extensive discussions. It is proposed that the Estimates of the Transportation Agency will be presented to this Legislature and we, therefore, expect that there will be full opportunity at that time for a debate on this issue if Members wish it.

It is further proposed that if the matter is proceeded with there will be legislation laid before the Assembly which will introduce the provision and at that time there will be yet a further opportunity for public discussion in the Legislature. We think that having had this extensive public discussion with the Legislative Committee of the Legislature, providing the normal provision for public discussion at the time of the Estimates and a further discussion of the provision when the Bill is introduced — having regard particularly to the fact that the Bill, as I recall it, was introduced last December, so that the public has had from December until now to debate the issue to know what it was about- then I think that no one

can suggest there has not been a full and adequate opportunity for discussion. No doubt further discussion will continue.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — CROW'S NEST PASS RATES

MR. D. G. BANDA (Redberry) moved, seconded by Mr. G. McNeill (Meadow Lake):

That this Assembly expresses its support for the retention of Crow's Nest Pass Rates for domestic and export movement of grain and grain products.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this afternoon to rise and speak on a motion in respect to retention of the Crow's Nest rates for western Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I had originally intended to describe the Crow's Nest rates as western Canada's birthright but upon consideration I have concluded that they are properly described as a right which has been earned by western Canada and western Canadians themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. BANDA: Mr. Speaker, after the introduction of a guarantee of a constant tariff for grain movement, I believe that settlement in western Canada was stimulated as a result of this guarantee, and I want to emphasize the word "guarantee," Mr. Speaker. I believe that settlers were attracted to the remote prairies and western Canada.

Make no mistake, this colonization was of major benefit to the railway, to the CPR which guaranteed the rate as its part of that bargain, the bargain of producing and providing a rail network for all Canadians.

The Canadian Parliament, on behalf of the Canadian people, extended an imposing list of material benefits to the CPR Company at the time of its organization back in 1881. The basic subsidy comprised \$25 million and 25 million acres of land. The utmost care was taken to ensure that the land was of good quality. The company was also granted the lands necessary for main and branch lines and for its stations, station yards, freight yards, workshops and other structures.

When the Crow's Nest pass agreement was confirmed by an Act of Parliament in 1897 the agreement provided for a cost subsidy to the CPR of \$11,000 per mile up to a total of \$3,600,000 for building a railway about 300 miles long between Lethbridge and Nelson, British Columbia. This was through the Crow's Nest Pass. It does not seem much money now, Mr. Speaker, but at that time it was estimated at about 40 per cent of the cost.

The railway in return granted in perpetuity, a reduction of three cents per hundred weight on grain and flour to Fort William and also reductions in perpetuity on a wide variety of goods moving to western Canada. Over the years, there was other aid granted to Canadian railroads and to other companies that are now part of that system.

March 29, 1977

The CNR for example, received \$88.5 million in cash grants including direct expenditures on lines now part of its system. This figure includes \$16.7 million from provinces and \$7,400,000 from municipalities. The CPR at the same time received \$106.3 million in cash grants as well. This includes \$12.6 million from provinces and \$5,300,000 from municipalities.

The CNR received \$643.8 million in outstanding loans made by government and accrued and unpaid interest amounting to \$574.8 million. They also received land grants of 7.5 million acres. Almost 44 million acres to the CPR alone, was granted.

It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the guaranteed rate to the western producer when added to the mineral and land construction grants in the areas of Alberta and Saskatchewan provided for the basis of the CPR industrial empire. An empire that is still flourishing as the conglomerate CP Investments.

We must not forget that the CPR now feels quite secure in launching a direct attack on the Crow's Nest rates, because by now all the original benefits have been safely hived off into CP Investments.

Mr. Speaker, the CN is no different. We continuously hear them complaining about losing money. The very people who say they are losing money and I will quote from the Leader-Post of March 11, 1977:

CNR will show \$10 million profit. Robert Bandeen, President of Crown owned Canadian National Railways has said today, the CN showed an overall profit last year, the first in 20 years. That should be about \$10 million.

We are now in the midst of a re-organization of the corporation designed to improve our financial performance by dividing our operations into clearly defined profit centres.

The future of our financial performance is looking bright because government action is being taken to relieve Canadian railways of some major burdens that have caused serious losses over the years. Relief appears in the offing in such areas as the 80-year old Crow's Nest Pass Freight rates Act.

Mr. Speaker, what he is saying is that he figures there is relief in sight because of the removal of these freight rates and yet they are showing a profit now.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition and the railroads are now trying to convince the people that these rates are ancient history. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell those Members on the opposite side of this House that it may be history but, it is not ancient — it's current. It is real life — a vital issue concerning the protection which was supposedly guaranteed to the western producer, the farmer.

The proposal that western farmers give up their statutory rights of having grain and flour hauled by rail to export points at low rates — the historic Crow's Nest rates — is an astounding one.

It's not a new proposal. We've heard it for years from the CPR. We've heard it for years from others who, like the CPR would dearly love to increase their profits at the expense of the farmers. What makes this proposal astounding is not only that it's been made, Mr. Speaker, but that it's been made by a federal Cabinet Minister supposedly representing western Canada. It is being made by Members opposite and backed by the Saskatchewan Opposition in this Legislature. I just want to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, every day we hear the Opposition standing up in this House talking in support of inland terminals, talking on behalf of groups which they represent.

I want to quote from the Western Producer, March 10, 1977, "Crow Review Welcomed by Cattlemen."

Boyd Anderson of Fir Mountain, Saskatchewan Vice-president of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and Chairman of CCA Feed Grain Committee says, that his association welcomes the recent statement by Wheat Board Minister, Otto Lang, calling for a review of the Crow's Nest grain rates.

Whom do those Members opposite speak for when they ask for the removal of freight rates?

In the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, our friends from Alberta, those Tory people in Alberta, "Alberta Backs Crow's Nest Pass Freight Rate Removal."

In a surprise move Friday, the Alberta Government proposed removal of the statutory Crow's Nest Pass freight rate on the domestic movement of all grains.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks are crystal clear as to where the Opposition stands.

If the farmers give up one solid protection they have, the statutory grain rates, in exchange for some vague commitment to set up a fund, this will be used in some equally vague way as compensation. With this move, with the Crow's Nest Pass rates gone, the last piece falls into place, for rationalizing the grain-handling and transportation system of Canada.

I say to farmers of Saskatchewan the Crow's Nest Pass rates are the key to the future shape of the grain-handling system in western Canada.

I say that the Opposition scenario is now clear. Let me review a few facts. We had the proposals promoted by the Ottawa Liberals to reduce the number of delivery points. Their favorite proposal is for inland terminals, perhaps 20 or 30 in the whole of Saskatchewan and I've even heard lower numbers than that.

MR. MERCHANT: Who wants to . . .

MR. BANDA: Your friend Otto!

We have inland terminals springing up across the prairies supported by both Opposition parties in this House. Both parties get up in this House and speak in support of inland terminals, speak in support of pounding our roads out. Mr. Speaker, even our friend, the Leader of the Conservative Party over there says, "Us too!"

March 29, 1977

I want to quote from the Nipawin Journal, Mr. Speaker, of June 18, 1975, which states quite clearly where the Leader of the Conservative Party stands, and I quote:

On the question of inland terminals, Mr. Collver said, he was not opposed to any concept for the movement and handling of grain as long as it was done by private individuals.

Mr. Speaker, who would these private individuals be? I don't think that is too hard to figure out.

Mr. Speaker, we are awaiting reports on rail line abandonment and costs.

I believe that Saskatchewan farmers are reasonable men. I believe that most farmers agree that the number of delivery points can be reduced, that it makes sense to have fewer elevators, to have high throughput elevators spaced 15 or 20 miles apart rather than seven or eight. And that is already happening.

I believe that most Saskatchewan farmers would agree that some rail lines could be abandoned without putting an undue burden on the system. Perhaps several hundred miles, but not 3,000.

What the farmers want to know, however, is not whether the number of delivery points should be reduced, not whether some rail lines should be abandoned, but who is going to be making the decisions about elevator points and rail line abandonment. Is it going to be the people whose lives are at stake or is it going to be Cargill and Continental, the CPR or the CNR?

On the one hand we have proposals for massive abandonment of rail lines, massive reductions in the number of delivery points. On the other hand we have the assurance of the Prime Minister of this country and the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board, saying that no branch lines will be abandoned unless the farmers themselves make the choice.

Mr. Speaker, here is where the crunch comes, to persuade the farmers to make the choice. If the Liberals or Tories are going to make the farmers make that choice that they want them to make, then the Crow's Nest rates will have to go.

They already had one go at this little operation by providing for flexible tariffs as between delivery points. This was supposed to persuade farmers to choose to bypass one elevator and go to another elevator to save a few cents a bushel. But this is peanuts.

Let's see what happens if the Crow's Nest rates go by the board. Today it costs the farmer 22 cents per hundred-weight to ship a bushel of wheat from Saskatoon to Thunder Bay. It costs for that same bushel of wheat to go from Saskatoon to Vancouver a freight rate of 24 cents. It costs 26 cents per hundredweight to ship that bushel of wheat from Regina to Vancouver, and 20 cents per hundredweight to ship from Regina to Thunder Bay. But without the Crow's Nest rate, the rate might be very much closer to the domestic rate in Canada.

Let's take a -look at the domestic rate in comparison from Regina to Vancouver. Mr. Speaker, it is \$1.05 per hundredweight. Let's take a look at Saskatoon to Vancouver, \$1.18 per hundred- weight, compared to 24 cents per hundredweight under the statutory rate. Or better still, Mr. Speaker, maybe we should take a look at the rates in the USA. In the place where Cargill and Continental have come from, where there are no statutory rates in the open market system. Let's take a look from Tampico, Montana to Duluth — 774 miles, the freight rate is 94.5 cents; Regina to Thunder Bay — 776 miles, two miles more, 20 cents a hundredweight; Billings, Montana to Duluth 883 miles, \$1.30 per hundredweight. Mr. Speaker, 17 miles more from Saskatoon to Thunder Bay which is 900 miles, the freight rate is 22 cents. Another good example, if we take a look at Wolf Point, Montana to Duluth 714 miles, in the summer they charge 88.5 cents per hundredweight, in the winter 82 cents. Kamsack to Thunder Bay which is 712 miles, 19 cents, Mr. Speaker.

These figures indicate that it costs almost five times as much to haul grain in the United States than it does under the Crow's Nest rates and in most cases a few miles less in distance than here in Canada.

The most interesting part, Mr. Speaker, that even with the rates five times greater in the United States, I am informed that branch lines are in need of repair, with as many weeds growing on them as there are here; many ties need replacing and they need to upgrade the lines just like our branch lines in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the increase in rates hasn't built a better rail system as being suggested by our railways here. I want to just substantiate that remark, Mr. Speaker, by quoting from the Melville Advance, March 9, and an interview that was held with a visitor who was in the United States. I quote:

I found them to be wanting in a number of areas.

And he is talking about the railroads.

US farmers and elevator managers complain bitterly about conditions of the grain-handling equipment saying that if a Canadian boxcar was available they were very happy since Canadian boxcars were usually in much better condition than their own.

And further he says:

Yet their branch lines are neglected and abandoned. We also found that due to the inefficiency of their railroads and the demands of the opening market system trucks were used to haul grain to distances up to 700 miles thus employing a system that is very wasteful in utilizing maximum manpower and energy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite evident that even though their rates are five times more than here, their rail system is even in worse condition than ours is in western Canada.

Let's take a look at what the railways can do with differential tariffs, Mr. Speaker. All they have to do is say to the farmers, you can deliver your grain anywhere you like, you can deliver it to Leask, which is in my constituency, or you can deliver it to Blaine Lake, or you can deliver it over to Maymont but the cost from those points is 70 cents a bushel. However, if you will truck it to the inland terminal at Saskatoon the price will be 35 cents a bushel.

March 29, 1977

Now there is a differential tariff, Mr. Speaker. There is a flexible tariff and what will happen, the farmers will choose to haul to Saskatoon and consequently abandon their branch lines in the process. That's simple economics to figure out. A farmer delivering 10,000 bushels of wheat at Saskatoon now pays \$1,320 in freight under statutory or Crow's Nest rates. However if he loses that Crow's Nest rate and, using an increased rate as I've illustrated in the USA, comparisons show, just as I mentioned, that the same farmer would then pay \$7,830 in freight on that same amount of grain. Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to where he'll haul his grain.

The Prime Minister is then off the hook, the railways get their way, our country elevator system goes down the drain, and very soon the branch lines which serve those elevators will go. Mr. Speaker, they are the Cargill cuties across there, their version of freedom of choice. At the same time you have to keep in mind that once the country elevator system is gone, tens of millions of dollars of the farmer's money tied up in the elevator system or the Pool and the United Grain Growers is also gone.

The co-ops will have to build new inland terminals in competition with Cargill and Continental. These international companies will have more money than the Pool, and they won't have suffered any losses due to the elimination of the elevator system and will be in top shape to compete. This is the Opposition's proposal for the rationalization of the grain-handling and transportation system and I ask rationalization for whom-? The CPR? Yes indeed: For Cargill? You bet: But for the Saskatchewan farmer, the implement dealer in Leask, or the general store in Hafford, for the people of Saskatchewan? No chance:

That is why the Crow's Nest rates are so vitally important. Take them away now and there is no way of stopping the railways and the private grain trade from imposing their version of rationalization in this province. If we take them away now we lose our last chance to bargain for a sensible approach to improving the service and performance of the railroads. We lose our fight to keep a sensible and rewarding system of rural service centres in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if the Crow's Nest rates go, all chance of a system planned with local needs in mind goes out the window. Mr. Speaker, farmers know that they have to fight and we on this side of the House will fight with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. BANDA: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one of the most important aspects in problems facing western Canadians in the next few years and I am proud today to be able to move this Resolution.

MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, before I speak directly to this Resolution made by my Hon. colleague for Redberry, I would just like to make some few comments. I see as soon as we speak of Crow's Nest rates or what Otto Lang's shoddy tricks are doing to the producers in the West the Liberals run like gophers to their hole.

I would like to make some remarks about the situation that exists in this province. It relates to the same situation we

find ourselves in when we look at the forces that are trying to do away with the Crow's Nest rates, the forces that would destroy national unity for their own good.

Mr. Speaker, the people in the Meadow Lake constituency are pleased with the development that has taken place in the North under this New Democratic Government. We are pleased because we know what didn't take place before this Government was in power, but they are not pleased with the lack of truth and morality displayed in Opposition statements about the development of the North. They are not satisfied that the press has done its job in informing the public of the changes that have taken place in the North under this Government. If it were not for CKFA in Lloydminster the people in Meadow Lake would know very little about the workings of this Government. Day after day we hear negative criticism by the Opposition parties, half truths, misleading statements by the Conservative Party and their leader. I keep hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the story will be told by the press to the public. I keep praying that they have the same courage as other media people in this country have shown in revealing this terrible truth about the scandals that would hold true in Saskatchewan. The press can be the conscience of the Government, Mr. Speaker. Historically they have seen the revelation of the truth as their sacred duty. But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it doesn't seem to hold true in Saskatchewan. It doesn't hold true because we see a conspiracy between the Conservative Party and the media to suppress the truth. A conspiracy that the people of this province will not stand for. There are many examples, Mr. Speaker, but I will only mention one of the most recent that has come to my attention.

CFQC in Saskatoon is owned by the Bassett family in Toronto, Ontario. The Bassett family is a well known Conservative Party family. They own a huge portion of the media in Canada. After the recent behaviour of this Conservative Party propaganda machine in the recent Sutherland by-election and afterwards, Mr. Speaker, I can only think of that station with shame. I can only think of those people in the Conservative Party opposite and their eastern backers with the same . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order; I sincerely hope that the Member plans on mentioning the Crow's Nest Pass rates soon.

MR. McNEILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to that very shortly.

On the eve of the Sutherland by-election, Mr. Speaker, and I'll come to the Crow's Nest rates immediately, the media showed an episode about the former Conservative Prime Minister after these series had long been finished. If that was all that happened no one would be upset, Mr. Speaker, but the day after the election. Bill Story, one of the long time announcers spent much of his program talking about his party, the Conservative Party, the one in Sutherland. On his television program he held up a \$10 bill and stated that he had won his bet and that his party, the Conservative Party, had won the by-election.

However, that's not all, Mr. Speaker, not by a long shot. On the Wally and Den show the next morning after the by-election Wally said on his morning program that he had been at the victory party of the new Sutherland MLA, that the NDP were probably crying in their beer and that he was glad. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Conservative Youth, Mr. Norman Jack was an

announcer during the by-election and has since been asked to resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. McNEILL: It's a shame to this House, Mr. Speaker, and it's a shame to the image of the media in this province. We thought those days had past.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that we are discussing a certain Bill before the House. I would think that the Member has the wrong speech; he must be reading the wrong speech. I haven't heard anything about the Resolution at hand before us at all. I would like to know if he has the wrong speech?

MR. SPEAKER: I tend to side with the Member who has raised the Point of Order and I find that nothing the Member has said yet except when I drew his attention to Crow's Nest rates could pertain to the Resolution in any form and I would ask the Member to hasten to the Resolution.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Whether, it is the retention of the Crow's Nest rates, inland terminal or a fair and objective reporting by the press, all these things have to do with national unity.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Resolution I am very concerned about this issue as it is of utmost concern to the western grain farmers and western producers in general. When in 1897 the CPR agreed to rate controls in particular, they agreed to reduce rates on settler's goods moving west and grain and flour moving from the Prairies and received valuable land and mineral rights, cash grants, tax concessions and miles of rail line. This is national interest. This in the national interest ties mineral rights, south-eastern British Columbia into Canada where there was a danger of it going to the United States at that time, also in the interests of the CPR it gave them access and rights to the minerals in wealthy British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, after the first world war the Crow's Nest rates agreement returned and was applied to only lines built before 1897. In 1895 the Government of Canada absolved the CPR of its agreement except the Crow's Nest rates and it was then put in the legislation as a statutory rate for grain and grain producers of western Canada and extended to all railways of western Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, this meant a uniform rate for moving grain and grain products. The population settled in a uniform manner throughout the province because of the grain freight rates and this allowed them to compete in the domestic and international markets.

The settlement around our rural communities gave rise to our Saskatchewan style of life. Mr. Speaker, not all the grain comes under the Crow's Nest rates. The rape seed industry finds itself in difficulty in the world market because rape seed oil and meal is not covered. I feel that the goal of any government of Saskatchewan must be to increase farm production and see that the farmer has a fair and stable income. This Government is doing an outstanding job in seeing that the farmers have

the facts on which to base their decisions and the farmers make their own production decisions and make good ones and as far as production is concerned we can rely on our farmers to do a top rate job. We fully support the Canadian Wheat Board, unlike the Members opposite and Otto Lang. We believe that a firm step should be taken to make farm income more stable.

Mr. Speaker, two topics of vital interest to agriculture and western grain producers are rail line abandonment and the statutory Crow's Nest rates. Decisions on these issues will decide whether our rural economy and our rural way of life is strengthened or whether it is all destroyed. How these two matters are dealt with will not only decide on how much we produce but rather who will get the most benefit from what we do produce, the farmers or the grain companies and the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, a long battle between the people of Saskatchewan and railways over rail line abandonment is approaching, a climax with the findings of the Snavely and the Hall Commissions. The railway submissions to these Commissions pose grave threats to rural Saskatchewan, in fact to the whole Saskatchewan economy; intertwined are issues of Crow's Nest rates, the shape and distribution of our grain-handling facilities and the fate of rural communities on lines which are to be abandoned.

As soon as the Hall Commission reports to the Government of Canada, the battle will move into the political arena. The railway companies and some of the international grain companies will be calling on wholesale abandonment. The people of Saskatchewan will be fighting to keep the rail lines necessary for a strong and healthy rural economy. It will then be good to find what side the Progressive Conservatives and the Liberals opposite take. Will they side with the people of Saskatchewan or with their friends, the large corporations who finance them? We know that Otto Lang and the eastern Liberals are out to destroy the small communities and the rural life in western Canada by working to have the Crow's Nest rates abolished. This fight concerns us all.

I recall some of the elements of the abandonment scheme proposed by the railroads. It is a scheme, Mr. Speaker, for example, which proposes that towns be totally without any railroads. That is a scheme to destroy rural Saskatchewan. It must be fought and it will be fought. We in the Government of Saskatchewan are firmly opposed to wholesale rail line abandonment and we believe that most of our branch line system can serve this province well for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I put it bluntly. Should the fate of rural Saskatchewan be determined by the railroads, the Cargills and their friends, or should the residents of rural Saskatchewan have the major influence? I believe that the voice of rural Saskatchewan should prevail. It is my belief that Saskatchewan 25 years hence should still be based upon the family farm and the small communities. The wholesale use of inland terminals will lead to widespread abandonment of rail lines with eventual destruction of many small towns and villages. The vast increased costs in grain-handling, costs which will be pushed up even further if Otto Lang makes good his threat to convert the St. Lawrence Seaway, a public service utility designed to protect both producers and consumers, to a purely profit-making enterprise by increasing seaway tolls by a staggering 110 per- cent. If we are to bow to the pressure of the railways, Cargills, Otto Lang and his Liberals and now the Tories, this would be

convenient for Cargill and the railways but what would it mean to rural Saskatchewan? For hundreds of small communities, closures of stores and businesses; for the railway, money saved because they can take the cream off the top and just use the main ones; for the people of Saskatchewan, few social benefits, few economic benefits, only huge costs. The railways are attacking the Crow's Nest rates and pleading their case that they are losing money. Well, Mr. Speaker, many of us are a little less than fully sympathetic to the railway case.

They have allowed many of their branch lines to deteriorate and haven't bought new equipment. After allowing this to happen over a period of years they now tell us that the branch lines are inefficient. I say, Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that once the country elevator is gone tens of millions of dollars of farmers' money invested in the co-ops will go too. That is the design for rationalization which is being put forward by Members opposite and by those who say the Crow's Nest rates should go. I hear attacks on our grain-handling system, attacks on our branch lines, rationalization for whom, Mr. Speaker? Not for the Saskatchewan farmer or for the people of Saskatchewan.

In the months to come we will be subjected to yet another campaign to do away with Crow's Nest rates. We will hear stories about how much the rail lines are losing. We'll hear many Liberals, both here and in Ottawa and the Tories defending the rails and the virtues of international grain companies. We'll hear how inefficient our country elevator systems are and how our branch lines have to go. We don't believe these, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all Members in this House and to all the people of Saskatchewan, don't believe those stories. Our country elevators, our branch lines, our roads, our highways are at stake if rail line abandonment comes about and it will if we allow the Crow's Nest rates to go and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): Mr. Speaker, I had not originally intended to speak on this particular Resolution because I want to tell the mover and the seconder that I will be supporting this Resolution and so will my caucus. However, there are some great distortions which the Members have raised, both the mover and the seconder to the motion, Mr. Speaker. I hope that you will afford me the same opportunity to deal with some of the issues raised by the Member who seconded the motion because I think that therein lies something of importance to this Assembly at this time.

First of all I want to say that I think in the short time that I have been in this House, this is the third time that I have heard that speech, I think the Member simply pulls out the same one again and that's fine. Both Members were blind to a certain amount of reality that exists in Saskatchewan today, both of them are either ignorant of their environment or they have not driven around the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, from my observations within 20 miles from where I make my home I want to ask both the mover and the seconder of this particular Resolution, a few questions. Let's start with a line towards Outlook. Who closed down the elevator

at Juniper? Was it the railways? No, Mr. Speaker, the railway is still there. Was it the inland grain terminal? No, they weren't even around at that time. Why don't you face reality? Who closed down the elevator at Lille, at Wartime, at Chipperfield? Who closed this up? You people simply refuse to face reality. You are trying to deal with the motherhood issue that you are the great saviour of rural Saskatchewan and nobody in rural Saskatchewan even has an idea of what you are talking about because they simply don't believe you because you try to distort the figures and you deliberately distort the figures and you call upon and make the statement like the seconder did that the Conservatives are against the Wheat Board.

Did you ever, Mr. Speaker, hear anyone from that side of this House, say that even one member of this caucus in the House or outside of this House, condemn the establishment of the Wheat Board? No, you have not, Mr. Speaker, not a one. As matter of fact the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, was destroyed and re-established and on both occasions it was a Conservative government that established the Wheat Board, not the socialist government opposite. You people like to distort the facts, but boy, when the truth gets near you, you jump and you squirm in your chairs and you just can't face the truth.

You know the man who seconded this Resolution said, "It's going to close down our little towns and our stores."

Let me ask the man who seconded this Resolution. I live in Elrose. The next town to the east is Wiseton and in between there were once four stores. They closed 15 to 20 years ago. Was it the railways that closed them? Was it the grain companies that closed them? Come on now, let's give this some light and be sensible about your approach to this question. You are blind to reality. You simply don't want to have to face the fact that this is 1977 and you come in here with the history of the CPR and try to give this side of the House a lesson in history. All you are doing is exactly what he did, he got hold of the wrong speech, Mr. Speaker, and he read off the wrong speech altogether. Oh, they don't like it, Mr. Speaker; they don't like it at all what the facts of the matter now are.

Let me get back to the Canadian Wheat Board. A Member stands in this House groping for ideas, groping for something to say that they are the great saviours of rural Saskatchewan and then very carefully along with the Crow's Nest rates, he says that a thousand farmers in the Weyburn area do not have a right in a so-called free province of Saskatchewan to pool their resources and build an elevator. Shame, shame on you people: I would be so ashamed to let that go out to the people of Saskatchewan. Not one speaker has mentioned it, not two speakers, but now a total of four speakers in this Assembly, Members of the Government side, Mr. Speaker, who have really said in this Assembly to the press of this province, they have said that a thousand farmers have no right to pool their resources at Weyburn and build a grainhandling operation and I say shame on you, shame on you:

Mr. Speaker, I hope that somebody on that side of the House has enough courage to stand up and face some of the realities facing Saskatchewan today. I have not heard any Member of my caucus, indeed, I haven't heard a Member of the official Opposition say the same thing that the seconder of that motion didn't say, that we believe in orderly rail line abandonment.

You try to come into this Assembly, try to present the fact that you're the saviours of rural Saskatchewan and you run a poor third in both. It's just about time that you people started treating the farmers in this province with a little more respect, that they are intelligent, that they don't swallow this motherhood, do-goodish hogwash that we heard this afternoon

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned at the beginning, I will be supporting this because I believe in the principle that's outlined here but I do not believe in the gibberish garbage and the people of Saskatchewan don't believe in it. They don't believe in it for one moment. If they would quit trying to make some innuendoes about us and who should govern. That's what you are saying. You have already told us that certain people do not have a right to be in business.

You know, I happen to have lived in a constituency where Cargill has built a grain terminal. That's in my constituency. I'm not actively now engaged in farming. I haven't met a farmer up there who said that anybody came to him and said, look, you've got to haul your grain to Cargill. And you know, I have every confidence in the world in the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, United Grain Growers and Pioneer being able to compete with this organization. I have every reason in the world. It's a freedom of choice that the people have. You people don't believe in freedom of choice, we know that you haven't got the courage to stand up and admit it.

Now if you want to stay with the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, in the retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates, there are some side effects that I would like to mention. There are some side effects that are damaging, not to the movement of wheat but if you took in the rest of the Resolution, to grain products, which could, Mr. Speaker, in a few years well be detrimental to the people of Saskatchewan. All I am saying at this time, you people, get the blindfolds off, this is 1977, quit drawing out your 1950 speeches and face reality that the people of Saskatchewan are facing at the present time. Give rural agricultural industry the credit for being managed by very intelligent business-like people and let them make some decisions of their own and quit trying to dictate their operations to do what you want.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Resolution. I think it's abominable, whoever wrote the speech for the two Members opposite, they were 20 years behind time and I suggest that they come to 1977.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to adjourn the debate on this Resolution but before I do so, I want to say just a word or two as a result of the remarks made by the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey).

One thing that I found very interesting in the Member's remarks was the proposition of freedom of choice. The argument goes that Cargill and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool were on an equal plane which given a free market place, should be allowed to exist in the Province of Saskatchewan and that somehow that kind of freedom of choice, that kind of competition is somehow good for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. That's exactly what the Member said or words to that effect. That's the bottom line. The bottom line of the situation as indicated by the Member for Elrose is that we ought not to be concerned

as Saskatchewan people about the evolvement of Cargill on the Saskatchewan scene.

AN HON. MEMBER: I'm concerned:

MR. ROMANOW: No, you're not concerned: You're not concerned because you say that you welcome them to your riding and you say, well, all right, you didn't use the words, "you welcome them," I withdraw that. You didn't use the words, "you welcome them," but the implication was of welcome because you indicated that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool would be able to out-compete them. And all that I am saying is that if you change the ground rules with respect to the rail lines that are abandoned, you change the ground rules with respect to the freight rates that are charged. If you change the ground rules which make it more difficult for a co-operative-owned Saskatchewan grain company like the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to exist, what kind of competition is[^] that going to result in? Some kind of freedom of choice that's going to involve the farmer when he has to haul 35 miles [^]n order to make a Cargill inland grain terminal operate. And you're saying that's the kind of freedom of choice that we are against. That's the kind of a proposition that says that everybody has the freedom to go hungry or the freedom to go bankrupt or the freedom to see the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool institution go belly up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the Member for Rosetown-Elrose was indicating. He indicated that Cargill's entry into Saskatchewan was good competition, and so is the one in Weyburn, he said that somehow the operation of Cargill is going to be a competitive move for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the facts and figures specifically in front of me because I had not intended to get into this speech. I think it's clearly on record that Cargill is one of the world's largest grain companies, if not one of the world's largest companies as opposed to a Saskatchewan controlled operation such as the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I think everybody knows that Cargill, through that kind of a world-wide set-up has all sorts of marketing and freight advantages, all kinds of storage and they've got the United States free market system to work with and they've got the international grain commodities system to work with. Somehow the Member for Rosetown-Elrose would argue that that's competition, that's what the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool should be stacked up against. That is the line the Conservatives and the Liberals, presumably, (when they enter the debater are going to take. They're going to say that we should change the Crow's Nest rates. I won't say remove the Crow's Nest rates. They may not say that but that's the implication in some corners of the debate; abandon the rail lines and then say that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool should compete with Cargill, and that somehow we're against that freedom of choice. That's exactly the message you gave. You said that because our boys on this side, the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McNeill) and the mover of this Motion said that what we've got to do is protect Saskatchewan institutions by the use of such things as the Crow's Nest Pass rate that we're 20 years out of date. That's exactly what you said and you're saying that the proposition is that you can deal with Cargill and it will be a competitive situation with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Mr. Speaker, I say that that is the prescription for the destruction of the family farmer in rural Saskatchewan.

He's talking about elevators being closed down. All you have to do is get a system of large inland terminals that you are promoting and you'll see country elevators closing down all over this province. If you want to talk about pure efficiency, if you want to talk about efficiency, I bet you could have about 20 elevators probably in all of Saskatchewan or western Canada and you can do it all efficiently, and you can destroy all the towns in Saskatchewan if you want to talk about efficiency. And you want to talk about competition in that kind of an operation? Competition to whose advantage?

You say that you don't appreciate the speech that the Member made because he simply tries to get up and he says look, there's a need to defend these kinds of institutions. Now there have been some arguments in some corners that the Crow's Nest rate should go up, not removed but should go up. You may want to take a look at that proposition carefully if it comes forward but that's one thing that I could almost accept as a logical feature of a discussion, not saying that I'd accept it, but I could accept it as a logical aspect of the debate. But the proposition that the Conservatives advocate in this debate is an entirely different proposition. His proposition, cut through everything, says that in the question of grain marketing free enterprise, or freedom of choice, or competition is the yardstick and is the rule. If you translate that in any other terms you have the return to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange days you have a return to the private commodities. You have the Cargill operations. No, now that's the situation and I invite anybody to check the transcript of the Member for Rosetown-Elrose because that is the bottom line of the proposition that is said here.

Now I am saying to the Member for Rosetown-Elrose that there are many things that the people of Saskatchewan are gradually finding out about the Conservative Party.

One thing which I have determined a long time ago but I think was confirmed by your kind of intervention in this operation, is that somehow it is fashionable and modern today to return to something that the farmers rejected 30 years ago or more in the grain industry area.

There was a motion, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Commons dealing with the Crow's Nest Pass rates on the matter of all grain coming out of the Wheat Board. That was the motion, Again, I don't have it, I'm going by recollection, but there was a motion on that moved by the Member for Regina, NDP Member Les Benjamin. The Tories voted against that. Every Tory voted against that and I don't think you have a report of it anywhere in the Saskatchewan press or the western Canadian press. And that's coupled with the types of comments that I read about in the papers from the Member for (sitting right in the corner there) Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) about orderly marketing, he's continually attacking the principle of orderly marketing. It's all tied in, the question of orderly marketing – the Conservative Party is opposed to the principle of orderly marketing. I made that accusation categorically. You tell me where you support orderly marketing and where you want orderly marketing expanded? I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, I'm telling you that the boys won't take up that challenge because they're not quite sure whether or not the principle of orderly marketing or the principle of Crow's Nest Pass rates is something which is fashionable or to use the terms of the Member for Rosetown-Elrose, modern or whether

it isn't modern. What they do is they chip away at it. They chip away at it like they do in the speech or they chip away at it by saying you guys are 25 years behind the time. They chip away at it in Question Period. They laugh because they are not concerned about the thing and I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker that this is a serious threat to rural Saskatchewan. These guys think they have a great big sail of political wind going now because they elect two boys in by-elections and they think they do that on something that is modern and fashionable. You know, changing the Crow's Nest Pass rates to make it more modern. What's with this business of orderly marketing? It's time to question whether the Canadian Wheat Board is really doing the job for the farmers.

I'm not against the Canadian Wheat Board, no, no, I just want to check to see if I'm doing the right job. No one is against the Crow's Nest Pass rate, but get modern. I'm not against the Saskatchewan Wheat Board but let's get in there and have Cargill give them some good effective competition. Let's bring in the world's largest conglomerate in the grain industry. Give them some good old fashioned Tory competition and that's the position that you boys are taking. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a serious threat to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. ROMANOW: I say to the people of Saskatchewan that that kind political philosophy which doesn't articulate with precision, which does not articulate with commitment, commitment to the Institutions of rural Saskatchewan that we fought for 40 years to keep in this province, is an insidious threat the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rosetown-Elrose gets up and tells us about freedom of choice, he tells the speaker here who had tried to defend the Crow's Nest Pass rates, that he's defending something that is not modern, is not fashionable. I'm saying – what he says in two sentences, one in the beginning and one in the end that he is going to support the Motion, but for 15 or 20 minutes attacks the Motion, when he plays that kind of shallow political waffling – I'm saying to the people of Saskatchewan and to this Legislature that they must beware of the Conservative Party which seeks to end the operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Speaker, I want to close my remarks by saying that I'm a relatively young Saskatchewan person but if there's one thing that I have learned about Saskatchewan it is that it's a struggle to maintain this province the way we have fought to maintain it. Co-ops don't happen by accident. The maintenance of the family farm doesn't happen by accident. The maintenance of country elevators- doesn't happen by accident. The question of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the credit unions, none of those have happened by accident. It requires deliberate determination on the part of all Saskatchewan people to protect and support those institutions by this kind of resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

March 29, 1977

MR. ROMANOW: I say, Mr. Speaker, that the failure of the Conservative Party to give that kind of commitment to rural Saskatchewan is a betrayal that the voters won't forget in 1979 or 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debated adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 12 — BRING FEED GRAINS MARKETING UNDER CONTROL
OF CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD**

MR. L. E. JOHNSON (Turtleford) moved, seconded by Mr. R. N. Nelson (Yorkton):

That this Assembly urges that the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board move immediately to bring the marketing of feed grains entirely under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I find that this Motion follows a motion that covers a number of different items. One of the things that I found interesting is that the motion previous has brought up the name of one of the corporations that is moving into the grain trade in the Province of Saskatchewan and that is Cargill. Anyone who wishes to, can read one of the latest news releases that Cargill sent out within the last week to those farmers who have permit books and you will find in it two examples of what the Cargill corporation stands for.

The first one is the fact that they consider the setting by the Wheat Board of a \$3 initial payment for wheat, political intervention and that they are not interested in seeing this intervention come into the grain trade. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board has set the price for grain for something in the neighborhood of 30 years and it has never once set the initial payment above what it was actually capable of selling the grain for. When I look at this information coming out in a news release by Cargill, I feel that they are deliberately wanting initial prices set low so that there is a margin there that they can make a profit by purchasing grain for less than what it is really worth.

The second item in this news release, refers to the job that the Canadian Wheat Board did in selling the 1975-1976 crop year grain. They say that this grain is now being sold for something more than one dollar less than the Canadian Wheat Board sold it in the first place and they say that in this way the Canadian Wheat Board is actually using the open market system. I say that if the individual looks at it more closely he will see that the Canadian Wheat Board recognizes what the price of grain should be and has sold this grain at the best price possible for the Canadian farmer.

I want to say something in regard to the motion that I am going to move and that is, that I look across at the Members and although they recognize what a Board is, they lack a working concept of a Board. They are able to describe what the Board is, what it does, where it works, but they are not able to provide with any accuracy a working concept of a Board. It's like talking about an axe to someone who has never used it. He could tell you that it's sharp and he could tell you how to use it but he doesn't have a working concept of that particular tool.

He doesn't recognize that there are different axes for different jobs. In fact, he wouldn't be capable of explaining what type of axe and what shape it should be for splitting wood or for chopping down a tree. And there is a distinct difference between the axes that would be used for that.

Knowing what a Board is and what it is capable of doing seems to be missing for those Members opposite and I think that a working concept of a Board is very necessary before an individual can discuss the issues involved. One of the things that should be recognized is that a Board is a tool, a tool for selling whatever commodity it is established for. The Canadian Wheat Board is an agency for selling grain. This agency can be used to good advantage or it can be used poorly but you have to look at it in the area that it works in.

Some Members have indicated that the Canadian Wheat Board is not able to do a very effective job at stabilizing prices above the cost of production. The reason for that is very simple; the Canadian Wheat Board is not in a position to regulate the market price because the market is world wide and the Canadian Wheat Board only functions in Canada. This is something like asking a marketing board in the Province of Saskatchewan to control the price of beef that is sold. This is not possible because it has to export the meat to other provinces in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to give a little history about the Canadian Wheat Board. It seems appropriate, when the motion that I am going to move is aimed at stopping the destruction of this marketing board. The Canadian Wheat Board did not originate in the mind one day and then become a reality the next. No, it developed over a period of years by trial and error. Some years there was a Board and some years there wasn't. So the situation has been both and the experience shows that a wheat board is the better of the two.

The history of grain marketing on the Canadian prairies is a history of establishing an orderly market. The need for an efficient orderly system of marketing grain was there from the beginning of grain production on the prairies. The Canadian Parliament recognized the need and in 1873 passed the General Inspections Act, a small step moving in the right direction. In 1900 the Manitoba Grain Act was passed and again amended in 1902. These early steps indicate that the government recognized that it had a vital step to play if the prairie region was to be a viable agricultural area.

Mr. Speaker, the first Board was established June 11, 1917, when the Canadian Government closed the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and established the Board of Grain Supervisors. This Board bought all the wheat produced in Canada for a fixed price and managed its movement to Europe as part of the war effort. This Board was established because the speculative market could not be trusted to handle the job.

It has always amazed me, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite can stand up and defend the system that fails to function under pressure.

The first Canadian Wheat Board was established on July 31, 1919, ten days after the Board of Grains Supervisors stopped handling the grain in western Canada. The major difference between these two Boards was the method of payment.

March 29, 1977

With the establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board came the initial and final payment system. It is this system of initial payments, intermediate payments and final payments which have been very effective in stabilizing the income of farmers over a long period of time and has meant that in Canada as a whole the small farmer has been able to stay viable.

But as I said in the beginning, the Canadian Wheat Board was a now you have it and now you don't situation. On August 20, 1920, the Canadian Wheat Board was closed and the farmer was left with a speculative market to move his grain. In desperation the farmers organized an orderly system of voluntary contract pools in each of the Prairie Provinces, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in this case there was no 90 cents for every dollar expended by the Federal Government to help organize the Pool such as has happened with the establishment of inland terminals. These Pools were very important to the grain market until the world wide economic collapse in 1929. I find the reason why the Pools were important to the grain market between 1920 and 1929 very interesting. It is recognized that the speculative market was able to operate only because the Pools did not hedge their wheat, and since they handled about half the western wheat crop, the speculative market was not called upon to handle the total crop or maintain the market and they leaned heavily on the Pools for a stabilizing effect.

The significance of this situation was brought into perspective by the manner Otto's little speculative market was introduced which, I might add has failed in every way you can look at it, except from the point of view of those who benefit by speculating on the grain exchange.

Mr. Speaker, as Members are well aware, under the new feed grain policy, the Canadian Wheat Board is obliged to be a supplier of last resort to the domestic market. This means that if there is insufficient stock on the speculative market, feed grain in terminal positions is moved onto the domestic market by the Board. This pampering of the non-board market is not what I would expect of a system operated by rugged individuals geared to a free enterprise system. I believe that the new speculative market was granted the stabilizing effects of the Canadian Wheat Board because it was recognized that without this support the speculative market would be a total disaster.

Mr. Speaker, here is a quick synopsis of the two years which the market for feed grain has operated. In 1975-1976 the crop year loss to the prairie economy was in excess of five million dollars because of the operation of this market. The losses varied from farmer to farmer with some farmers gaining because of losses incurred by their neighbor but the average overall loss was \$3.25 per ton during that crop year. This is a significant loss when one realized that money generated by the agricultural sector of the economy in the province of Saskatchewan is spent about two and one half times before it leaves the province, so a million dollar reduction in the value of grain sold in the province means a probable two and a half million dollar effect to the economy of the province.

Mr. Speaker, a recent study conducted by the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, comparing the open market margin for feed grain for 1974-1975 with the Canadian Wheat Board charges for the same grain in 1973-1974 brought some interesting figures to

light. If we look at the non-board average marketing margins for wheat it is 53 cents; Canadian Wheat Board marketing costs were 42 cents. Now I agree that there is a breakdown in this comparison regarding the years. But if we increase the cost to the Canadian Wheat Board by 3 cents per bushel, which is what is expected to happen for 1975, we increase the marketing cost in the Canadian Wheat Board to 45 cents, which brings the difference to 7 3/4 cents. It is still an increase of over 17 per cent.

In 1974, if you look at the three reasons why the speculative market was set up, you will see that it did not succeed in even one of these, a complete failure for the two years in which it operated.

Let's go back to the Canadian Wheat Board in 1949. The Canadian Wheat Board was expanded to include in that year oats and barley and until 1974 it handled all these grains moving out of the prairie region, all the barley, oats and wheat, in a manner which made it possible for the owner-operated farmer to stay in business and make a living. How was this accomplished by the Board?

1. It provided stability to the farm income over the short- term slumps by paying an initial intermediate and then final payment.
2. It equalized the opportunity for all to deliver their grain to the handling system. It was not possible for any operator to manipulate the handling system, placing some farmers in an economic disadvantaged position.
3. Most important of all, the Pool price meant that all grain produced in the Prairie Provinces in a given year, of a given quality, sold for the same value. Whether you produce a million or fifty bushels you received the same price per bushel.

This co-operative concept was what made the prairie region a productive area. Federal Governments, both Liberal and Conservative, have never believed in the orderly market. The Federal Government in 1974 after 25 years of orderly marketing under the Canadian Wheat Board moved to destroy this marketing system. I assume that they expected 25 years of orderly marketing to have dulled the memories of prairie farmers. As was once said, it would take a generation to be born and to die before the farmers would forget what took place.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Nelson), Resolution No. 12.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. R. N. NELSON (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to speak on this Motion. I find it of very great interest to me personally having grown up on the farm and also representing a constituency that is partially rural.

I remember as a very young boy, and this is where my main interest starts as far as this is concerned, I remember as a very young boy on my parents' farm watching my father being forced to sell his grain in the fall to pay his bills, and then

only later to see that the price of grain rose considerably when he had sold most of his grain.

I talk to many of the farmers today in my constituency and they tell me, at least the majority of them tell me, that when grains are sold to the Wheat Board they can get the best possible price; that they feel that the Wheat Board operated by the Government of Canada would do this for them, find the best prices possible throughout the world and return all that money back to the farmers themselves. They feel that surely they can trust the elected officials to run the government of their country to see that those farmers get the best deal in this way.

Mr. Speaker, before asking for leave to adjourn the debate, I want to raise one more point. I see that the farmer is one of the few people in this world who sweats to produce a product and then is asked to turn that product over to the speculator, thus the speculator makes money by the sweat of the brow of the farmer. The speculator makes his money by manipulating the markets at the expense of the farmer.

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

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 21 — UNIFIED FAMILY COURT IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Miss Clifford (Wilkie):

That the Attorney General be requested by this Assembly to begin negotiations immediately with the Federal Government to combine the federal jurisdiction in family matters with the provincial jurisdiction in family matters under federally-appointed judges, as has the Province of Ontario and establish an all-encompassing unified Family Court in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself, not so briefly I am afraid, to the concept of the Unified Family Court. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to find that the Minister of Finance announced on Thursday in the Budget Address that we, in Saskatchewan, will finally be setting up a unified family court project. I say, finally, because the Government has been promising to follow this step for some years and have fought at least one election campaign on that issue and vaguely promised in the 1971 campaign as well.

The pilot project was established in British Columbia some time ago and I suggest to the Government that all of the benefits of the pilot project in terms of the lessons learned are available from that pilot project in British Columbia. Even so the concept that this Government intends to follow is to proceed with a unified family court, so-called, which will only unify those functions that are provincial in nature. And in part, Mr. Speaker, what I will be discussing is . . .

MR. ROMANOW: . . .dead wrong:

MR. MERCHANT: Is the Attorney General saying to me that you have made arrangements with the federal authorities to unify the

Family Court both from the federal and the provincial jurisdictions?

MR. ROMANOW: There will be an announcement . . .

MR. MERCHANT: So as I understand it from the . . .

MR. MESSER: It is going to be short . . .

MR. MERCHANT: Well, you know Jack, all I had to do was get on my feet and they looked after the problem. Now that is what I call action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Speaker, may I then with the indulgence of the House, have an opportunity to dispense with certain portions of my speech.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, in fact, to receive the news which you, of course, with your selective hearing process can't hear, that the unified family court in the way in which I had hoped would proceed will, in fact, be announced very shortly. I think all Members have been disappointed in the past number of years that more action has not been forthcoming by the Government. This is an area where, as we all know, situations will arise — child abuse, deserted wives, difficulties over divorce.

The result has been that a couple might find themselves before a whole myriad of courts, might well, Mr. Speaker, find themselves having their deserted wives' matter resolved in one level by a magistrate, married women's property matters going before the district court; custody matters going before the Court of Queen's Bench in a preliminary way, then coming back for a divorce before a Court of Queen's Bench judge, who might well be a different judge. This myriad of courts was expensive for the people involved and, secondly, was very disruptive to the family and not helpful in terms of dealing with the family.

All of us, I believe, seeing a rising level of divorce have been alarmed about that and have also been alarmed about the number and severity of violations of the law by young people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that problems like vandalism and the kind of needless violence that we see among young people are frequently related to the home and I assume that in a unified family court that will be a meaningful unification to deal with these juvenile matters, and will be included in that unified court.

The Attorney General has advised me that they will be moving in a comprehensive way. This follows the lead set by the Province of Ontario. Some months ago the Province of Ontario negotiated an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments by which, in that jurisdiction, the federal court is composed of judges chosen from the panel of people at the magisterial levels adjusted by the provincial authorities and in that way, the rather small question of who will appoint the judge, has been resolved, and I suggest to the benefit of Ontario people.

March 29, 1977

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people in the province will not view my enthusiasm for a better court system over deserted wives and other areas of that nature, as in any way being an encouragement to a freer use of divorce. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the growing rate of divorce is in part due to the fact that we have, in some ways, gone too far in making divorce easily available to the people of the country.

I suggest that I am reinforced in that view by experience from other jurisdictions.

In Sweden, for instance, in 1973, legislation was introduced by which instant divorce is available. Either spouse has the right to assert any grounds really and the marriage is then terminated. The only qualification under that jurisdiction is that if there are children the divorce is not quite so automatic, but even in the case of children it is readily available. That has resulted in a very large and a very alarming rate of divorce. It reminds me, in fact, Mr. Speaker, of the Russian system during the revolution and of course. Members opposite who are more friendly with the Russian system of government will understand better that concept. Under their system all that you had to do to get married was go down and write that you and your spouse wanted to marry and then all that you had to do to get a divorce was one or the other of you would go out and cross out their name. The result being that people might have not even known that they were divorced.

I believe that the statistical data quite clearly proves that the broadening of the divorce laws has resulted in an increase in the number of divorces. That is also borne out by the fact that in American states that have more liberal divorce laws, there is a far greater proportion of divorced and separated people living in those jurisdictions than in the states with more severe laws.

Our law in this country was highly restrictive before 1968. It was only on the grounds of adultery that a divorce be granted. That was eased and I think it was eased to bring divorce into a state more relevant to Canadian thinking, but I do not share the view of those people who would like to see the grounds of divorce widened to such an extent that divorce without grounds could become a possibility. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that family life education and marriage counselling and conciliation services will become a part of the unified family court. I suggest that it is not acceptable for the state to impose a sort of restricted fault oriented divorce law in society in a futile attempt to buttress the stability of marriage and the quality of family life. But by the same token it is not acceptable for us simply to say that the courts are available and no effort be made by our law to try to assist the couples to reconcile where reconciliation is possible. I believe that when a couple comes before the court for a deserted wife order or custody order or whatever that may be that it will be very helpful in the unified family court to bring meaningful reconciliation services to bear. Indeed that is one of the great advantages of having a unified family court.

There are some and I think I share that view, who would argue that the unified family court should not become devoid of the trappings of the court. That the delays in the trappings of the court, in part, encourage reconciliation. That in the American jurisdictions where divorce is readily available you don't get the feel of an occasion of solemnity, that you are

apt to proceed with the divorce or to deal with those proceedings in a cursory way and the divorce and other forms of marriage breakdown become more common.

We must maintain those trappings of the court because they assist in maintaining marriage, but at the same time bring an informal, flexible and investigative approach to bear on the problems so that we do more than simply deal with the divorce or the deserted wives application we, in fact, deal with the family situation as a whole.

I believe that a distinction in this new court should be drawn between a separation of a childless couple and that of a couple with offspring. I think we would all accept that the faultless people in a divorce are the children and that the interests of the parents are not paramount but the interests of the children are paramount.

There are many reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I believe a unified family court is extremely important and I am pleased to hear that we are proceeding in that direction, so that we will go on making it possible for the strength of marriage to be maintained in this society.

There are I suggest three basic advantages to a unified family court. I've mentioned the counselling that is available and reconciliation, that also is available in situations surrounding a juvenile delinquent. I have often thought where there is a juvenile delinquent case, frequently you are seeing a situation where the parents are likely candidates for marriage breakdown. And similarly, when you see marriage breakdown, you are probably looking at children who are likely candidates for the juvenile delinquent court.

Wardship, placing children in the custody of the state, those kinds of situations oftentimes lead to juvenile delinquency. That where you don't have a strong family unit you are moving towards a criminal situation among the young. And I am hopeful that the proposals by the Attorney General will include proposals to change the way the welfare Act now reads, by which social welfare officers are not only not encouraged to be the eyes and ears of the court but are made non-competent witnesses before that court; not only are they non-compellable but they are non-competent. The result is that the court is deprived of the eyes and ears that should and could have been available to them through the social welfare workers.

One of the greatest advantages of unifying the court will be that the myriad of court structures having been abolished will mean that one judge or one group of judges will apply their attention in a continuing way to the problems that they face. That means that the judge will acquire experience and that expertise will be passed on to counsel, so that the proceedings simply by the unification of the court will be faster and more effective and better for the couples and better for the system in general.

The only effort that we now make under our law to reconcile in any formal sort of a way is to have judges ask a sort of pro forma (perfunctory) set of questions of people as they are sitting in the witness box. A question that really says after they have gone all that distance towards getting to a divorce, "Do you want to reconcile?" Of course, the answer is No. And those kinds of statutory gestures by lawyers and judges simply

March 29, 1977

are not enough. I hope that the unified family court legislation will take away the form of trying to reconcile and will instead bring forth some substance.

Curiously, one of the advantages as well will be that by unifying the court to one judge you will have unified the bias, and because one judge will then have his biases better known, the results for counsel will be that the court is apt to adjudicate in a fair and better way. We all I think can imagine that judges being men and women have biases that they bring to bear in the court.

Unfortunately, you have many different lawyers, appearing before these many different judges and only those lawyers who practise principally in that area have the opportunity to acquire an expertise about the bias of the many judges who sit in the Court of Queen's Bench, the bias of the various judges around the province who hear deserted wives' matters and matters of that nature. It sounds curious, Mr. Speaker, but as the result of having one judge whose bias will then be apparent to all of the counsel who come before it, come before that man or that woman, the result will be that a better sense of justice will emerge because lawyers will learn to deal with that judge and deal with the biases of that judge. That is rationalization because one will know the likely result coining before that judge will mean that there will be fewer needless cases brought before the courts. Today I might well bring a case before a particular judge hoping that I could tantalize him with his biases in a particular area while I wouldn't be prepared to take it before some other judge. The result is, to some extent, needless cases come before the court.

Specialization will also result in an informal easing of the red tape, because of the greater experience of court and counsel.

The third most important advantage, for the various reasons that I have expressed, is that a cheaper justice will flow. Get rid of the myriad of courts, few occasions to come before the courts, few problems for the spouses and with a less adversarial form of hearing less need for lawyers. I long thought what lawyers should really be trying to do in marital law at least, is find ways to get lawyers out of the scene because to some extent they aggravate the problem. A specialization of court and counsel will result in cheaper justice as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can dispense with those six or seven pages of my prepared text where I told the Attorney General how impressed I was with his apparent small approach to these matters (in that he was not prepared to unify his court with the federal court) and say only that I hope that the unified family court will be what it can be and what its potential is. I would hope that court (as is almost the habit with courts and lawyers) does not so completely blind itself by precedent and tie itself so completely to rules of procedure and precedent that it destroys part of the reason for its formation. This is part of the reason that since I have been elected, I have been talking about a unified family court, and I am delighted now to see it finally moving towards fruition. I hope that that court does not as a result of the operation of the judges and counsel become just like every other court. I am sure the Attorney General will share my view that the court should maintain the flexibility and freedom that will be important if the court is to do all that it can do.

I therefore move, seconded by the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) Resolution No. 21.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to also adjourn this Motion but hopefully under somewhat different circumstances than the one that I did a few moments ago.

First of all I listened with interest to the speech from the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant). I think the Member for Regina Wascana has demonstrated what everybody has acknowledged, namely, a long-standing interest in reform in this particular area.

We have had in the past some difficulties with respect to the establishment of the unified family court. The basic difficulty has been a constitutional jurisdictional dispute. We watched with interest the position taken in British Columbia, where there was a unification of sorts. There, however, Mr. Speaker, the unification was merely a physical unification or physical integration. They sought to house in one building the various levels of courts which were involved in this matter, namely, the Magistrate and the District Court and the Supreme Court or the equivalent of Queen's Bench and to give that physical integration the necessary support staff and social services and other conciliation proceeding so that one could find a common location in which to try and resolve the myriad of family problems that arise. We watched with interest that experience and quite frankly, I took the position that while it was an improvement, it was not the kind of improvement that was really getting to the core of the situation, as indicated by the Member for Regina Wascana.

Manitoba has had, for a little while, the unified family court experimental project in the District Court. All district court judges are established currently in district courts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most of the provinces, from my observation at federal-provincial conferences on this matter wanted Magistrates' Courts to be the unified court. The reason for this or the reasons for this are basically the same reasons that the Member for Regina Wascana outlined. I would paraphrase them in my way.

The Magistrate's Court is the court of the people. It is the court where on a provincial level the support services through social services and so forth can be easily provided.

I am not sure that the Member for Wascana and I are quite in agreement on the question of the trappings of the court, but I have argued that one of the advantages for a magistrate is that it has fewer trappings than a superior court. The Member for Wascana argues that more trappings or at least trappings are important with respect to the question of marriage because one approaches the court knowing that this is a very serious matter, and therefore, may be less inclined to deal frivolously in the break-up of a marriage. I have taken the view that very often that kind of trappings provide no room for conciliation, the necessary give and take during the course of a dispute, for the couple to possibly get together again, once they go to Queen's Bench for a divorce or to any kind of superior court. The formality of it almost tends to push the couple beyond the brink. Now whether he is right or I am right

does not matter. The point is that there are some very strong arguments for Magistrate's Court.

The Member said he was going to chastise me on the bickering that we have been involved in, the petty bickering I think he used the description, in this matter and it was the bickering on this question of where this court should be housed. The Federal Government took the position that they could not constitutionally give a provincially appointed judge the divorce granting power. I am not a constitutional expert but on the advice of my lawyers there was some dispute on that.

So the point is, Mr. Speaker, that there was bickering or at least argument, but it was over a legitimate matter of substance, namely, whether the court should be housed in the Magistrate's Court and if so, could we do it constitutionally or should it be housed elsewhere and if so what would be the impact of achieving these objectives, keeping in mind the need for informality, access and conciliation and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unable to tell the House more at this time about this matter. I can simply say that we are negotiating with the federal authorities, in particular the Minister of Justice, Mr. Basford and his officials. And I want to say quite candidly that we have gotten along very well with them. We have not agreed. Negotiations are continuing. They have been tough, but I think they have been fair negotiations. I am hopeful that in the not too distant future, a couple of weeks or so without pinning myself down too much, that some kind of an announcement or statement can be made by all involved.

I don't want to cut off debate on the matter but in the light of my remarks I am going to propose that an adjournment perhaps would be in order. Let's see what happens in the next little period and if the Members of course want to pursue the issue for inactivity or whatever they would so do at that time. So with those brief words of explanation why we have taken the time to get where we are and why I am not fully able to announce something today, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): Mr. Speaker, before the Minister takes his seat may I ask him a question, would he entertain a question?

Really in respect to a related matter you may recall I asked you some months ago, in view of the burden in the Court of Queen's Bench that applications under The Married Women's Property Act are causing and the Act is working well, but it's burdening that court which is the only court that has jurisdiction, I made a suggestion to you some months ago that we consider giving to the District Court jurisdiction in that area too. I see no reason why the District Court shouldn't be given jurisdiction. Have you considered that suggestion and are we likely to have some amendments to that Act brought forward to empower the District Court to deal with those applications?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Speaker, this is an important question obviously affecting many people. I think the Member is right, that there is a back-log that is building up. What I have done, quite candidly is to refer this to the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, asking them for a report as to how serious

it was and what kind of solutions they would recommend should be taken. The situation is as follows; the Court of Queen's Bench has either completed a review of the circumstances or is about to complete a review and I've been asked by the court to hold off until they give me a submission as to where or how they think this matter should be handled. Accordingly, I've taken the position that I will wait first for the answer of the Justice's or at least get their recommendation before determining whether we need to put it in the District Court or look at some new procedures or mechanisms to deal with the problem, because I think it is a problem. So I can't give the Hon. Member an answer to the question today.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 24 — VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino) moved, seconded by Mr. P. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre):

That this Assembly deplores the increasing violence in television programming and the consequent desensitising effect on viewers and urges the Canadian Radio Television and Communications Commission to take steps to: (1) study the effects of constant exposure to violence, particularly among young viewers; and, (2) set standards for programming which prevent excessive amounts of violence.

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In moving this Resolution in the Legislature, which I hope every mother and father in Saskatchewan will support, the Resolution deals with the increase in television violence and its effect on our young children.

I am astounded at the type of programming now that is being aimed at our children. The key ingredient is violence, violence by the bad guys, violence by the good guys. A few years ago we used to teach our young that good guys didn't use violence. Now all the shows seem to tell them that they're not with it if they don't act tough and shove other people around, you know the shows that I mean, the Kojack and the Starsky and Hutch types, who feel they haven't earned their pay unless they crack four skulls and kill two or three petty crooks each day.

Then there are the shows featuring terrorism, robbery with violence and murder-suicide. This stuff goes on and on without relief. What must it be doing to our children? Well, one thing I know for sure is that television shows such as this are desensitising them. In other words, they are so used to seeing violence shown on the screen, that they have begun to accept such horrible acts as a natural way of life.

We're now reaping the results of letting this happen. We know that crimes of violence have increased all over the world. Worse than that, we have excellent documentation that such violent crime among young people, the TV generation, has increased alarmingly. Our youngsters have become so used to seeing people suffering from the effects of violence on TV and in the movies, that they no longer seem to care when it involves them and suffering of others in real life.

The sad part of it all is that all our children don't prefer to see violence in the first place. A survey of nearly 1,000

March 29, 1977

young people in Australia, an audience seeing some of the first television shows, preferred the shows be without violence. Our own children were no different from those in Australia. They haven't asked for violence, they had it foisted upon them by the same people who are selling war toys and tough-guy hero dolls and the like.

From the time our children start school to the time they leave school, they will have seen 87,000 acts of violence. That has to have a terrible effect on their view of the world, not to mention the effect on preschoolers who, many times are baby sat by television.

I'm sure as a farmer, that I know the care the farmer takes to ensure a steady, healthy development of his crops. They go to great lengths to see that the fields are free from weeds, have adequate fertilizer and are covered by insurance. Surely we can have the same degree of concern for our children. I know very well that if a hail storm comes along while the crops are in bloom that the damage is devastating, but if the hail storm comes along when the crop is in the bin, there is no damage. Some say, they can see the shows in theatres, but there is a difference between a theatre and television in your home. Television in your homes has everything piped in and the child that's three years old can turn the television on. But with theatres, usually the shows are rated and a person has to make a conscious decision to go to a theatre. It's not so with television in the home.

I hope that every Saskatchewan parent will apply all the pressure he or she can to get violence off the air. Send the sponsors a message. Tell them that you care about your young children. Some may call it freedom. Here is another attack on freedom. But I grew up in a home that told me, with your privileges, comes responsibility and people who are so irresponsible to provide this kind of material to the little minds that are in bloom and can be seriously affected are not worthy of freedoms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear:

MR. THIBAUT: I would like to read a quotation from the Reader's Digest:

A New York Department of Mental Hygiene study led by Dr. Monroe Lefkowitz revealed that the single most important factor determining how aggressive a boy will grow up to be ten years later was not the school, or the family life, but the amount of brutality he views on television.

I'm going to add to that, Mr. Speaker, that you see very good homes today turning out youngsters that are so violent you don't know where it comes from.

In the city of New York just a few weeks ago, there was a program coming over with 13-year old children going into the homes of elderly people and torturing them to death and having no compunction whatsoever that they've done anything wrong, because it becomes a part of a way of living, by completely portraying violence from morning until night.

Mr. Speaker, there is a country, Mexico which has already banned several programs. They say that television should aid and improve human life and instil social morals and human dignity and family ties. None, however, has taken such drastic steps as Mexico whose Ministry of the Interior banned 37 programs known to be persistently violent. These include such popular adventures as the Untouchables, the FBI, Ironside, Kung Fu, Mannix and the Four Just Men. The Mexican law maintains that radio and television should be aimed at improving human life and should seek to instil in Mexicans, respect for social morals dignity and family ties.

Mr. Speaker, we used to say, like father, like son, like mother, like daughter. But I'm going to tell you, you can look into many homes today and this doesn't apply any more, because of the things that they have been exposed to.

Our jails are getting so full that we don't know who's running whom, the guards or the people in jail. The situation is going from bad to worse and we're going to build more jails when we should be building recreation centres for our young people and providing better recreation facilities. Instead we are going to build more fences and more iron bars. As a senior Member of this Legislature I've seen a lot of water go under the bridge and I think that the environment is the thing you've got to get at first if you're going to have any decent result. I hope to see not one Member in the Legislature vote against this Resolution, but get behind it because these people will understand when the legislators of the country start speaking against the kind of programs they are providing our society.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Saskatoon Centre, Mr. Mostoway, Resolution No. 24.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure for me to be able to second this Motion asking the CRTC to study the effects of violence on TV and other areas and to also set standards in this regard. I»as a teacher, I don't say that I think I know, I know that a steady diet of violence helps to dehumanise citizens, be they young or old.

MR. CAMERON: Do you play cops and robbers?

MR. MOSTOWAY: Do I play cops and robbers? Yes, I'll play cops, if you be the robbers, and I believe you are. You'd like to be the robbers. They tell me you fellows were, for seven lean years, robbers, but you said it, I didn't. I say, Mr. Speaker, that with a dose of that for seven years, look what it did to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. MOSTOWAY: But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, I was rudely interrupted and I was sort of sidetracked.

I happen to know that all this violence, be it violence in books, violence on the movie screens or TV or radio, really has a dehumanising effect on people. There's evidence of that

in school. New programs come up on TV which I have occasion to watch because I want to see whether they are violent or not, and whether they are suitable for our children. There's evidence that a lot of the practices that are condoned on these TV programs are picked up by students, youngsters who are still going to school and, naturally, will become adults and thus there is a transfer there throughout society.

I also believe that far too often our TV shows, our books and movies play up the shyster type, the violent type, he's made to look like a hero, and this seems to be the accepted mode in the entertainment media throughout the country. I think it's having a bad effect on people.

I believe that a violent society has to be the inevitable outcome of watching all this violence on TV, reading about it in books, listening to it, seeing it. There is evidence of that, all you have to do is stand on any street corner in the larger major centres of North America and you can see the violence that is in the air. Sometimes you can even smell the violence. You will see policemen minding their own business, protectors of citizens, being accosted by the people, sworn at and cursed at. I believe the reason for that is because our children and adults have been fed a constant diet of violence.

MR. PENNER: Will you let . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: I am not so sure that you will get the opportunity to say anything today because it is getting rather late. But I will give you a good reason for that a little later on.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the reasons why we have a violent society and why we have all this violence is because of corporate greed via advertising. I am a firm believer that some of these large corporations will pay anything for advertising. It doesn't matter how rotten it is, how corrupt it is as long as it puts money into their coffers. I say that the CRTC in Canada has an obligation . . .

MR. PENNER: What about the . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: Yes, what about it? Did you wish to speak, Hon. Member? Well, I am not going to sit down and the more you interrupt me the less chance there will be of my sitting down.

I believe the CRTC has an obligation to the citizens of Canada to clean up the act that we see on TV, to clean up the mess in regard to violence.

I don't really know what Liberal Members opposite are going to do in regard to this motion. It seems to me they will probably see the light and vote in favor of this Resolution as put forward by the Hon. Member. I am quite sure the Tories will be caught on the horns of a dilemma because I know they advocate a free-wheeling society, I think they are going to be caught between the devil and the deep blue sea, as to how they vote in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, because this is such an important debate, and there are so few Members in this House, I don't think we should deprive those who are absent of the pearls of wisdom that will be said by others on the topic, and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 25 — SUITABLE MARKERS FOR HISTORIC SITES

MR. R.R. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose) moved, seconded by Mr. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to provide at cost suitable markers or cairns to community groups wishing to preserve our heritage and history by marking the original site of schools, churches, or similar historic sites.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to address myself to this particular topic earlier and I just want to say a few words in regard to this particular Resolution.

I mentioned in the Assembly the other night that in just a few months time the Province of Saskatchewan will be celebrating its 75th birthday. I think that after talking to the Minister in charge of this particular resolution, I am assured by the Minister that there are going to be a lot of things happening in preparation for our 75th birthday. I suggest too, that in providing the public with a great deal of information in regard to the various ways in which we can preserve our history and our heritage, that perhaps the Minister in charge could (in consultation with the Minister of Industry and Commerce and probably some other groups) prepare for the citizens of the province at an early date, a choice of say, three or four markers or cairns, to take them about the province, let the people take a look at them, let them make their choice. Then the Government could make these markers available to the various community groups throughout Saskatchewan in order to have the sites that they so wish to designate for the 75th birthday of the province.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I have said in the Resolution that I think the Government should do it at cost. Somebody said well, the Government is already providing something in the way of a plaque free of charge. I don't think the people of the province are really asking for anything free of charge. I think it is the responsibility of the Government to make available three or four different types of cairns or markers. Perhaps the Department of Industry and Commerce could get a branch going where they could be made. It will allow the people to make a selection, put them on view in various places throughout Saskatchewan and thus facilitate the various community organizations in marking the 75th birthday of the province, as well as of course, preserving our heritage to the original sites of some very, very important institutions that came with the opening of the prairies.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Wipf (Prince Albert- Duck Lake) Resolution No. 25.

HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us certainly has a fine proposal with respect to providing markers for any of the historical sites and also identifying some of our heritage.

At the moment we do have a program or we did have a program in the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources for the purpose of providing markings for certain community groups in identifying the various historical sites. Since that

time the responsibility for the preservation of historical sites and our heritage has been transferred to the Department of Culture and Youth. My colleague, the Minister, who is absent from the Chamber this afternoon, I am certain has some comments to make with respect to the proposal made by the Hon. Member. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 01 — An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property of the Saskatchewan Command and Branches of The Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League was incorporated by an Act of Parliament, being Chapter 84, Statutes of Canada in 1948, which established the legion commands of each province. Each being a separate entity including among others, the Saskatchewan Provincial Command comprising the Province of Saskatchewan whereby the act of incorporation of Chapter 84, mentioned, the commanding branches could hold and possess real or immovable property for the purposes of carrying out their objects, it became necessary to pass an Act in Saskatchewan to cover this. The result was in 1949, Chapter 133 was passed by this Legislature covering the holding of real property of Saskatchewan Command and branches in Saskatchewan.

Recently the Act of Incorporation of the Legion by the Federal Government was amended to provide a section providing as follows:

No Branch may, without the consent in writing of the Provincial Command, have jurisdiction over the Branch hypothecate, mortgage, pledge, lease, sell convey or otherwise dispose of its real or personal property except in the ordinary and usual course of its activities.

As a result of this amendment by the Parliament of Canada, it has now become necessary to amend Chapter 133, to give effect to the federal amendment which is the reason for this private Bill.

The intention of this Act is to provide that a branch of the Legion within Saskatchewan may hold in addition to real property, personal property and that no branch may without the consent in writing of the Saskatchewan Command once again hypothecate mortgage, pledge, lease, sell, convey or otherwise dispose of its real or personal property except in the ordinary and usual course of its activities. Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 01 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 02 — **An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Retailers Trust Company.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Norfolk was founded in 1916 as one of the

very few Saskatchewan-based trust companies. For many years Norfolk operated as an adjunct to the Retail Merchants' Association, Norfolk administering the estates of the late members of the Association, etc.

Since 1972 Norfolk has been a member of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation and has thus been unable to accept deposits from the public. Norfolk is a full service trust company headquartered in Saskatoon and with branches in British Columbia. Norfolk has over 400 shareholders, 99 per cent of the shareholders being western Canadians, perhaps over half the number being residents of Saskatchewan.

Of the directors, five are permanently ordinarily resident in Saskatchewan and four outside of Saskatchewan.

Norfolk's assets are now in excess of \$14 million. The directors intend to keep the company's head office in Saskatoon. The company employees are approximately 15 people. Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 02.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:55 o'clock p.m.