

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session - Eighteenth Legislature**

April 25, 1978.

**EVENING SESSION**

**CONTINUING ON MOTION ON LEAFLET RE MR. MERCHANT**

**MR. A.N. McMILLAN** (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the two hour session over supper has given that caucus office the time to heal that immense riff that it developed in its ranks in the past three hours. I must say, you would not know that by the looks on your faces but I am sure you will be all the more happy when I get finished explaining to you exactly what the situation involves in this House and how it involves your members and you caucus principally and what should be done to rectify the situation.

It is an interesting thing, you know, for a member of a Legislature who has sat in this House for almost three hours now, pardon me, three years now — the member for Rosemont has as the rest of us have and maybe three hours would be just as accurate. A member who has sat in this Legislature for three years and who has witnessed the contribution that the member for Wascana has made, it is an interesting thing, when the only criticism that that member can find of the work from the member for Wascana in some cheap political shot that he would like to bring before the people of Saskatchewan. That is an interesting thing.

It says a mouthful about the kind of work that the MLA for Wascana has contributed to this province. And it has been good work. Here is a man who has taken on controversial issues, who has not hesitated, has not shunned the political heat when it has been potentially there. He has taken on these situations and he has done it with a certain amount of principle that is seldom found on the other side of the House. The only criticism the member for Rosemont can find to raise with the public about the MLA for Wascana is the fact that somebody took his picture and the Liberal Association for Regina East decided to use it in a campaign brochure. That is big stuff.

That says a lot about the MLA for Wascana but it says just as much about the MLA that raised that matter. It says even more when you consider that that member is the Legislative Secretary to the first minister of our province, the Premier. I am not at all surprised to see that the Premier is traditionally absent from the dicey little political discussion that the NDP has initiated in the Legislature. We would not have expected to find the greying ancient Premier of Saskatchewan in his seat when there was a dicey political subject on the agenda. But it is interesting to note who is carrying the NDP flag in this battle, the Premier's Legislative Secretary. The little engine that could, I think the story goes, that huffed and puffed. We got a little steam and we got a little noise and that was about all, nothing of substance. If you have such a problem finding some area to vent your political spleen, go to your caucus, beg them for a cabinet post. Get in there. Do some work for the people of Saskatchewan. Don't personally vilify one of the hardest working members of this Legislature that the public has ever seen in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I say you are all in this. I say your role in this shameful. I say it's shameful, I say it's a shameful thing when your caucus has to go against their own best

principles and their best ideas and support you in something they would have to do very reluctantly. I say it's too bad when you put them in that position simply to try to smear one of the members of this Legislature politically. The member needs an escape valve. If they can't put you in the Cabinet, maybe they can move you in beside or behind the two new whips for the NDP party, one who has been there for a long, long time, but everyday it seems like he has just started the job, so I will refer to you as a new hip and the sincere and hardworking member for Redberry.

What is the question, what is the question before this legislature? The question is — it is interesting to note that the question that has arisen here deals specifically with whether or not a picture of an MLA at his desk has been published. I gave you an example here, and I said before supper, as the member now says, a most serious charge, just enough to shake the political foundation of this province to its roots. Something no doubt that those members will want to spend a great deal more time on in the days to come. How serious has this been. This is not the first time this situation has arisen in this province and I am sad to say it may never have crossed my attention before but had it I'm sure I would have been propped on my feet to raise it as a point with the Speaker. In 1975 we find several members of this Legislature being indiscreetly exposed in photographs in the Star Phoenix sitting in their seats. I see that once youthful, vibrant MLA for Estevan here in his seat, hardly recognizable today. I say not your fault, Mr. Member, a mere shadow of his former self.

The MLA for Indian Head-Wolseley, sitting innocently in his seat probably not aware that the photograph was being surreptitiously obtained and another MLA, one of the greatest statesman of our province who has since gone to his reward in the Senate, Mr. Stewart, his complete image tarnished by this unkindly photograph in the Star Phoenix. I say shame that no member brought this to the attention of the Speaker before. And other members, too new in this Legislature to know what horrendous deeds were being done against them by the photographer who I say surreptitiously slipped this photo into the Star Phoenix and nobody noticed. Tough stuff indeed. Tough stuff indeed. No one made an issue of it at that time. What could be worse, I suspect, than that? Well the member for Rosemont feels that having a single picture for the MLA for Wascana standing before his mike, no doubt waxing eloquently to the people of this Legislature, that is worse. I say, how do you as MLAs support this motion which is not probably properly worded in the first place? How do you support that when in fact that epitome of justice and objectivity in our legislature, the Speaker, has somehow been degraded by having his photograph put on information and probably again surreptitiously slipped out the front door of the Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I would caution the member about bringing subjects into the debate which would have the net effect of putting the Speaker in the debate and I have cited the rules several times to the members today about that and I will cite it again to the member for Kindersley.

The Speaker's actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except a substantive motion.

I remind the member for Kindersley that that is the rule, not established by me, but the rules that guide this Assembly, set down long before I arrived here.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Speaker, members of this House know that I would, on no occasion, bring disrespect to the Chair of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

My only point is, is that here is a photograph of one of the MLAs of this House (it may very well be the Speaker) which some member could have taken and mailed to his constituency. Who are we to say? The photograph has been available. I don't recall having any requests brought before this Legislature for this photograph or for the ones in the Star Phoenix. How can we as members single out one member who used a photograph, not for political purposes, against you people, not a photograph of you people, not unlike the Speaker's photograph which no doubt does great honor to this Legislature wherever it is handed out. This member has done you no harm, nor has the Speaker done this Legislature any harm with his photograph here, nor did this Star Phoenix article do anyone any harm. And you people expect us to differentiate the MLA for Wascana from these other pictures that have been taken? How do you expect us to do that? We can only assume that you would like to apply the rules of this House in this situation. Pardon me, I am sorry, there are no rules in this House with respect to photographs. You would like to apply the practice of this House against the MLA for Wascana for doing what probably other members of this House and other member of the photographing public have done time and time again since I have been here.

How do you expect us to be inconsistent in that respect? You won't find us inconsistent. We are not prepared to apply any sanctions against the member for Wascana any more than we would against the Speaker for having his picture published by whoever or the Star Phoenix for running a photograph of other members.

Now if you are driven by some perverse desire to see the MLA for Wascana scandalized politically, I suggest you do it with a little more class. I would only to think . . . because I know the member for Rosemont is a good fellow . . . I would only like to think that you did this with a smattering of humor in mind. That you thought you would come into the House and maybe have a subtle embarrassment for the member for Wascana and leave it at that. But it is no longer a joke. Your motion calls for a condemnation of the MLA for Wascana for using a photograph of himself in the paper. I say, are you prepared to condemn the Speaker for doing the same? No, nor should you be. Don't be inconsistent with this motion.

If you are prepared to apply sanctions against the MLA for Wascana then you had, good Lord, better be prepared to apply them against every person that has ever taken a picture in here and every member of this Legislature that has ever published a picture in here and every newspaper that has ever taken a picture in here and published it.

I say you can't afford to be inconsistent and if you think this situation is still pretty humorous, I'll be anxious to hear you get on your feet to say so. Other than that, you don't have a leg to stand on and any of you that support this motion would be displaying your consistent inconsistency to the public of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. W.H. STODALKA** (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to try to follow that very colourful performance here by the member for Kindersley. At the end of my few remarks that I am going to make, I intend to introduce an amendment to the resolution that has been presented by the member for Regina Rosemont.

It would appear to me that during the last two hours, I'm not sure that what we've really accomplished here in this Legislature. I have personally examined the resolution that was originally published or presented by the member for Regina Rosemont. Really after careful scrutinizing I can hardly realize how anybody could really support the

April 25, 1978

resolution. I would just like to make a couple or three points as to why.

First of all, it says in the resolution, this was a contravention to the rules of this Legislature. I think it has been clearly evident at this time, contravention to what rules? Where can anybody point to these rules? They simply are not here.

Secondly then, if they are here, in an unwritten form, isn't there a responsibility then on somebody in this Legislature to have informed us as members about these rules? I have been here three years and nobody at any time has told me, in three years, that I could not have my picture taken here in this Assembly. It may be ignorance on my part and if it is, I apologize for it. But nobody has told me. I am sure there are other members around here as well who have not been told, and I can't see how we can condemn somebody for breaking a rule, if they have never been informed of that particular rule. So certainly, this is not . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Read the book, it is there.

**MR. STODALKA:** — The second point I would like to make is this. All of us have been involved in election campaigns before and election literature has been prepared by our committees. This election material then of course is distributed by those — really this is the Regina East committee that prepared this material. How are you going to ask the constituency of Regina East, a federal constituency, to bring their material into this Legislature and turn it over to the Speaker? I don't think you have the right to do it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, they don't. They certainly don't.

**MR. STODALKA:** — This the Regina East constituency, it's material paid by them, it is material prepared by them, and how can you ever ask them to come in here and present that material? I really don't know. The hon. member for Arm River seems to be pretty good on his feet. I would like to hear him on his feet. These are two or three points I would like to make and with that, I would like to move an amendment to the resolution that we have before us. I would like to move that the motion is amended by adding the following words:

And for all pictures and negatives taken on opening day be returned forthwith to Mr. Speaker.

I would like to move that amendment, seconded the member for Regina South, Mr. Cameron.

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN** (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I think that we have to make a couple of things clear right off the bat. We have had people deal with the whole question, I think, of semantics. We talk about rules; we talk about practices.

In my view there are rules that are written; those are the written rules of the House that are in the green book. But in parliament there are many, many practices that are part of traditions of parliament that are just as important to the decorum of the House as the written rules.

**MR. CAMERON:** — What are they?

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, the member asks, what are they? One of the rules is that —

**MR. CAMERON:** — TV in parliament.

**MR. ALLEN:** — That is right and they changed the rules. I do not object to televisions in parliament. I favor televisions in this Legislature and when we change the rules to allow that I will be happy to vote in favor of that because I believe in it.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have read in the press or heard on the radio the member for Wascana, speaking on this broad issue, make some personal attacks on myself. I suppose it is his right to do so. He has termed me a political hack. I suppose what it boils down to is what you mean by that term. If political hack means that I support my party, I am.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — If political hack means that I support the policy of my party and do not publicly defame it, I am a political hack.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — If political hack, Mr. Speaker, means that I do not attack my leader, both privately and publicly. I am a political hack.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I say to the hon. member for Wascana that as far as my politics are concerned in my party, I am not a fair weather friend, or a sunshine patriot. I am speaking to the amendment. I don't get out when the going gets tough. I was in this party as a political hack, yes, in 1964-65, 1966-67, 1968-69 and '70. I was with my party and when times got tough I stuck with my party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — If that means I'm a political hack, yes I am. All I can say to the member for Wascana is you are not a political hack . . . (Interjections of laughter).

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabor this debate. I brought in this resolution originally and I fully expected that member would get up and apologize. Now the party has moved an amendment that deals with all pictures. I suppose that we'll have to have a look at that amendment and look at it seriously. But I have a few thoughts, Mr. Speaker, on the whole subject of pictures in general. Mr. Speaker, members outside the House have tried to say that the rules and the procedures of our House frivolous and inconsequential. Basically what they say is this particular motion and by way of their other recommendation, they think that this is frivolous. Well all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is if this Assembly allows one of its member to callously ignore the practices of our House, how can it then ask or expect other members and future members to live and operate under these rules? This violation comes from one who suggests he would be selected to the Parliament of Canada. Surely the members of the Liberal Party are not serious if they suggest that such a flagrant . . .

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is your point of order?

April 25, 1978

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could ask the member to confine his remarks to the amendment much as I was asked to confine my remarks to the topic at hand?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I didn't hear the member.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could ask the member to confine his remarks to the amendment much as you requested me to confine my remarks to the topic at hand?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have been trying in this debate to ask the members, all of the members, to confine their remarks to the topic. I have had very much difficulty. I must admit, other than hearing the member for Regina Rosemont say the amendment once, I haven't found much connection with what I see before me as amendments. So I would ask the member to adhere to the subject which he is speaking to which is the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, I would be delighted to do that, Mr. Speaker. I might say that the members of the Liberal Party seem to be a little skittery tonight. They seem to be able to pass it out pretty good but they get a little bit nervous when somebody tries to give it back.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — I think the reason they are nervous, Mr. Speaker, is that they know that they are on darn thin ice. That's why they are very nervous about this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the subject of pictures, as in the amendment to the motion. I want to talk about another picture, another picture taken, Mr. Speaker. My father like thousands of other men and women in this city served in the Canadian Armed Forces. Because of that and in part, compounded by other infractions, I was upset to see the member for Wascana attempting to exploit his position in the Reserve Force of the Canadian Forces for personal political gain. I am advised it is a violation of the rules of the Armed Forces, in fact, Mr. Speaker. I had it checked out, Canadian Forces base, Winnipeg legal Department, Winnipeg, Manitoba. I was advised that indeed for a member of the regular force or the reserve to use a photograph of himself in uniform to advance one's political career is out of order. That comes from the legal department, Canadian Forces Base, Winnipeg, Manitoba. When I think of the men and women . . .

**MR. MALONE:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am just wondering when the member is going to bring his remarks around to the amendment. There is nothing in the amendment, except for the reference to picture taken in this House. The member for Kindersley got up and drew it to your attention I am getting up to draw it to your attention. I hope Mr. Speaker can draw it to the member's attention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I have been trying to get all members to adhere to the rule of speaking to the motion before us. I have had a lot of trouble with that today, as members will witness. Now, the amendment is to the motion. Now the member for Regina Rosemont has to confine himself to the effect that the amendment will have on

the motion. Apparently, he is going to relate it. I gather there is some relationship to what he is saying, with the amendment, but I have to be equally as generous with the member for Regina Rosemont as I was with other members when they allowed themselves to be off the topic and I had to, several times, stand and bring them to order or attempt to bring them to order. I want to give the member for Regina Rosemont the same latitude I have given other members in order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order! Order! — In order to be fair with that member as I have been with other members who have been off the topic unfortunately.

**MR. ALLEN:** — I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly try to follow your ruling. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that when the member for Wascana impugned my motives in bringing forward this resolution. I was not jumping up on my feet screaming points of order and I think that the Liberals should probably sit there and listen to what I have to say silently, the way I did for them this afternoon. However, I am not sensitive; I do not mind a little heckling now and then. Just let me finish off by saying this, Mr. Speaker, that I think there are a lot of veterans in this city and they have got a lot of friends who are buried in France, in Belgium and other theatres of war. They do not appreciate the fact that he is using that uniform for . . .

April 25, 1978

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Order, Mr. Speaker, point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a —

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order, order! The member for Wascana has a point of order. Now if he could state what the point of order is, rather than making an argument, I would listen to it.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member is pursuing the idea of the use of a military picture which he apparently thinks is some offence somewhere. It maybe be, but it is not an offence in this House and is not speaking to the amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I have listened to all kinds of debate today for much longer than the member for Regina has been up, which was off the topic, and I attempted time after time to get the member back on the topic. Now I just say that I should give the same latitude to the member for Regina Rosemont as I gave to other members earlier today. I think that is being perfectly fair. It is unfortunate but I made every attempt to get several members back on the topic this afternoon, and was not too successful.

Now the member for Regina Rosemont has spoken for just a matter of a few minutes and he has several interruptions on points of order. Now I think the members should allow him the same latitude as they took for themselves.

**MR. MALONE:** — A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is the point of order?

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that you mentioned earlier about giving members latitude. You instructed me to sit down on numerous occasions and I did. You asked me to stop making remarks which you deemed to be critical of you; I did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you did that on your own volition, not on a point of order. I ask you to give that member the same deal you gave me by rising on your own volition and bringing him to order when he gets off the amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. What happened to the member for Lakeview this afternoon is on the record. It is quite clear for anybody there to see it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order! Order! Order! The member for Regina Rosemont was called to order by me on a point of order raised by one of the members here. Now if the member for Regina Rosemont is out of order I will attempt to keep him on the subject but the record will clearly show this afternoon, and I do not think we have to go all over that again, that members were out of order time after time and if they want to be out of order I have to rise on my own volition, if necessary, to bring them back to order. I have already raised and brought the member for Regina Rosemont back to order. Now the member for Regina Rosemont should continue.

**MR. ALLEN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, once again, confining my remarks to the amendment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want to deal with the amendment and the amendment says that all pictures and negatives taken on opening day must be returned forthwith to Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is fine with me. I suppose we will have to look at it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at these things. There is a subtle



difference between pictures that are taken by the news media and pictures that are taken with the knowledge and consent of the members of this Legislature for political purposes. There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, from Joe Blow out on the street. Pictures in this House are taken with the permission of Mr. Speaker. No doubt Mr. Speaker got his own consent to have that picture taken.

Now let me finish, Mr. Speaker, on this point The point I am trying to make is that the member for Wascana isn't Joe Blow citizen who comes in and happens to have a camera, snaps a few pictures. The member for Wascana's photographer who's working under the instructions of the member for Wascana (no doubt) isn't operating on the basis of ignorance, is he pleading ignorance?

These people, Mr. Speaker, are members of this Legislature. They should know the rules and practices of this Legislature and if they have made a mistake, they should have the gentility at least to stand up and apologize. That's all I ask of the member for Wascana. That's all I ask. When I brought in this resolution did I bring in a long harangue? Did I harangue the member the way the way he harangued me this afternoon? I did not. I simply moved a resolution that asked him to apologize, very, very difficult to do. I've had to apologize in this House. I didn't get up and rant and rave. I know I was wrong and I apologized. Is that a lot to ask? Whether it's a practice or a rule, is that a lot to ask?

Now, Mr. Speaker, on this subject of pictures, I want to talk about a few more picture. Since I first raised this matter, Mr. Speaker, last week, it has come to my attention that there has been some of the pictures taken, some other pictures taken. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, it's important to distinguish between a leaflet that's printed for political purposes and a newspaper. Let me give you an example. Say there's a demonstration or a petition or a group of people that come to petition the Legislature and that group of people has two pictures taken. One is taken by the newspaper. The Leader Post take a picture . . .

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Is he referring to pictures taken on opening day, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't know. The member for Regina Rosemont is making a speech and the speech has to pertain to the motion before us which is being amended. Order, order! The member for Regina has to confine his remarks to the amendment which is being offered to the motion before us and I don't know whether — it seems to me the remarks at this point are pertaining to the amendment which is before us and I suppose we can only tell after we've heard some more remarks whether they, in fact, stay with the amendment.

**MR. ALLEN:** — I am trying, if I wouldn't be interrupted interminably by the members of the Liberal Party, I'm trying to point out that when we're talking about pictures, as mentioned in the amendment, that there's a difference between pictures that are taken by the media, the public and the members of this legislature, or people working on their behalf. That's the point I'm trying to make. Now, I'd like to point out also, Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment, the hon. member for Maple Creek talked about pictures, different types of pictures. Let me finish my point. Let me finish my point. I was talking about people who have their picture taken by a paper, people who have their picture taken for political leaflets.

Now if a person in the public came up to the Legislature and in the course of making a presentation had a picture taken and found it in the Leader Post, well, so what? But if a

April 25, 1978

person came up here to meet with a member, talk with the members of the Legislature, had a picture taken and found it in a political pamphlet without their consent, they might be upset. And there are other pictures that I could talk about, pictures, Mr. Speaker, in this leaflet of a group of women who are embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that that member had their picture taken without their consent and sent it to 30,000 people in a Liberal leaflet.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — On opening day?

**MR. ALLEN:** — I don't know what day it was. So that's another little sidelight on pictures, Mr. Speaker — the hon. member for Wascana taking people's pictures without their consent and embarrassing them. Mr. Speaker, I admit that I may be a little irate at this but I witnessed, Mr. Speaker, a flagrant disregard for the practices of the Legislature. I didn't, at that time, give any deflammatory remarks. All I did, Mr. Speaker, was to bring in a resolution asking the member to resign. I was surprised when he did not rise to or should I ask you to resign, I'll get to that next. I am surprised that he did not rise in his place and apologize immediately. Instead, he and his colleagues outside the House and inside this House have chosen to attack you, Mr. Speaker, and to attack me. They have tried to concoct a conspiracy theory, Mr. Speaker, that I and you conspired to . . .

**MR. G.H. PENNER** (Saskatoon Eastview): — . . . because surely to goodness the rules that apply to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would ask the member for Regina south to relate his . . . (interjection) . . . I would ask the member of Regina Rosemont to confine his remarks to the amendment which is before us. Now what the member is discussing is a matter which I have ruled out of order previously today, therefore, I do not believe it is open to the member to raise the subject again because I have already ruled it as out of order and I would ask the member who will have an opportunity to close debate, if he so wishes, to confine his remarks to the amendment. And I am going to have to ask the member to adhere to that and if I cannot see a connection with the amendment I am going to have to call the member to order.

**MR. ALLEN:** — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. All I wanted to say was because people have asked me to do so and I do so now. They have asked me to deny that I spoke to you about this matter before bringing it to the House and I say to you, to them, to the members of this House and to the members of the public that I have never spoken to you about this matter and with that, Mr. Speaker. I will sit down. Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. G. MacMURCHY** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **BILL NO. 38 — AN ACT RESPECTING REFERENCES IN THE STATUTE LAW TO 'CUT KNIFE'**

## Section 1

**MR. R.L. COLLVER** (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just ask briefly what is this bill all about, Cut Knife? I am sorry, I really wasn't and I am glad to know that the member for Lloydminster-Cut Knife is alive as we have never heard him speak in the House and perhaps he could explain that to us now.

**MR. M. KWASNICA** (Cutknife- Lloydminster): — Mr. Chairman, I was going to say in a joking fashion that we should wait until my support staff arrives because, but anyway . . . I would like to caution the member for Nipawin that maybe he ought to check the Hansard if he figures that I have not been making any speeches in this Legislature because he is never here anyway to hear them. In case you are not aware I did make a speech about seven or eight days ago, April 4, as a matter of act, it was on the status of equality for women. It was about a half an hour long and I wish you had read it because it might have done you some good. I also spoke on the Throne Speech Debate as well as it is a disappointing thing really.

Anyway for the clarification for the member for Nipawin I would like to suggest to him that the purpose of the bill is very simple merely to correct the spelling in any reference to the constituency, or the town in the province, the spelling in all Legislative Assembly Acts to them mainly in the Election Act and the Representation Act has been as one word and I have been asked by the RM of Cut Knife? And the town of Cut Knife, the council, to make this change because all the postage that comes out of here spells Cut Knife as one word and they get upset about that. I don't but they do. So I have brought in this bill to make this change in the two particular acts pertaining to the Legislative Assembly and really that is what this bill does.

Items 1 — 5 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

## SECOND READINGS

**MR. S.J. CAMERON** (Regina South) moved second reading of Bill 36 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Development Fund Act, 1974.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, with regard to this Bill No. 36, on Tuesday, April 18th, 1978 a point of order was raised by the Attorney General that Bill No. 36 An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Development Fund Act was out of order under rule 30. I have considered the provisions of the bill and find that the bill restricts the use of The Saskatchewan Development Fund to investment in Saskatchewan undertakings and further that all moneys advanced to the corporation by the Minister of Finance shall bear interest. Neither of these provisions create an additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people and I therefore rule that the bill is in order.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, the bill is set against this background, that The Saskatchewan Development Fund Act was passed in 1972 and established a mechanism ostensibly to permit Saskatchewan people to invest in Saskatchewan companies in order, under the terms of the act, to retain control of the Saskatchewan economy by Saskatchewan people. And in setting it up there were some advantages made to the Saskatchewan Development Fund corporation which is the corporate arm which runs the Saskatchewan Development Fund, advances made by the government

Finance Office to that corporation which have never borne interest. We have consistently taken the point with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Revenue that those interest free advances from the general revenue to the Development Corporation amount to a subsidy of that corporation.

Now, it's important to put it into this context, that the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation is a commercial enterprise. It's nothing more or nothing less than a vehicle to permit people who have excess money to invest in an array of investments that are available to them. People in those circumstance can invest down at Houston Willoughby, in the credit unions, or the co-ops in a variety of things such as Registered Retirement Savings Plans or other special investment plans. Now bear in mind the people we are here talking about are people that have money to invest and it is a highly competitive area that we are dealing in. We have insurance companies, co-op or trust companies, life insurance companies, banks and so on, all competing for this market. People who have additional money to invest. Then along came the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation which also entered this market and is competing, may I say incidentally, with some Saskatchewan institutions such as Co-op Trust or the credit unions or Houston Willoughby. These people all provide the same services as the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation does. That is point number one. Point number two is that so long as the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation is advanced money by the Consolidated Revenue or by GFO, interest free, it therefore is receiving a competitive edge in competing with the other Saskatchewan people in the investment market. The first question is, should the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation have the competitive edge. I have never heard a persuasive argument yet to persuade me to give, at the taxpayers expense, that kind of competitive edge to a government institution in respect to investments by Saskatchewan people. So long as the moneys advanced by the government Finance Office to the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation do not bear interest, it means that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are paying the equivalent of the interest each year. That is we are subsidizing to that extent, the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation. Who are we subsidizing? Who are we assisting with these tax dollars going to that purpose? As I say, we are not assisting in any way the poor, not assisting in any way those in need, not assisting those with some social difficulties that need our assistance. The people we are required to assist by granting those tax free loans and tax free advances to the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation are those people in the province who have income remaining to invest. In other words, we are assisting not the poor, but the rich or the near rich, because they are the only people who have money to invest. I just think it is wrong that we should be spending public funds in this way to subsidize those who don't need any subsidy, those who can afford and have income left over to make investments. So, therefore, for two reasons the bill is proposed. One is I see no reasons why we should give a Crown corporation a competitive edge in these circumstances, because the market is well served as I say, served by Saskatchewan people and highly competitive. Secondly, is I see no good reason for the public purse, the taxpayers of the province, to subsidize those people who wish to invest in this particular vehicle. So the act, therefore, would require if passed, the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation to pay interest both retroactively and into the future with respect to the advances that it has received since 1972 from the government Finance Office. It should pay interest on those advances at the commercial rates of interest like any other investment institution has to do. I therefore set up in the act a requirement that they pay interest at commercial rates of interest. Commercial rates of interest are defined as

those rates of interest that apply from time to time in the free market place, that is to say the prime rate that it costs other people to borrow money and the banks and credit unions and the like are loaning money in the province from time to time. That is the interest rate the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation would be required to pay to the government Finance Office. In the absence of it doing that, it is, no matter what the Minister of Finance or what the Minister of Revenue say, being subsidized by the people of the province and we have no right to be subsidizing those people who can afford to make investments. That is what the act is aimed at, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to move a second reading of the act.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As usual the member for Regina South in his attempt to gain the maximum press benefits in his drive to become a member of parliament, has stated the problem and outlined the problem very distinctly. He has detailed, correct me, the fact that the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation attains interest free advances from the government of Saskatchewan and that this seems to give it a competitive edge in its involvement in the competitive industry. What the member for Regina South failed to outline in detail in his statement and his proposed solution which is, of course, an absolutely nonsensical solution, but what he failed to outline was that even with that subsidy the return on the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation is lower than any other kind of development fund anywhere in Canada. It's lower than any other kind of pension fund anywhere in Canada. The results of the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation so far, relative to anybody else's results, have been abysmal and are lower than bank interest rates.

**MR. CAMERON:** — 14 per cent.

**MR. COLLVER:** — 14 per cent the member says and I am afraid that they don't quite calculate the interest the same as anyone else, even with these interest free advances.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation is serving, in reality at this point in time, no useful purpose in the province of Saskatchewan. It is merely competing with other organizations in the same area. It is not providing any kind of a service that Co-op Trust isn't providing . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I agree.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well if you agree, then why would you recommend that they pay interest to the general fund? Why wouldn't you recommend the Saskatchewan Development Fund cease operation.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I couldn't do that.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Couldn't do it, he says. Well he certainly couldn't have made a bill but he could have made a motion that the Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Speaker, certainly the solution of the member for Regina South is inappropriate. The Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation is not serving a purpose in Saskatchewan as other organizations can possible do. I have a great deal more to say on this subject so I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — AGRICULTURE — VOTE 1 (con't)**

**MR. E.C. MALONE** (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions of the minister that have been asked before but I just want to get some figures for my own purposes.

Mr. Minister, could you tell me how many people who are farming or ranching in Saskatchewan (I say that) and I think what I really mean is how many farms and how many ranches, how many units in the agricultural industry are there in Saskatchewan? Can you give me that information?

**HON. E. KAEDING** (Minister of Agriculture): — Approximately 67,000.

**MR. MALONE:** — 67,000 farms or ranches, is that correct? Can you give me an indication of how many people would be engaged in farming or ranching, the husband, wife, sons and so on? Do you have those figures?

**MR. KAEDING:** — There would be approximately 240,000 to 250,000. We don't have the exact number here.

**MR. MALONE:** — O.K. Now when you had the Farm Fuel Rebate Program in 1974, I believe you paid 10 cents a gallon . . .

**MR. KAEDING:** — 7 cents.

**MR. MALONE:** — All right, 7 cents. Would you give me the total cost of that program in the last year of its operation?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The last year it was in operation it was \$1,013,000.

**MR. MALONE:** — I couldn't catch that, Mr. Minister.

**MR. KAEDING:** — \$1,013,000.

**MR. MALONE:** — Do you have statistics available to you which would show what the total energy cost was for farmers and ranchers in the last year you have statistics available for, fuel for tractors, for trucks and so on? Do you have that information?

**MR. KAEDING:** — \$120 million.

**MR. MALONE:** — \$120 million for the total . . .

**MR. KAEDING:** — Total fuel costs. Approximately, that's a pretty rough figure.

**MR. MALONE:** — I am sorry.

**MR. KAEDING:** — That's a fairly rough figure.

**MR. MALONE:** — Thank you very much.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK** (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I would like to just take a look at some of your actions and the actions of your government in recent years. We

see a government that has made claim and laid claim time and again to being dedicated to the maintenance of rural Saskatchewan. Rural Saskatchewan is where the heart of the farming industry is and the agricultural industry. During that time, Mr. Minister, we have seen a decline in the numbers of farmers, seen a decline in the overall population of the province and we see an incline in the farm size. We've seen you introduce programs, as I said last night, so many, that they have to be catalogued in a book of this nature, 'Services and Programs for rural Saskatchewan.' Now, whatever your intentions whether they are good or bad and let's assume they are good, whatever they were, they're not working obviously. Obviously, whatever effort you are making, have not taken grip at the root of the problem. They seem to be treating only the symptoms which again is temporary policy . . . temporary measures. Now, I want to urge you to very seriously consider some longer term policy and take a look at agriculture as being a vital industry and a number one industry in the province of Saskatchewan, not just for today or tomorrow but for many years to come. Things the Premier has been saying recently would lead a farmer to believe, would lead members on this side of the House to believe that you're indicating that a stronger emphasis is being place on resources. Most definitely that has been the case.

Well, you've taken it upon yourselves to increase the per capita debt to Saskatchewan people. To take over these so often termed holes in the ground. You're making a strong effort in terms of the resource industry, a direction we do not agree with but nonetheless you're taking a strong effort in terms of your philosophy.

We don't seem to see that type of effort made in agriculture. That is what I want to see you, as Minister of Agriculture and your government do. I want to see you take on some of the federal policies that affect Saskatchewan, namely, that being the processing of our raw products here in the province. It surely doesn't make much sense and I think you'll agree with me, if we're sending our raw products down to eastern Canada, having them processed and then having them shipped back out, paying the freight both ways, which is one of the reasons why the city of Regina in the heart of the food belt, has one of the highest costs of living there is in the country, and one of the highest food costs. I have a brother who lives in Toronto. He can buy a loaf of bread cheaper than I can here. That surely doesn't make much sense to me. I don't think it makes much sense to you. I think your government has got to take some very serious measures in terms of processing our raw products here in Saskatchewan. Take the same effort that you've applied to the resource industry even though it's wrong in our opinion, and we're going to be faced with correcting the mess you've created when we form the government in '79. We're going to have to face the same mess that you're going to leave us within terms of the Department of Agriculture.

Now, so many times, Mr. Minister, we've asked you, asked you to take that leadership which I have talked about, take some firm positions on behalf of agriculture. Marketing boards is one talk . . . we've asked you. Go head have a plebiscite. Let's see if the farmers of Saskatchewan want marketing boards or they don't want marketing boards. But you're not too anxious to do that because you know you're a lot safer to be in the situation that you're in now, because when I ask a question or the Liberal Opposition asks a question, you can always get out by saying, 'Well, we're in the process of listening to the various farm organizations and we haven't heard from them all, yet.' Now, you should be fortunate that they're not organized, and you are because if they were organized and agreed on those things that they could agree on collectively then you would not be able to use that as an 'out', when we came to you with their proposals and said, 'look, this is what the agricultural industry wants. . . the vast majority of them.' Then you would not be able to say, 'well, I've got to listen to a few more and different

April 25, 1978

organizations or there's one other farmer left hiding behind a rock or something that you haven't heard from.' You would have to accept that and you would have to move immediately to implement a policy, the policy which they were suggesting to you.

Now, it's those kinds of things, Mr. Minister, which I am urging you now to consider. Now when I take a look, for instance, at some of the news releases that come out of your department to information services and I have not got the one that stated the tour that you have made of the province. But it was two stops and I just can not recall the two places that you stopped at. Maybe you could recall just which two they were and tell me how many people were in attendance. Now one of the biggest groups that you have to speak to collectively all at one time is the SARM Convention. You should be thankful that they have one because that gives you an opportunity to speak with a lot of farmers all at once.

Now what are you doing, Mr. Minister, on your own. Are you taking deliberate steps to tour through this province, call meetings in various parts of the province, meet with the farmers and hear what their ideas are? What their proposals and policies are? Or are you prepared to do as the federal government is doing and as this provincial government is doing, and I say provincial governments right throughout this country. That is the position where they are listening to their bureaucrats.

How many decisions, Mr. Minister, do you make? Do you come to your office in the morning and say, 'boy, there is a problem in this particular area.' Maybe we have got flooding in a particular farming area and you come up with an idea. Do you do that? Not too often, I would suggest, Mr. Minister. What I suggest you are doing is what our federal Minister of Agriculture is doing, relying entirely on advice from his civil servants. And I know a lot of the people, Mr. Minister, that you have in your department. And I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that you have got a lot of good people there and a lot of them give you good advice. And you should be thankful that you have them as support staff. Because if you did not have them, if you had to rely on your initiatives as Minister of Agriculture, I do not know just where agriculture would be. I know where you would be as an individual, as the Minister of Agriculture. You would be on pretty shaky ground. But when you get a release, when one of these news releases from Information Services says that, for instance, last fall the conditions were very wet, the farmers couldn't get the crops off. Something that was quite well known to every resident of Saskatchewan and little did they need to have you spend taxpayers' dollars to put out a news release on it. Now whether it was that somebody needed a job, somebody needed to get some typing done or what, I don't know. But when I go over the news releases and they are coming in quite regularly into my office, I don't see too many that are really telling me anything that I do not already know. Now it is like putting out a news release that is telling the people the time of day. Most people have a wrist watch. And most people know when it is raining and when it is wet and when the farmers can't get their crops off. And most people know when it quits raining and it dries up and they are able to get the harvesting done. That's part and parcel of this bureaucracy which you have which I sometimes question as to its efficiency. And I wonder if you have every questioned it, as Minister of Agriculture. Have you ever looked at some of the news releases that come out in your name? Do you read them all? Do you look at them and say yes, that is a good news release. That people need to be told what that information is, what information is contained in that release. Or do you go back to your people and say, no, look, we don't need to put this out. This isn't anything new.

The best example of what I am talking about is when we go back and look at a federal program called Operation LIFT which Otto Lang introduced. Now Otto Lang didn't know



how much grain was out in the west. He really didn't have a clue. But what he did was to rely on people who are his support staff, his civil service, his bureaucracy. They were putting so much into some computer and getting some answer out that said, well, there are so many millions of bushels of grain out in the prairies and we have got to sell it. Now you know that he found out very quickly that there wasn't as much grain out in the west as he was led to believe. But there were farmers, like myself, at that time who could not afford to give up their permits to sell grain. There were big farmers who said, well, we are going to do the smart thing. We are going to do the opposite of whatever the government is telling us and that's the position right now which makes it very difficult, not just for you and your department, but for every minister of government and for every politician in this province and in this country to administrate on behalf of people, because the people don't have any faith anymore in the politicians. It's for that reason they tend to do the very opposite, so when sometimes you may have a good suggestion in the interests of agriculture, they are going to balk at it, they are going to reject it, not because they thought it out necessarily, but because they are going to opposite direction because of the low body politics that we have today in Canada.

Now you would admit, Mr. Minister, you would have to agree with me that the information that Otto Land had said with regard to the amount of grain that was here in western Canada at that time which prompted him to introduce Operation LIFT Program was not accurate in any sense and it created a lot of hardships on the smaller farmers and those are the farmers which so many times this government here in Saskatchewan says they are standing behind, they are supporting, and I surely have to question that when I look at a little pamphlet by the CEMA (Canadian Egg Marketing Association) which by way of its formula allows the egg producers at two and a quarter cent profit per dozen eggs, two and a quarter cent profit on a dozen eggs. Now then, what effect does that have and what effect are programs like that going to have on the industry? If all I could make was two and a quarter cents on a dozen eggs, then I would have to produce millions of eggs. The only way to make any money is on volume and that creates a bigger operation or further yet and worse yet, the very thing that you are contrary to. It will place it in the hands of the multinationals and you know and I know that this is being done in a number of places in the United States where families are running, and that's a good example as a matter of fact . . . my parents happened to drop into one on a farm visit, and that's exactly what they were doing. They owned the farm. All of the machinery and the mechanisms here for the production of eggs were not owned by them at all. It was owned by a large food chain. So, I'm telling you, Mr. Minister, that some of the advice that you may be getting from your people is not necessarily the truth. It's not necessarily the best thing for agriculture and then when I say I want you to take a leadership role, I'm not suggesting to you that your staff is all bad, the people in our department are all bad, not at all. And I'm not saying, Mr. Minister, that you are not capable because I think you are and I don't mind telling you, Mr. Minister, and I know that the rest of the government boys over there are just sitting there to needle on something, but I'm going to tell you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture as a minister in this government I have been quite favourably impressed with you in terms of your actions within these Chambers that you have handled your department well but I'm expecting a little more of you, I guess, because I know that that basic goodness is there. You are a farmer yourself and I'm trying to encourage you to stand up and face Ottawa number one and say, 'look, we have had enough of that. We are going to process our raw products here in Saskatchewan' and take what measures you have to, negotiate whatever you have to, get out around this province and meet the people and I think you can come back to your people, your staff, your department and you can say, look this is what I'm getting. Now here are the recommendations I want to make to you. Now can you put it in place. I don't expect you to draw up every program and work out every detail, not in the least

April 25, 1978

I'm just asking you to reverse the trend that we have today in government and let's start getting the ideas coming from the producers and let's have you start and put in place enabling legislation for them to run their own businesses.

Now, Mr. Minister, I think that at this point in time, when you look back and reflect on agriculture and see that it's not going the way you would like it to go, then whatever you have been doing is failing. We have talked about municipal grants, 30 per cent, 50 per cent actually going to the 30 per cent of the population. Centralization of our population in primarily two cities in the province, all of the things which you say on the one hand you are opposed to and yet by your very record have been ineffective in correcting it. You have introduced FarmStart. You thought that would generate some revitalized economy in agriculture, but it really hasn't accomplished that. Land Bank was another and Mr. Minister, I would like you to reply and I would like you to make some comments on some of the programs that you have implemented and generally speaking, tell me if you really feel that the direction you are taking now is in the best interests of agriculture and if you are waiting and if it is better now than it was four or five years ago?

**MR. KAEDING:** — With all that advice I am sure, I can assure the hon. member that I'll be a much better Minister of Agriculture from now on.

Going back one by one over some of the items which the member raises. He is critical, of course, about the fact that in Saskatchewan the number of farms have declined in the last number of years and that the farm sizes have increased and I think that if he look around him in the rest of the world and in all the provinces of Canada and in the states of the United States, you will find that that trend is a fact wherever you go. The numbers of farmers are decreasing and the size of farms are going up. But it is interesting to note, it is just in tonight's paper, it talks about the number of young farmers who are now coming on stream in Saskatchewan and the quotation says that the number of farmers under 25 years of age increased from 2,270 to 4,722 in the last five years and the number of farmers under 35 years of age increased to 11,200 to almost 62,000 in the last five years and I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is an indication that our Land Bank program and our FarmStart program is working, it is helping to keep young farmers on the land and is doing the job that it was intended to do. Certainly we intend to maintain the level of programming in those areas because we are confident that that will help to improve the capability of some of our young farmers to stay on the land. I know the pressures are there for them to continue to get larger and larger units. The pressure is on because of publicity by large machine companies to get those portable drive tractors and it is a great thing to be able to sit on one of those and say that I own two or three sections of land. But our thoughts have been in our department to try to discourage that kind of land development but rather go to more intensification within the fence line and we intend to continue with that and we think that is the mechanism we want to use to maintain a good rural population.

Now there was some criticism about the fact that there is not enough further processing in the province of Saskatchewan and I agree with that, I would like to see it improved a great deal, however, my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is working very hard in that connection to try to get the Hall Commission in its entirety adopted across western Canada and I must say that we have to give him full marks for the amount of work he has done and the kind of activities undertaken in that regard, not only alone but in consent with his fellow ministers across western Canada. We are very hopeful that as they are able to convince Ottawa that we need the Hall Report adopted

all of the sections of the Hall Report, that we will get more further processing in western Canada.

It was interesting to note that a comment he made about food prices in eastern Canada costs have been much lower than in Western Canada, the cost price of food. I have here an advertisement that was clipped from the Toronto paper showing sirloin steaks at \$1.56 a pound, on that same day that same steak was \$2.58 in a store in Regina, the same store, and we wonder why that should happen and it is obvious that there is some collusion on the part of wholesalers, fruit wholesalers, food distributors, the large food chains in attempting to recuperate some of their profits in Western Canada which are being lost or at least being held down in competition in eastern Canada. When we see a steer on the hoof in Regina bringing about \$6 a hundred less than it does in Toronto and then seeing cuts of meat coming on Toronto counters for \$1 a pound less than it does in Regina, then it makes you wonder who is controlling the food chain and the Minister of Consumer Affairs in his dealings with Ottawa is looking at this problem and trying to get Ottawa to police this whole area of food wholesaling. That certainly is an area which requires a great deal of work.

With regard to future development in the province of Saskatchewan in agriculture, we are in the process now of attempting to set up another long-term agreement with Ottawa and in regard to the Agricultural Development Agreement under which we hope to be able to get financial support together with our own for a fairly massive land improvement program which we feel we need and that would include, for instance, such things as breaking and clearing pastures and on other cultivable land, irrigation projects. We think that we need to do a lot more work in irrigation. Further processing is certainly an area where we want to get federal-provincial co-operation. We are looking in areas of manpower development in terms of training young farmers to be more capable managers on farms. All of these things are already in process. With regard to his comments as to the minister's tours and really what we accomplished there, it might be interesting for you to know that in those tours and those evening meetings, we've had very good crowds. In Maple Creek, we had something like 250 people in the evening. We had probably 125 in the afternoon.

**MR. R.H. BAILEY** (Rosetown-Elrose): — I was there.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yeah, good. In Shaunavon we had about 175. In Meadow Lake we had something like 200 and Turtleford, I believe about 150. I want to point out to the member that he makes some criticism about the minister listening to his staff. And I do listen to my staff because they are a very good and competent staff. In the meetings, when I've gone on these tours, I've always made a practice of taking the senior directors of the departments with me. The director of Land Bank or FarmStart or Lands Branch or Rural Development and there are always some of the senior staff people along and I do that deliberately because I want them to be there when I'm taking some flack from some of the local people. They understand and I'm sure they know this but I think it's a good exercise for all of us to be out there and taking a little bit of flack from the public so that we do understand what the public wants us to do.

With regard to some of the comments that the member made relating to news releases and why we are putting out news releases. I can tell you that if we don't put out news releases the press would be on our back the next morning and saying, well look, I want to know about this and I want to know about that. Certainly, we feel that it is to our advantage to put these things out into the press so that the people do have knowledge of what the department is doing. I would suggest that anybody who would not do that

April 25, 1978

would be delinquent in his duties.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Would the minister mind, tell me, you are surely not saying that you put news releases out because of pressure from the press? Is that what you are telling me?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, it's easier and much more efficient for us to put out press releases which relate to topics of interest and I can tell you that I believe that most of them are of interest. Every press release or almost every press release that goes out of my office with my name connected to it is approved by me and I don't want to have that any other way. I know that some of our staff people put out news releases from the department, for instance, the statistics department. This department puts out news releases on a fairly regular basis and I think that's a good idea because it keeps farmers posted on figures, on cattle movements, on grain storage volumes and so on.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I have a few questions I would like to ask you. We have a problem which has developed in the last five or six years. You know when you look at television at this time of the year you will note that the advertising media points out that we have a number one weed, the wild oat. It has become a great success, the chemicals we have. I'm referring to the kochia weed which seems to be growing to be a real problem, not only here in Saskatchewan but across Western Canada. Has your department at the present time any concentrated effort as to how they are going to control this weed? It seems the habitat of the weed itself makes it difficult to eradicate, I realize that, but at the rate in which it is spreading, Mr. Minister, I suggest that it could become our number one weed problem. I would like to hear from your department as to what action you are taking against this weed?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, as far as we are aware it hasn't been identified as a serious weed in the province. It is not one which creates a problem in the field. I think it's a roadside kind of problem rather than a field problem. I think that as far as I'm aware I haven't ever had anyone complain to me that we should be doing something about that particular weed. If it should be a problem certainly someone should be alerting us to that.

**MR. BAILEY:** — You are right. At the present time it is a roadside problem, vacant lots and so on, but it is running into areas which are normally hay and pasture so it is becoming a problem. The reason I mention it is because I have had a number of people and discussed with a number of people wanting to know how to control it. I find it difficult to believe that someone hasn't contacted your department, you know, to get some information on this. I would like to know more about it myself. Do you have a pamphlet prepared for this kochia weed?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I can't identify exactly whether we have any written material on it but certainly a contact to Vic Beck in the Plant Industries Branch would bring you the information you want. If you wish we can get that for you.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I was interested the other day listening to a comment, and apparently this is not the first time that it has happened (although it may fall slightly into the Department of Municipal Affairs) for the last number of weeks that every day, crossing the border on the Soo Line down near Portal, we have from 8 to 12 carloads of grain moved in CPR boxcars, coming up from the mid-west, being transported entirely once it crosses Portal on CP lines and then south of Vancouver crossing into the state of Washington and down into Oregon.

Now, as I understand it, this grain is not moving at the crowrates. But I find it difficult in a period of time when we have a demand for more cars and while 12 cars may not be that great in the total picture of western Canada, I tried to get some more information as to why this grain was moving in Canadian cars. Secondly, why was it coming this route? Could the minister enlighten me on this at all?

**MR. KAEDING:** — I am not entirely sure why it is moving this way. I understand the cars in which it is moving are cars which are not adaptable to our elevator system and to our unloading system. It is going through on Canadian rails and as far as I am able to determine it is not misplacing any cars, which we would normally be using in the movement of grain. But this is really all that I know about it. I just heard the report and I have that much information.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to get into a problem and a little bit of discussion with the minister, not that we are going to have any concrete answers to this particular topic. It is a problem that sooner or later (we can procrastinate all we like) but sooner or later the province of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan is going to have to deal with the acquisition of large acreages. I am referring to the gradual expansion which must take place over 15 years with the Hutterite colonies in the province.

Up until this point in time no one had too much concern when there were about 10 colonies and we had a gentleman's agreement between the 35 miles as the crow flies and so on. There has been, at times, a lot of vindictiveness and a lot of bias and prejudice in the selling of land. These people are quite used to that.

Earlier this spring, I am sure you are aware, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs is aware, certain RMs passed some by-laws to make it impossible for them to live in a colonial setting. I am not too sure how that turned out.

One year ago, I believe, we had 29 or maybe 30 colonies and probably by this fall we are up to 35 or somewhere in that neighborhood.

The minister realizes that once this takes place and you have been involved, there is great deal of friction and to try to legislate this problem, of course, you get into human rights and you legislate against somebody wanting to sell and so on.

What I want to get into in this particular topic is that it seems to me, Mr. Minister, that there are areas of the province particularly in the North, and you can call them your fringe area or not, but it may be advisable and it may be something worthwhile looking into on the part of your department, to take a look at agriculture in the North, to expand it even more than it is.

People laughed about the Peace River development a couple of generations ago, or less than that, in the '30s. We had a lot of people move there. But there is a fringe area, Mr. Minister, and I wonder if we could not entertain with your department the possibility of pushing the frontier back. I am quite sure that these people with their knowledge and their aggressiveness and their ability to overcome the obstacles, it may not be a good thing for the province; it may be beneficial as matter of fact to suggest to them that certain lands could be available. I am not saying that we should give them all the poor land. Don't get me wrong. But when a colony needs to expand maybe we should have some options for them if we want to make use of our hinterland and push

April 25, 1978

the frontier back. I am quite convinced that there are areas in the North that could be producing agriculturally and I throw that out as a suggestion and a comment from you.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, this is a problem which we are faced with, one which is continuing to give us a fair bit of trouble on the west side, as you well know.

However, as you indicated, it is a very difficult problem to deal with because you are dealing with human rights and certainly these people are good citizens, they are good farmers. In terms of the farm size, they are sometimes criticized about farm size, but per capita they are not large farmers. They would average about 500 acres per family unit which really can't be criticized.

The proposal that they move to the North, of course, or some other area, we keep saying that to them but the Hutterites are as clever as anyone else. They want only good land if they can get it. Because they are able to pay cash in most cases they are able to pay better prices for land than anyone else. Therefore, they are in the market, legitimately, purchasing land. We have, as I said, tried to encourage them to spread out a little more. We can only encourage them, we can't force them. There is no way that we can say to them you can't have land here you are going to have to go up North. It is a difficult proposition.

I discussed this matter with Premier Lougheed when we were at the Premiers' Conference in Yorkton. I asked him how they were dealing with the Hutterite problem; were they contemplating any legislation or any regulations? He indicated to me that, No, they were not prepared to — in fact, they had had legislation which had been struck down — and that they were not really too concerned about the problem. They said they seem to be levelling out. I know that some of them are coming here but I am sure there is some expansion going on there as well. I really don't know on what basis we could attack them. I know that municipalities are taking some action to try to discourage their concentration. I don't know whether they will succeed with that or not; I understand that there has been some action taken against those municipalities under The Human Rights Act. I don't know how that is going to be resolved. It is certainly not an easy question to answer I know that it creates problems for those people where there are concentrations. I really don't have a good answer. The idea of moving them away, I say again, they have all the rights that you and I have and there is certainly no way that you can force them to move.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I am glad to hear the minister state that because you are quite right, they have rights. What I wanted to learn from you, of course, was the fact that you had given them the opportunity to look at some of the marginal land for development. You are quite right they do have the right to remain here and purchase. If they can pay a heavier price and I have to sell I guess that is my right to get the most money for the land and so on.

I am wondering, Mr. Minister, if you take a look at the year 2000, recognizing that you double the numbers in about 15 years, 15 to 17 years. What we are looking at between now and the year 2000 is about 70 colonies in the province. I am not saying that is good or bad. I am saying that if there was a way in which we could get some of our own people to work together like that — it would cause us no problems. But if there was a way to get some of the undeveloped land worked by them, I think your department, and I appreciate the stand that you have taken, would give some help to them. You are quite right, they don't have to go but at least keep the problem before them, if we do have a problem. I don't think that any government wants to legislate against them. I

understand that when the Alberta government did legislate against them it backfired. The legislation didn't work out anyway. It didn't have what the legislation desired was going to be the result. That probably would happen here too if anyone tried legislation.

**MR. KAEDING:** — I think the member will know that we do have kind of a gentlemen's agreement with the Hutterite colonies under which they are supposed to stay 35 miles apart colony to colony. They were living up to that agreement fairly well up until this year. They have now been stepping outside of that agreement and we are hoping to meet with them fairly shortly to try to see whether we can get some discipline back into that again. We understand that the elders of the colonies are not particularly anxious to be closer than that. At the present time they are buying within those ranges. Again, it gets very difficult to lay the law on them because there isn't a law that you can lay on it. It is simply a gentlemen's agreement.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Chairman, last night in my opening remarks I dealt with a number of problem areas which our caucus and I believe the farmers of Saskatchewan saw in regard to this particular Budget. I stated last night that this Budget really does not reflect the real needs of agriculture in Saskatchewan. I had an opportunity last night to cover some of them. I talked about energy, irrigation and land use. However, there is another area which I think is just as important and very vital; it is the area of education, research and incentive. Let me say again, that this Budget, in those three terms does not basically reflect the needs of agriculture in Saskatchewan.

In terms of diversification, there is no doubt that if we want to encourage the development of the small farm, the small family farm in Saskatchewan, we must encourage greater diversification amongst farmers themselves. Just as an example, if we want to take advantage of the dwindling farmland which we have in Saskatchewan, one can provide an adequate living on one section of land, providing that particular farm is diversified and has gone into the field, for example, of hogs or some other form of livestock. A one section farm with a 40- 60 sow farrow-to-finish operation can provide a very handsome income and return for a family farm.

What we see in Saskatchewan though is a greater dependency year after year to rely strictly on grain production. When we look at the annual reports which are provided to us each and every year, we find that the number of farmers involved in hogs has dropped 137 from last year instead of increasing. We find that in regard to poultry in a province as large as Saskatchewan, we only have 28 turkey producers. In a province as large as Saskatchewan we only have 128 farmers involved in egg production again, in a province as large as Saskatchewan we only have 66 producers involved in the production of fryers in terms of chicken.

I think this is a sad commentary on the total agricultural picture of Saskatchewan,. And might I add as well that in regard to hogs, turkeys, or especially turkeys, eggs and chickens, that the majority of producers in these three categories are Hutterite colonies. They are the only ones who form the major percentage of those various figures. If this government is really sincere about maintaining the family farm, trying to draw away from the emphasis on huge four, five, six and seven section farms more incentives must be provided, more education must be provided and more research must be provided to encourage more of our younger farmers and more of our established farmers to diversify their grain operation and go into other forms of livestock.

We can be noted as the 'bread basket' of the world. Why can't we be noted as the 'food basket' of the world? We have the potential; we produce the raw material here to feed

April 25, 1978

our livestock and our poultry. Why can we not direct some incentive in a budget such as this towards that area?

Another area which I am extremely concerned about is that, at the time years ago when I attended the School of Agriculture up at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan had the great distinction at that time of being the best agricultural college in Canada, the best college in terms of research and development in the province of Canada. What has happened over these years since then is that from first place, we have dropped significantly to the point where basically our contribution to the total education and research picture in Canada, as far as agriculture is concerned, has dropped very, very low on that particular ladder.

It is encouraging to see in the Budget that the government has decided to co-operate with the federal government and provide a fair amount of funds for a swine research station at the university, which is a step in the right direction, but as I said last night, Mr. Minister, we are not going far enough in this regard in order for us to catch up on the various areas of concern in regard to agriculture that we have lost over the past years. Instead of looking at a 3 per cent increase in our provincial Budget, we should be looking at a 12 percent increase for agriculture in Saskatchewan.

When one looks at the new Heritage Fund which the government has set up, as I mentioned again last night one one-thousandth of the dollars that this government receives in its Heritage Fund is spent on agriculture — only one one-thousandth. This is why I have suggested on many occasions that we do take the initiative, use the dollars that we have available under this fund and make those available to agriculture, especially in the areas of research, education and incentives.

As I said last night, according to page 112 of our Estimates, this province has \$116 million which they have not budgeted for, \$116 million excess of budgetary revenues over budgetary expenditures, \$116 million which is lying there and collecting interest. Why not take that money and try to build an agricultural industry in this province, provide the incentive that is needed for our smaller farmers, our younger farmers and our established farmers to first, diversify their operations, secondly, upgrade our university especially the College of Agriculture and provide the space, the dollars and the research facilities that are needed to provide the staff that is needed which is so very lacking at our university now in regard to the College of Agriculture?

When one goes through the Heritage Fund and sees the expenditures, and I believe I mentioned this last night, the government has found it important enough to spend \$5.6 million on the construction of an engineering building at the university, possibly a good expenditure. Why if they feel so concerned about engineering can they not show that same concern for agriculture? In that budget of expenditures out of the Heritage Fund, as I said, one one-thousandth of that amount of money is being spent for agriculture and that is \$400,000 on the building expansion at the Veterinary College. Nothing, Mr. Chairman, to upgrade our College of Agriculture. It is for that reason that I would like to move seconded by the member for Shaunavon the following motion:

In order to restore Saskatchewan's position as the leading province in regard to agricultural research and education, this Committee recommends that the government of Saskatchewan makes funds available through the Heritage Fund to provide for adequate financing of our College of Agriculture to, (a) come to grips with the future financing of the College of Agriculture, and (b) to provide funds for badly needed space for the College of Teaching and



## Research requirements.

Now there is no doubt some meagre funds are being made available through the Department of Education. There is no doubt that some requirement is there from the College of Agriculture to present its case to the University Board to make funds available for the College of Agriculture. What has happened in the past is this particular method and this formula hasn't worked because if it did work Saskatchewan's Agricultural College in terms of teaching and research would not have sunk to the low position it is in Canada today. It is for that reason that I think that extra emphasis must be placed by a provincial government. You are the ones who have the capability. If you are willing to spend \$5.6 million on engineering why not spend a similar amount on our College of Agriculture and increase our capabilities and our potential in terms of agricultural education and research in the province. It is for that reason that I now move this motion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I rule the motion out of order because I think there are two other areas that would be much more appropriate and that could be in Continuing Education or on the Heritage Fund itself and it's for that reason that I rule the motion out of order.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to challenge your ruling. I think basically I will allow the Conservatives to talk a little while if they wish and I will be prepared to move another motion that will possibly accommodate for this particular subvote.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I find myself in a very interesting situation of having discuss the topic of agriculture on item 1 while the member for Morse, the Liberal agriculture critic, writes up another motion. Nonetheless, I did have a number of questions that I want to proceed with and not all just questions but things that I feel, at least in my opinion, and my opinion is an opinion which reflects that of, I would like to think, the majority of farmers, surely the ones I have talked to at least on a number of items, I might just come back to these news releases again.

I say, Mr. Minister, these news releases are in part nothing more than political propaganda on our part. You must be very happy about it, really when you think about it. Comparing yourself as a member of this Legislature with, say, the Liberal agricultural critic or myself as it pertains to agriculture. If I write a news release and the member for Morse writes one, it may be carried, it may not be. But all you have to do is to jot one of these out and boy, it is in every paper, it is in the Producer, it is everywhere. It is on the news. It is a big item. It doesn't matter what you say or how insignificant it is.

Now, when you reply, Mr. Minister, please don't always attempt to misinterpret and misconstrue what I am saying. Really, when you look at the news releases, when you have one like this one: 'Drainage and Grants Available to Farmers.' O.K. That is the government and there is nothing wrong with that. But it is the government and, again, the government is doing something for the farmers. It is something that you are going to have to do a whole lot more of in terms of irrigation, because as you well know this province only produces 5 per cent of its own vegetables requirements. Five per cent and we import the rest with all the land that we have. Surely there are a number of irrigation projects, not necessarily large expensive projects but smaller irrigation projects which could be put into place, in particular for special crops like vegetables.

Another one: 'Expanded Agricultural Programs Announced.' I suppose that is intended to make the farmer feel like, my goodness, isn't this government just looking after us.

April 25, 1978

Here they have another good program a whole host of programs. Pretty soon they will be looking after us entirely. Basically, that is just where you are heading. You are trying to place farmers and all business people in this province, in fact, every resident in this province, under your control That is what I am opposed to. Surely they need assistance. They need to be assisted in a way which they can help themselves, not be placed in a position where they are subject to your help and only your help on the conditions that you see necessary. That is where I am critical of you.

But to continue my remarks strictly to these news release, when you turn around and look at some of the other ones, these are newsworthy. 'Private Land Drainage Legislation Studied.' We are glad to see that. If you will recall the member for Souris-Cannington placed a lot of pressure on you and your government to look at some of these drainage problems which we have in the southeast part of the province in his constituency. We are glad to see something like this.

'Metric Milk Pricing Schedule Announced.' That is newsworthy. There is nothing wrong with that. So I am not saying they are all bad, some of them are very informative and we appreciate it that you are getting them out to the people. But you would realise that from your point of view they are very advantageous to you politically. When the farmers get news releases like this, that really don't contain any information whatsoever, like saying the sun is shining or something like that, they are not very happy because they question how you are spending taxpayers' dollars through the Department of Agriculture and they have a good right to question you. That is why I am questioning you now, Mr. Minister, do you not agree that, in part, a lot of your news releases could be well screened and some of them tossed aside? They are not worth the money that is invested to get them out to the people and they are, in fact, political propaganda? Now, can you not agree to that, Mr. Minister?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, very interesting comments the member was making. First of all he was criticizing because we were putting out too many releases and then he was telling us how glad he was to find out about the programs.

I can tell you, first of all, when a news release is made up no one requires the newspapers to carry it, nor does anyone require the TV or radio stations to carry those news releases. They are sent out and if they think they are of value, obviously they must or they wouldn't be putting them over the air, then, of course, they accept them and use them.

One of the major criticisms that I got when we were at our minister's meetings across the country, was the fact that people were saying, you know you have government programs and we don't know what they are. Please give us more information on these government programs. The FarmStart Program, a lot of people don't understand how it works. The Land Bank Program, a lot of people don't know what it is all about. A lot of these programs which the public wants to know about and are critical of us because we haven't given them enough information. Certainly I think it is part of the job of our staff and of our communication section to provide that kind of information for farmers. We think we are doing a good job of it now.

I know that, as far as I am concerned, you talk about the fact that they are political propaganda — I don't believe they are. However, we are very happy when we can announce a good program and if people think that gets us some political benefit I suppose maybe we deserve too a few accolades once in a while. Not everyone criticizes the government, you know, and some people do appreciate what governments do. I am

not going to answer Mr. Wiebe's comments now because he is busy.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, what you are saying in effect then is that the agricultural offices which you have throughout this province are not effective and that they are not doing the job that they are intended to do and that is to provide a decentralized implementation of agricultural programs which come out of your office. Surely, at no time other than when our local Ag Rep did not have the information, did I have to call the Department of Agriculture, at no time. Surely, if anybody in rural Saskatchewan wants to know anything about programs under the Department of Agriculture, all they should have to do is pick up the telephone and make a call. It may be long distance. Unfortunately, that is getting pretty expensive now but nonetheless, make a telephone call and if it is not urgent write a letter to their local Ag Rep. He should be more than willing to provide whatever information is required. Nowadays with the number of farmers that travel, to come into Regina is not that big a problem for many of them. I don't think that they would find it out of their way at all to drop into any one of your departments. I know I have on many occasions dropped into the Department of Production and Marketing. I find the information that I get most accurate, the people there most willing to work with me and provide me with whatever information I want on any subject. I surely as a farmer and I don't think that there are very many farmers, very few that need to rely on this type of news service which you are providing through your department. Your department should be working through your regional Ag Rep offices. Surely that is what they are there for. Now if that isn't what they are there for, then, Mr. Minister, could you tell me, are you saying they are ineffective, number one, and if not, then elaborate on just what their function is.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, a number of comments on that. First of all, I think the member would be the first one to admit that the people in the urban areas are often much more critical of agricultural programs than anyone else because they don't understand the programs. I think he would recognize that it is important also for people in the urban areas to know what is happening in agriculture. One of the major problems we have, I think, is because there is a lack of communication between urban and rural people. People in the urban areas don't understand why farmers, for instance, need assistance on certain programs. The fact that this information gets into all of the news media helps to create that kind of communication. He indicates that, of course, if anyone wants information about the Department of Agriculture that he can go to the Ag Rep and get it and certainly he can. Our Ag Reps are doing a tremendously good job in that regard. I think he will know as I know that there are just a lot of people that don't use the Ag Rep service. They just stay around home; they don't go out very much; they don't visit around with their neighbors too much and a lot of those people just don't get the information unless it comes through radio or some other mechanism. I know that because, for instance, in the Crop Insurance program we have a regular series of bulletins that go out to our people in crop insurance advising them of the termination dates, of certain requirements that they have to have their applications in at certain items, they have to put in their applications for adjustments and so on at certain times, and invariably we get letters back saying, "We didn't know." We attempt in every possible way to get that information out to them and yet we miss some. It seems to me that it would be very remiss on our part if we didn't do all we could to provide that information to farm people.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just one question to the minister. I am not sure what vote to ask it on so I will ask it here and you can tell me if it is another vote. Is there an assistance grant to people breaking virgin farm land? I understand there is Crown land but I am not sure if there is for land that isn't Crown.

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, there is not.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, when the minister was replying to some of my questions regarding the news releases and the services that our Ag Reps provide — you might be further made aware of a situation where you failed to use the services of the Ag Rep offices. I refer to last fall when the conditions were very wet and the farmers could not get their crop off, when reports stemming from your offices were indicating from you or some of your people that there was going to be a total crop failure, that it was going to be growing in the swaths soon and that we were going to have some real tough economic times because the agricultural industry wasn't going to be prospering this year but at the same time you issue a news release or a statement came out — I can't just recall who it came from at that time regarding the grain dryers being CSA approved and that if they didn't use them, you know, if they were using grain dryers that weren't approved, they would be prosecuted. You know the way that hit me — I looked out the window and it was raining and everything looked pretty bleak for the farmers at that time and then I had to listen to this on the news from the Department of Agriculture or from one of your departments saying that, well, here we are now and if we ever do get a bit of sunshine and start taking the crop off, the farmers are going to be prosecuted if they don't use approved grain dryers. I thought to myself, well, surely that was a negative approach the department took, surely they should have been taking a more positive approach.

What I understood was to put some thought to it myself. I didn't have any support staff, any people I could call on to dig into some research or come up with any ideas. What I thought of was using our Ag Rep offices to co-ordinate a program where we might be in touch with all of these distributors of grain dryers, the people who sell them and co-ordinate a sale of CSA approved grain dryers, to locate those numbers of grain dryers that were in the province and possibly give some transportation assistance to move them into the areas where grain drying was required.

Now about a week after my news release which, thank goodness got some coverage, you came out with a program just exactly on stream with what I had suggested and it got great headlines, believe me, and it was a good program. I'm suggesting — never mind that now — all I'm suggesting is that this is what I am asking you to do, put some thought to these matters, use the mechanisms that you have in places like the Ag Rep offices and you can come up with some real good programs. Now when you were replying to all of this you suggested that the crop insurance program, you use as a way to convey information to farmers — you feel there are great numbers of them not getting to town or not getting to the Ag Rep office which may be closest to them. Mr. Minister, very simply, would you not the kinds of dryers that are suitable for small grains and needed adjustments. Some of them were not safe, the attachments which were on them, the gas attachments, were not safe, and we made every effort to attempt to notify farmers and advise farmers not to buy this equipment or at least be aware of the problem that there was with that equipment. So I think that we did what we could in that regard. Certainly we made our Ag Reps aware of the kinds of problems that there were with grain dryers. I don't know what else we should have done. It seems to me we did the maximum that we could in that regard.

The appropriation this year for operation of the crop insurance program is \$4,449,000.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, this is O.K., \$4.5 million. Now that is a direct cost to the government of Saskatchewan?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The administration costs, carrying on all the district offices, all of the staff that's out there, all of the program costs, all of the computer costs, all of those things are involved in that.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that I finally have a motion that can be acceptable to the committee. I don't want to go through my long tirade of a few minutes ago in regard to my support for this particular motion but let me say that I quite sincerely feel that it's an important motion and one that should be looked at from a serious vein. I move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon (Mr. Anderson) that:

In order to restore Saskatchewan's position as the leading province in regard to agricultural research and education this committee recommends that the government of Saskatchewan increase the grants made available through the Department of Agriculture to provide for adequate financing to: (a) come to grips with the future financing for research at the College of Agriculture; (b) provide funds for badly needed space for capital expenditures to provide for necessary expansion at the College of Agriculture.

In speaking in support of this particular motion, the reason why I include in the motion, that this committee consider the increase in grants — under some of the subvotes under Agriculture there are grants presently being made available to the College of Agriculture and to the university for research and crop development in a number of areas. In support of this particular motion, while these dollars that are presently being spent, I think, are welcomed by the university and by the college, the proof that Saskatchewan has fallen behind other provinces means that we are not putting the same, or had not been putting the same kind of emphasis on agricultural research and education in Saskatchewan as other provinces have.

We are still the leading province in Canada in regard to agriculture. I would hope that all members would support this particular motion to ensure that we can once again, regain our position of being first in Canada on so many fields and I feel that agriculture should be one of them and that we can maintain that first position.

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that you found that in order. It seems to me that it recommends an increase in the spending of money which I think is inappropriate. Is that still your ruling?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Recommends. The word is recommends.

**MR. KAEDING:** — O.K. I'll accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

That is, I suppose, a good motherhood motion because there is no doubt that there is never a time when you are spending enough money on research in an area as broad as agriculture, and I suppose if we were spending \$40 million, we would still get the criticism that we should be spending more. I suppose we could agree with that, however I would like to point out to the member that our record in terms of spending at the university and for research is a pretty good record. I have figures here which

April 25, 1978

indicate that in the province of Saskatchewan we have the highest spending per agricultural faculty member of any province in western Canada. Our record there is \$2,290,000 for Saskatchewan, \$2,117,000 for Manitoba, and \$300,000 for Alberta per faculty member.

In terms of our comparison to other colleges at the university you might be interested to now that in 1975-76, the latest figures that we have, the amount of expenditure on the College of Agriculture was \$2,003,000 and not included in that is an additional figure of \$1,041,000 for the Veterinary College out of a total of \$9,800,000. That indicates that in terms of spending in the college we are maintaining a fairly substantial, strong role.

Now I would like to compare this to some of the figures back a little ways to the 197-71 budget. The Department of Agriculture Budget in 1970-71 was \$15 million, not \$55 million but \$15 million and less than less than one half of one per cent of that budget was for agricultural research. In fact the only real activity that was funded in that budget, was a soil survey for \$67,000. I would like you to compare that, Mr. Chairman, to the program which we have this year. Research, in this Budget, this year is \$2,305,000. That is direct research. That is an increase of 3,300 per cent over 1970-71 and the members criticize that we are not spending enough money on research and maybe we are not, but I think if you would compare that with the past history it is a pretty good record.

The department, this year, compared to 1970-71, as I said earlier, provided one-half of one per cent of their dollars in research and we are putting in 4.3 per cent of our Budget this year into research.

I suggest that if you look back to the funding 1971-71, the first year there was any funding for the Crop Development Centre, \$200,000 in that budget. That is increased by almost 300 per cent now to \$790,000, a very, very large increase of about 300 per cent. This year, alone, it has increased 30 per cent over last year.

The Institute of Pedology which didn't even exist under the previous administration is now receiving \$285,000. It may not be enough, but it is a heck of a lot more than we had in 1970-71.

We are now involved in participation in the POST (Protein, Oil, and Starch Plant). We are putting in \$50,000 a year into the plant and that is committed for five years. The participation in the VIDO (Veterinary Infectious Disease Organization), which is dealing with infectious disease of livestock and hogs — \$1 million committed there over a five year period and this year we are putting in \$250,000 in that program. In the Swine Research Unit, this year, we are looking at \$900,000 in the Swine Research Unit, one unit which I think will complement, very well, the entire structure we have at the university. I might say that at the previous conference one of the things that was commented on by the western Premiers was the fact that how they appreciated the fact that we had that very effective complex in Saskatoon, dealing with livestock disease.

We have the College of Veterinary Medicine; we have the Vital Centre and now we are getting the Swine Research Unit and we are developing a sheep development centre there. I think all of those things put together will provide a very, very commendable unit for the department.

We have, in research, \$1,980,000 in PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute). All

of these programs, I suggest, are there for the benefit of agriculture. I agree again that probably the amount of research that we are doing could be criticized. There is still all kinds of room for more research, but certainly these are major funding propositions that we have put forward. There are all kinds of other research projects going forward in which we have cost-sharing —smaller units, through the horned cattle fund, all of those kinds of units which are being funded, partly by government and partly by farmer input themselves.

So I think on the basis of history and the basis of the past performance I think our performance of this government has been very commendable and this year's program, particularly, strengthened in the area of research. I would suggest, although I agree with the concept of the motion, that we should defeat the motion because it simply puts forward the proposition that we are not doing enough and I would not agree to that.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this motion I would like, first of all, to comment that the comments by the Minister of Agriculture just immediately passed and all the wonderful research projects that the government of Saskatchewan is funding through its marvellous beneficence, represents an exceptionally small percentage of the total Budget of the government of the province of Saskatchewan. The amount of benefit to be derived from agricultural research, in Saskatchewan, relative to dollars spent is far in excess, for example, of the interest cost alone on the \$500 million invested in the pieces of paper in the potash industry, or, in fact, is far in excess of the \$11 million invested in 45 per cent of Intercontinental Packers, or far in excess of the moneys being spent for used oil companies and used oil wells that Saskoil is expending in the government of Saskatchewan. The amount of benefit that could be derived by a government allocation that was significant and that was relative to the size of the government of Saskatchewan's budget, could be immense in relation to the future development of the province of Saskatchewan.

The real benefits in Saskatchewan, in terms of productivity of agriculture, have been derived because of research. The real benefits in the area of producing new grains, the real benefits in the production of attachments to combines, produced right here in the province of Saskatchewan, of different forms of agricultural equipment, produced right herein the province of Saskatchewan that have helped to improve the productivity of Saskatchewan farmers and have helped to develop new processing industries in the province, that have created wealth and jobs beyond the minister's comprehension. The amount that he suggests that has been allocated by the government of Saskatchewan to agricultural research, quite frankly is peanuts compared to the size of the Saskatchewan Budget. If the minister had any clout in the government, if the Minister of Agriculture had any get up and go in that Cabinet over there, he would go to that Cabinet and say now look, to suggest that we should allocate this money to SEDCO to lose money all over the province when we could put money into agricultural research knowing that we would create benefits to the people of Saskatchewan. To suggest that we should allocate moneys for increase in the number of "G" plates travelling around the province — the executive assistants do nothing but political work — compare to the benefits to be derived from agricultural research is phenomenal. There is no reason at all why the minister shouldn't do that. I am hoping that the minister, next year, because I know this year in the allocation of the Budget resources, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is bound and determined that the allocations are as they are going to appear in these estimates. He is not going to allow any opposition member to introduce any suggestions that would improve the lot of the people of Saskatchewan because my goodness gracious we might have to find ourselves in a situation where as recently happened our deficit increased almost \$100 million. We are trying to suggest to the

minister that he should squeeze the other members of Cabinet, tell them to cut down their administrative personnel so that you can make an allocation to some basic research in Saskatchewan that we know, that has proven in the past to be successful.

However, the main reason I wanted to comment on this motion, Mr. Chairman, is that the motion coming from the member for Morse representing the party that he does, in the light of their commitment to agricultural research in the province of Saskatchewan, is in my judgment and in the judgment of this particular caucus, particularly crass. Because the commitment by the present government in Ottawa to the province of Saskatchewan and to the University of Saskatchewan for education and research in the agricultural sector is not only peanuts compared to the expenditures of the government — I notice the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland didn't bring his book with him — I would have liked to have read into the record tonight some of the marvellous expenditures of the present Liberal government in Ottawa, such as, for example, and I am sure the minister is aware of this book, *A Legacy of Spending*. I am sure every member of the House should be aware of this *Legacy of Spending* of the present Liberal government in Ottawa. But, Mr. Chairman, the present government doesn't make a real commitment to agriculture but \$6,000 grants, for example, to study why people are studying. Let me just read a few: \$18,541 by the Liberal government in Ottawa to study the interactions of personality traits and situations in feelings of anxiety, \$10,000 for experimental work in the production of handmade paper as a visual art form, \$14,000, Mr. Chairman, for research to make a system of measurement of authoritarian attitudes the balanced "F" scale a more accurate tool . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, please! I fail to see — I think we are drifting away from this motion. I would like the hon. member to confine his remarks to the motion at hand. I can't see what is going on at Ottawa has any effect on this motion at present. I would like the member . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I intend to move at the conclusion of my remarks this evening an amendment to this motion. I intend to move:

That all the words after education be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

That this committee recommends that the Liberal government in Ottawa cease tying federal government grants to the University of Saskatchewan for research and education to priorities established in Ottawa and instead grant unconditional grants to the university for agriculture to establish Saskatchewan priorities.

Now the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this member who purports to represent the party that has concern about agriculture is recommending to the present government of Saskatchewan that, admittedly, is allocating an extremely small amount in its total Budget to agricultural research which means that the benefits that can be derived therefore are going to be very small—but this member purports to be recommending to the province of Saskatchewan that they allocate more funds to research for agriculture while his government in Ottawa allocates grants not to agriculture because any grants allocated in the province of Saskatchewan by the Liberal government in Ottawa are tied to these kinds of ideas, Mr. Chairman, to the kinds of ideas of a government in Ottawa that recommends these kinds of grants and they are tying them to their planners. Think of this, Mr. Chairman, the benefits of agricultural research in the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government in Ottawa allocates



\$32,262 for a study of the occupational history of male and female librarians in Canada — \$32,000. Think of what that kind of grant in agricultural research could do in the province of Saskatchewan.

Here is another one, Saskatchewan, the same kind of attitude that presently prevails towards agricultural research by the Liberal government in Ottawa prevails when it comes to this kind of grant. Mr. Chairman, \$29,305 to conduct a cross national investigation of leisure role socialization. Think about that, \$29,000 to conduct a cross national investigation.

Here's one. Think of the benefits for agricultural research in Saskatchewan that could be granted by the present Liberal government in Ottawa by giving unconditional grants to our universities so that we could allocate the funds or our universities could allocate funds towards real and meaningful Saskatchewan research in agriculture. Mr. Chairman, \$21,014 for a systematic study of the French language in Montreal — \$121,000 that could have been granted to the Department of Agriculture, University of Saskatchewan, for a study of agricultural research to create jobs and opportunities for Saskatchewan people and instead these same planners in Ottawa, who are planning these kinds of studies, are dictating to our university officials (and I noticed some of the officials, when I said that, nod their heads). The same kind of planners in Ottawa that are creating and recommending these kinds of studies to our university in Saskatchewan and all researchers are caught in a squeeze, are caught in a box. If they want that federal money they have to comply with those planners in Ottawa; they have to appeal to the planners in Ottawa who make these grants.

Here is another one that you might be interested in, and I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan would be especially interested in this. \$112,123 . . .

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — On a point of order. I don't mind the member for Nipawin speaking in this manner if his amendment has been introduced, but as far as I now we are still talking on the one that was proposed by Mr. Wiebe. As soon as his amendment is introduced he can speak on it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on his amendment for the government of Saskatchewan to increase its grant to agricultural research in the province of Saskatchewan. I am going to suggest . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order please! The hon. member introduced a motion that you are introducing an amendment to his motion as I understand. Well, I would like to ask the hon. member for Nipawin, again, to please confine his remarks to the motion that he is amending and not what is happening in Ottawa and so forth. I would ask him, very attentively to try to do this.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, surely I am entitled in this Committee, to outline the rationale and the reasons why I am going to amend this motion and why I am proposing this amendment. I am proposing this amendment because the motion by the member for Morse, in my judgment and the judgment of this caucus, is an irresponsible motion to the government of Saskatchewan in the right of the present government at Ottawa's attitude towards spending priorities, generally and towards the allocation of research moneys specifically with reference to the University of Saskatchewan and its agricultural research programs. And that is what I am attempting to point out to this Assembly, Mr. Chairman. I would like to go on if I can, just to suggest a few more. I am certainly not going to go through the entire study. I am certain that anyone who wishes to get this study may get it and I am sure that the members opposite will be extremely interested in this legacy of spending, produced by Edward Murphy at CGO radio in Vancouver, British Columbia. And they can get it here at Canada Drug and Book Store, if they are interested in obtaining a copy. But it is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, \$135,900 granted by the Liberal government in Ottawa, \$135,000 to study the impact of modernity on traditional modes of life in the eastern Arctic, \$135,000! Those are the people, Mr. Chairman, that are deciding on the grants for research in agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan and squeezing our researchers and the minister knows this is true In order to get those federal funds and continue on with the programs, that the worthwhile programs that they are doing in their part time and in their spare time, they are having to go to these federal programs and study these kinds of nonsensical studies that are being suggested by the Liberal government in Ottawa. And this gentlemen, the hon. member for Morse, wishes us to believe that his party and he cares about agriculture. They give \$112,123 to study the role of parties and elections in the Canadian political system; a special study, \$112,000 and yet our agricultural research as the minister has said, his government is spending more on agriculture research now than they were in 1971. He is right there. Mind you inflation does cut it back, Mr. Minister, and I am sure you will agree with that. There has been inflation in that period of time. You will have to at least double plus a bit the amount of grants for research to the University of Saskatchewan in the field of agriculture if you have wanted just to stand still from 1971.

Now admittedly, you have gone a little further than that. So you have allocated more than they did in 1971. But think of the benefits if you had allocated sufficient money to agricultural research instead of — let me just cite just a few others that I think anybody would be interested in, \$30,700, Mr. Chairman, for an ethnological dictionary of old French, \$30,700! Here is a beauty, \$28,993, granted by the party of the member for Morse, who put forward this motion, for a comparative analysis of social change in Yorkshire and Massachusetts 1690 to 1841. Isn't that worthwhile compared to agricultural research in the province of Saskatchewan. Here is another one, Mr. Chairman, \$29,580 for a history of French vocabulary in Quebec as revealed in records of old legal transactions and other documents. Compare that to agricultural research in the province of Saskatchewan. Here is another one — federalism, the member for Kindersley says. Mr. Chairman, \$10,260 for the member for Morse, \$10,260 granted for a chronology of the

enlightenment of France, 1680 to 1789 — \$10,260.

Oh here's one, for . . . (inaudible) . . . teacher, I'm sure in Canada who has undoubtedly read the results of this study, \$15,550 to study the effects of teacher expectation of pupils abilities.

**MR. BYERS:** — Well . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well that's just exactly right. Have you read that study, Mr. Minister of Environment.

**MR. BYERS:** — You are . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — Is that an important one, you've read that one . . . (interjection) . . . What, the Yorkshire-Massachusetts one from 1600?

**MR. BYERS:** — Yes.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Here is another interesting one as well, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the member for Morse is most interested in these — \$75,000 to compile a folklore and an . . . (inaudible) . . . analytic inventory of French folk traditions in North America \$75,000.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — What have you got against the French?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, I have nothing against the French. I'm just reading them as they come in here for the benefit of the member. Oh, here's one that I think the people of Alberta . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! I think the hon. member for Nipawin knows that he has — I think he has been trying to make a point. He should have made it by now. I would like him to relate his remarks now to this amendment and proceed with the amend, please.

**MR. COLLVER:** — yes, Mr. Chairman, I will complete . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — The hon. member . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'm questioning the Minister of Agriculture on agriculture, I'm not . . .

**MR. BYERS:** — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if he has his for Manitoba from his agricultural . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! He stated that he wouldn't take a question. So would you proceed and try and wind up your remarks.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I am certain that the Minister of Agriculture realizes the tremendous amounts of money that are wasted by the present government in Ottawa. I know that his officials are aware of the strings attached to every single research grant made to the University of Saskatchewan tying the hands of the researcher and the fine researchers in the province of Saskatchewan. I therefore would agree that the Minister of Agriculture's suggestion that the present motion that is before this Assembly should definitely not be voted on by this Assembly because from where it goes, it implies that somehow — had it said that the government wasn't allocating sufficient

April 25, 1978

resources to research out of its total budget of well over \$1 billion, if that was the case then that might be a reasonable motion that we could support.

When this member suggests, as he does, the motion that is on the floor of the Assembly, I couldn't agree with it either, Mr. Minister, and, therefore, I would like to propose an amendment that I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will support and the members opposite.

That all the words after 'education be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

That this Committee recommends that the Liberal Government in Ottawa cease tying federal government grants to the University of Saskatchewan for research and education to priorities established in Ottawa and, instead grant unconditional grants to the University for agriculture, to establish Saskatchewan priorities.

I move that, seconded by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I have read the motion and I rule it out of order in light of the fact that it deals primarily with the Department of Education grants as opposed to Department of Agriculture grants and, therefore, I rule this motion out of order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, for one moment, that the motion does not say anything about the Department of Education at all. It says, for education and research and it relates specifically to the first words of the member for Morse's motion. You have to read the motion of the motion of the member for Morse and after that to our amendment. It certainly does not refer to the Department of Education at all or education grants at all. It is grants for education and research.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — It involves grants to the University of Saskatchewan which involves the Department of Education and, therefore, it doesn't involve the Department of Agriculture. On that basis, I rule the motion out of order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — What I would like to say to you, Mr. Chairman, is this. All grants to the University of Saskatchewan are surely not made by the Department of Education. Surely, you are not suggesting that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order! I have made a ruling and I rule this motion out of order in light of the fact that this deals with grants made through the Department of Education when we are dealing with Estimates through the Department of Agriculture. I have ruled your motion out of order. Unless you challenge my ruling, I am ruling this motion out of order.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, on page 13 it refers to research under agriculture under item 8, does that not show that there is research money in this vote, therefore, we are on the same thing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — What is your point or order?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You said research is not under agriculture but rather education but there is a vote for research under item 8 of this vote of Agriculture. Would you consider that is your ruling?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I would like to point out to the member for Rosthern that the amendment clearly specifies that the grant be made to the University of Saskatchewan. This grant would normally be made through the Department of Education Estimates not through the Department of Agriculture Estimates.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, sir, the very motion that is being made by the member for Morse pertains to grants made by the Department of Agriculture to the University of Saskatchewan.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I am going to call the member to order. If the member for Nipawin wishes to challenge my decision he may do so at this time.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I am challenging your decision, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I ruled an amendment out of order. The member for Nipawin appealed my ruling.

Ruling sustained.

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Minister, I moved that this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:53 o'clock p.m.