

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 26, 1978

The Assembly met at 2:00 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a group of 47 interchange students on Canadian studies from across Canada. They are also accompanied by some students from various collegiates in Saskatoon. They are in the Speaker's Gallery, some 47 in number, and I believe another 78 will arrive a bit later. They are accompanied by Mr. Cox and Mr. Wensley.

I am sure that all the members in this Assembly would want me to extend a warm welcome to the Canadian interchange students. We hope they enjoy the proceedings in the Legislature this afternoon. I am not completely familiar with their total routine and where else they might be touring, but we will be meeting them in Room 267 after the question period if they want to ask us questions with respect to the proceedings in the Assembly. I hope all members will give these students a warm welcome.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to join the member for Saskatoon Nutana in welcoming these students to the Assembly this afternoon. My understanding of the project that these students have undertaken indicates that it is a study of problems that relate to Canada and is an opportunity for young people from across the nation to expound their views with regard to the situation that Canada finds itself in today and some of the solutions that they may see to some of the problems.

I have noted from the press that the meetings that you have held in Saskatoon have been very good kinds of meetings with excellent topics under discussion. I want to, as I say, join in welcoming you to the Assembly, particularly to note old colleagues of mine, Mr. Cox and Mr. Wensley and I look forward to seeing you later this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add a few words to the introductions already made, relative to the group of students from Saskatoon and all other areas of Canada.

I would like to point out that the interchange, as far as I can determine, is going along very well. I want to also mention to all members of this House that this is a tremendous example of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments and also the two local fiscal school boards in Saskatoon, the federal government contributing 40 per cent of the cost, the provincial government 40 per cent, and the two school boards 20 per cent. I understand they visited the Museum of Natural History and I am sure you found that interesting, and will be visiting the RCMP Depot a little later on in the day. I just want to also say hello to our daughter Lynn, "Hi Lynn" and hope that you have an interesting day in Regina and a pleasant and safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina Victoria):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to welcome a large number of students in the west gallery from the St Augustine School. There are 100 in number and it is pleasing to see that so many of them came out at once. I shall meet with them later on. St. Augustine School is one of the larger schools within the Catholic school system in our city and is one of the older ones and does a great job in that neighborhood in our community. So I am pleased to welcome them this afternoon for their contribution to the city, what that school has done in the past. I hope they will have a fruitful stay this afternoon. They are accompanied by their teachers, Allen Schmidt, Jim Frolick, Denise Jestadt, Teresa Benesh. I welcome the Grade 7 and 8 students to this Assembly through you and the members here. A hearty welcome.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Unemployment Situation

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — A question to the Premier. According to your monthly statistical review, which was published showing figures to March 31, 1978, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan was 7.1 per cent, an increase of about 144 per cent in the eighteen month period back to December, 1976. The number of full-time jobs in Saskatchewan was down from 1,800 in December, 1976, to 900 at the time that this particular bulletin was issued. I wonder how the government intends to come through, in view of that with its slogan, "Jobs today, energy tomorrow." Would you not agree that it is really just a slogan that you have enunciated and that your statistics show nothing is really being done with regard to jobs at all?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Elphinstone):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not agree. First may I say that any comparisons of March figures with eighteen months before, comparing winter figures with summer figures, is palpable misuse of statistics. We know that lies, damn lies, and statistics have been the manner in which statistics have been used. I think one knows that is not an accurate measure. I ask the hon. member, if he asks a supplementary question, to state the number of jobs at each time, to state, therefore, whether or not there has not been a significant increase in the number of people working in Saskatchewan measure by any 12 month period since our government took office in 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PENNER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. It hardly seems to me that it is fair to say that March figures are summer figures. At least in Saskatchewan, I have never known March to be a summer month. The fact still remains that the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan today is the highest it's been, probably since the depression at 7.1 per cent. It is also a fact that the number of full time jobs available today is half what it was within the past year. We are down to 900 full time jobs available according to the statistics that are published by your government. Now I would ask . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Member for Souris-Cannington.

### Cancer Care Program — Medical Staffing

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. I have here a copy of a letter from the staff of Allan Blair Memorial Clinic to the Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission, wherein the staff indicates that its activities are greatly restricted due to a lack of medical manpower. Is the government aware of the concerns expressed by the staff, which concerns were completely contrary to the assurances given by the Premier to this Assembly last Monday?

**HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that particular letter. I have not seen the letter. As I have said before, the standard of cancer treatment in the clinics both at Saskatoon and Regina is being maintained, I believe, at a high level. There is reason from some concern because of statements made in this House and because of statements that have been made publicly, and that is why I have engaged Dr. Watson from London, Ontario, the director of the cancer clinic there, to come and do a study and assessment for us. We will await the results of his assessment, consider carefully the recommendations and make sure that the standard of cancer treatment that we have had is maintained and indeed improved, in areas where it is thought it needs improvement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, the letter indicates that a copy was sent to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health tell this Assembly what actions he took upon receipt of this letter to deal with what the staff considers to be a crisis situation? I will send a copy of the letter over to the minister.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, a member displays the problem with reading questions prepared for him by someone else. Had he not depended so greatly on the script in his hand, he would have heard my answer to his first question which indicated that I have yet not seen the letter. It has yet no arrived in my office. I am looking at the copy he sent to me and indeed it does say copy to myself. When it gets there, I will consider it.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

As the minister has said, the government has announced that Dr. Watson has been appointed to investigate the matter and report back. As I understand it, Dr. Watson's terms of reference have been restricted to allow him to examine only the clinics. Will the minister consider expanding the terms of reference to include an investigation of the activities and administration of the Cancer Commission, with reference to the operation of cancer care in Saskatchewan?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, the scope of Dr. Watson's Inquiry will to a large extent be determined by himself when he gets here. I have asked him to carry out the general review and an assessment and to make recommendations. I'm reading from the letter here on the organization and the management of the two cancer clinics administered by the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission. Indeed Dr. Watson, while he is looking at the two specific clinics, will also obviously be having to look at the total operation of cancer treatment and so on. That is what he is coming for and he will do it.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question which I gave, I find it kind of curious that the letter which the staff wrote to the executive director is marked personal and

confidential and that the member passes it over even though he did not get sent a copy of it.

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — I would like to ask the minister whether it is the intention to give directions to Dr. Watson to have this inquiry held in public, in the open, so that people may make submissions to it or whether it will be closed in camera, more or less private affair?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is a need for a public kind of an inquiry. Dr. Watson will be speaking to all of the parties concerned, including the medical staff, including commission members, including all others concerned with the delivery of cancer treatment in the province. That is going to be, I think, a pretty adequate job that this gentleman, who has got a very good reputation, will be doing of us.

### **Unemployment Situation**

**MR. PENNER:** — A question to the Premier. In light of the fact that the unemployment figures for Saskatchewan March 31, 1978 are the highest that they have been; in light of the fact that you have in your Budget document presented this spring indicated that you have this slogan, "Jobs today Energy tomorrow", would the Premier indicate to me and to the House what steps he intends to take to provide jobs so that those who are unemployed in Saskatchewan will in fact have work?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, I think that the Budget outlined in some detail the measures taken in order to provide employment. One has to understand that there is a limit to the number of jobs that can be provided in Saskatchewan as people pour into this province from other parts of Canada. I advise the hon. member that in the last 12 months the number of people in the labor force in Saskatchewan has moved up from 404,000 to 420,000, an increase of 16,000 in the labor force.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — The great bulk of those we have provided jobs for because of the burgeoning economy which we continue to have in this province notwithstanding the decline in activity in the agriculture sector. We are hopeful now that the agriculture sector is giving some evidence of a turnaround and that there will be an even greater number of jobs available and the measures outlined in the Budget, we believe, will make a major contribution to providing those additional jobs.

**MR. PENNER:** — Since the unemployment rate is 7.1 per cent, the highest that it has been, and since the Premier indicates that some new jobs are going to be made available but recognizes that a good number of unemployed are going to remain in the province, would the Premier not agree that any increase in jobs for people in Saskatchewan is going to be the skilled areas and that by and large, these are going to come from people attracted from outside of the province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, I do not agree. I think that there will be jobs in many sectors. We have attempted to schedule our building programs so that there are jobs in the construction industry. We are building, as hon. members will know, far more government buildings than we built three or four years ago when there was a general availability of jobs in the private sector. That is no longer true and government buildings are coming on stream and they provide jobs not only for skilled workers but

for unskilled workers as well.

We intend to promote housing and we believe that that will provide jobs and we intend also, to give the tax relief and other measures which were outlined in the Budget so that the private sector will be encouraged to expand its job-creating activities.

We reply primarily as you know, on private sector as we all do and we look forward let us say, to an expansion at IPSCO which will provide a significant number of jobs in the private sector.

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Would the minister not agree with the fact that the highest rate of employment in the construction industry in Saskatchewan in the last two decades was in the years 1968-69 when there was a Liberal government? Would the minister not agree that even with the increase in the construction industry employment, you fall well below the figures as they existed in 1968-69 and would the minister not also agree that if he is going to develop jobs in the mining resource sector, that those are skilled jobs which are not there in the Saskatchewan sector of our economy and that, in fact people will be brought in from outside of the province in order to fill those?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, a couple of comments. First, I do not deny that people may well come in from outside of a province to seek employment. We know that is happening. We know people for example, are getting paving contracts from companies coming in from Manitoba and in some cases they bring employees with them and there is really nothing effective that the government of Saskatchewan can do to stop a community, a town in this province for example, from engaging a contractor who comes from Manitoba and brings some employees with him.

We believe that this will continue. We very much believe that the construction industry provides jobs, not only for skilled peoples some of whom will be from our province and some from outside, but for unskilled people, and we believe that is true in the resource sector as well. We do not accept the proposition that those who are employed in the resource sector must necessarily come in from outside the province. That has not been our experience in the past and we not expect it to be our experience in the future.

### **Pipeline Delay**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservative Opposition):** — The Premier will undoubtedly be aware that yesterday there was an announcement in Alberta, that there was some concern by the Alberta government about the proceeding with the pipeline due to a delay in American law, that there might be a year delay. For that reason I am sure the Premier is aware that any expansion of IPSCO might be delayed as result of the delay in the pipeline. Therefore, jobs are not going to be created today. Would the Premier not agree that the 7.1 per cent unemployment rate in the province of Saskatchewan today is serious, first of all. And secondly, it therefore requires dramatic measures by the government of Saskatchewan to improve the climate of confidence in the private sector in order that, in order that jobs and opportunities can be crated in the private sector, to materially affect this dramatic increase in the rise of unemployment in Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I agree that the matter is serious. I agree that steps need to be taken, and we believe that the Budget outlines those steps which need to be taken. If, in fact, some dramatic measures are necessary in Saskatchewan, I think they

are more necessary in the province of British Columbia which has a higher rate; in the province of Manitoba which has a significantly higher rate; in the province of Ontario which has a much higher rate; in the province of Quebec which has double our rate; in the province of Nova Scotia which has at least 50 per cent higher than our . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I will take the next question. The member for Lakeview.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Unemployment Situation in Saskatchewan**

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. The fact remains, Mr. Premier, that as of March 31 of this year, there were 30,000 people out of work in Saskatchewan. Your budget, as presented by the Minister of Finance a few weeks ago, said that there would be approximately 5,800 new jobs of a permanent or temporary nature created, which will leave approximately 24,000 people out of work some time for the rest of the year. Now this of course will be balanced by the summer situation, but that again will be balanced by students looking for work. My question to you, Mr. Premier, is what plans, if any, does the government have at this time to create employment for those 24,000 people that are not covered by your Budget?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is proceeding on the assumption that all of the jobs in this province are created by governmental action, and I would be the first one to dispute that proposition. There are, in fact, a significant number of unemployed in Saskatchewan as there frequently are in March. It is a very high month and I instance that it was fairly high last year. It was 6.5; is now 7.1. I acknowledge that to be a change for the worse but not a significant change. I point out that we can reasonably anticipate a substantial increase in employment as the summer comes on from activities in the private sector. Accordingly, I expect that unless we have the continued depressed effect on our economy of the Liberal government in Ottawa, which is not taking proper steps, we can look forward to a better and brighter summer of employment.

**MR. MALONE:** — I would like to deal with this in a non-political way because it is a serious problem as the Premier has pointed out. Would the Premier not agree that the tax relief afforded in the Smishek Budget and the make-work program of the NDP government will not come on stream for some months and indeed the tax relief will not come on stream for many, many months. There is going to be period of time between now and, say, next October where the government programs are not going to be ready to be proceeded with and for that interim period of time our unemployment situation is going to remain unacceptably high. Maybe not 7.1 per cent but perhaps 6 per cent which the Minister of Finance in 1975, Mr. Robbins, called unacceptable to the people of Canada.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Certainly almost any level of unemployment must be deemed to be unacceptable from a policy point of view because we would very much like to think that unemployment could be reduced to 2 or 3 per cent, those number of people who are moving from job to job, and that everybody else was gainfully employed. So that in that sense of the word I agree with the hon. member that any level of unemployment is unacceptable. I do not agree with the hon. member when he says suggests that our tax measures will not take effect until October. The income tax cuts will show up on

cheques at the end of July, commencing for the month of July, and they will be very significant tax cuts and this, I suggest, may well encourage spending. The sales tax cuts as a result of the federal budget are now in effect and they may have some impact on spending. There are indications that, let us say farm machinery sales are increasing, that there is some renewal of confidence in the private sector of the private farm sector. For all of these reasons I expect a very considerable increase in employment in a very short number of weeks.

### **Quality of Air Service by Air Canada**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I think it has been a matter of concern for the past two to three years as the quality of air service by Air Canada has been steadily deteriorating and it is spoken rather freely by people who travel out of a variety of points and where Air Canada must compete with CP Air, that it is a much superior airline. Mr. Premier, my question is, in light of a policy which was announced late last week by CP Air, which was a new low-fare passenger service starting May, 1, between Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg and Toronto at a round trip cost of a one-way flight plus \$1, would the Premier agree that perhaps it is time for the province of Saskatchewan to ask the Department of Transport to consider allowing CP Air to land in Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I will ask the Minister in charge of the Transportation Agency to reply.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, we have not requested the Minister of Transport to request CP Air to provide service into Saskatchewan. I think the hon. member will well know that there is an application before CTC for a regional carrier service in to Saskatchewan from PWA which has implications both for Air Canada and for air service in the province. Until the decision is made by CTC, I don't think any action should be taken by the provincial government, therefore, we should take a wait and see approach with respect to what the future holds for air service in the province.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, would you agree that in light of what is, I think, vastly superior service offered by CP Air where it does compete directly and because of excellent programs such as this one which I think, Mr. Minister, anyone would have to agree is an excellent one where you fly at off-peak hours and come back for \$1, you have to stay six days. Mr. Minister, would you not agree that the people of Saskatchewan, like cable television, that they have been deprived of services like this for far too long, would the minister not agree that it would highly appropriate in that the Minister of Transport is from Saskatchewan, that he seriously consider and that your government asks him to reconsider this inequity to this province?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Well, I am sorry, I am not like the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, and have had an opportunity to fly CP Air. So I don't know the quality of service that that airline provides. I do fly with Air Canada and for my part I have been pretty pleased with the quality of service that Air Canada has provided. It is provided to Saskatchewan both on a national basis and on a regional basis. It is true that we have been pressuring both Air Canada and the Minister of Transport with respect to international service. We have made some gains with respect to the city of Saskatoon and we will be continuing the pressure in terms of providing improvement for international service for the city of Regina.

## Unemployment Situation

**MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. In light of the high unemployment figures that we have been discussing this afternoon there undoubtedly will be additional strain on the Department of Social Services. What steps is your department taking to meet the problems of this increased unemployment?

**HON. H. H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I think the budget indicates that we have in the Department of Social Services tremendously or significantly increased the funds allotted for ESP (Employment Support Program) which I have indicated in the past has been very successful, that is the Employment Support Program. I believe I am not certain but I think there is \$3.8 million in the present budget and I would hope that many of the people who because of the changes made in the Unemployment Insurance Act which have significantly increased our SAP roles . . . I would think with the increase of unemployment rate that many of these we will be able to accommodate under the SA Program, at least I hope we will be able to do that.

**MISS CLIFFORD:** — Mr. Minister, do I understand from your answer that you were projecting these increased unemployment figures then at the time that our budget was laid down and in that case how many additional employees were you planning in order to look after this additional paper work that would be required by more recipients?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the member's first question is, No, we had not anticipated the increase of unemployment. We increased the budget for two reasons. First, we knew that in our discussions with the federal minister that they were going to put restrictions on people being eligible for unemployment insurance and we knew our discussion with other provincial ministers that this would have an effect on our roles and that is one of the reasons why we increased it. Secondly, we increased the amounts of money in our budget because we were so successful under the ESP. I indicated to this House before that 80 per cent of the people who have gone through our Employment Support Program are no longer on public assistance and that's why were able to convince the Treasury Board and this government to increase the allocations for funds in that particular program.

**MR. S.J. CAMERON:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Unemployment among native people is reported to be running between 70 and 80 per cent. Is it not a fact that the unemployment numbers among the native people are not included in the unemployed numbers in this publication and if they were, is it not a fact that the unemployment in the province would be nearer 10 per cent than the 7.1 per cent?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Certainly not. All native people except those on reserves are included in the figures and the number of native people who are on reserves is a progressively smaller part of the total number of native people. As we all know the movement of people off reserves has been significant, and notwithstanding this movement off reserves, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan has only moved up very modestly and I think that is a matter for a very considerable congratulation on the part of us all.



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **STATEMENT**

### **Remarks by member for Regina Wascana**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yesterday, the member for Regina Wascana in debating item 19 under Public Bills and Orders, Adjourned Debates, made a statement which I determined at that time was critical of the actions of the Chair. I have had an opportunity to examine the record on page 1934. The following statement is recorded:

I notice that you, Mr. Speaker, were in no great rush to spring to your feet to correct that.

The statement and the context in which was given was similar to others occurring about the same time which were withdrawn. I find that the citation that I gave at that time, citation 72 in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms was appropriate for that time.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):** — I want to raise a point of order on procedure in question period. The tradition has been, Mr. Speaker, that you have been alternating questions from the two opposition parties. I realize that the Chair has been under some embarrassment the last few days and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, has not been quite as conscientious on alternating as he has traditionally been, and I would like to direct Mr. Speaker's attention to the procedure that has existed that we have noticed, perhaps through inadvertence, has slipped the last couple of weeks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I want to take this opportunity to assure the member for Qu'Appelle that I stand before you, unembarrassed, and I want to say to the member for Qu'Appelle and I apologize to the Conservative caucus, that I made an error and I should have taken one of the members of their caucus and I'm sorry — inadvertently.

**MR. MALONE:** — A point of order?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Today in question period you allowed me two questions and cut me off when I was seeking information from the Premier on what he referred to and which the Leader of the Conservative Party referred to as a very serious problem — unemployment.

We were dealing with unemployment of 7.1 per cent involving 30,000 people, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

The member wants to know why he was cut off. It is not an opportunity to re-debate the issue and bring in all the figures. He wants to know why he was cut off. Quite simply, I cut the member for Lakeview off because I thought the question and the answer were getting into debate and I didn't want to proceed along that line. It was getting away from a question and answer period and it was becoming a debate. I felt that I should move on to something else in order to get both members on both sides of the House an opportunity to get away from the debate and get back to questions and answers.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Can I . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No. The member can't speak to that point. Oh, a new point of order? Yes.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well my point of order generally is the way in which Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks now has been conducting the question periods.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The member can deal with a point of order with regard to today. He cannot go back several weeks. Order! A member can deal with a point of order that occurred today, and this is not new. This was the practice of the House ever since the question period started. He cannot go back and recall events that occurred in the past. They were supposed to be settled at that time. I will take a point of order if it is with regard to today's question, and I want to know what the point of order is.

**MR. CAMERON:** — My point of order is, with reference to the question asked by my seatmate, the member for Saskatoon Eastview, Mr. Speaker, on the same topic, unemployment. I thought that Mr. Speaker didn't give him nearly the latitude Mr. Speaker ought to have given him and I was going to point Mr. Speaker to an example drawn from the record of the House of Commons on a similar matter quite . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Order! I think I have the member's point of order. He wants to know why the member for Saskatoon Eastview was cut off on his question, which was the first question of the day. The member for Saskatoon Eastview received a question and a supplementary and I became aware of the fact that they were out of order at that point and I refer the member to the rules which govern question period.

Questions must be stated without preamble or speech or be in the nature of a debate; and D (E)  
Questions must seek and not offer information to be Assembly.

And that is why I cut the member off. The member will be aware of the fact that I allowed him to rise later and I thought he put his question adequately without debate.

**MR. PENNER:** — Can I . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — No, the member may not speak to the point of order. The member for Nipawin.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, on a new point of order I wonder if it might be possible for . . . and this is a general point of order, I am sorry, pertaining to question period, but it may help. I wonder if it might be possible for you and your staff, since it is causing considerable confusion in the opposition benches, pertaining to decisions made as to whether or not a party or an individual will get one supplementary or two supplementaries, whether you and your staff might review the question period entirely and work out whether or not it might be more satisfaction for this Assembly to call together the committee again to recommend perhaps a question and two supplementaries that are definite and definitive so that everyone knows precisely where they stand, instead of being this way. Every single day we seem to have a point of order period as well as a question period. Would it be possible for your office to do that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, I think I have the intent of the member's comments with regard to a general point of order about the question period. I would say at the beginning that I

am not prepared to dedicate my staff to the task the member puts forward. However, it is up to the members, they are free to refer to the rules committee at any time they wish, and if they wish to discuss the possibility of changes to the question period, then there is nothing to prevent them from bringing that forward to the rules committee and it could be dealt with at that time. Perhaps the committee could make a recommendation to the House with regard to a change in the question period. I don't believe that the staff should be the people who dictate that to the member's of the Assembly. That is something that should be decided by the members of the Assembly.

**MR. COLLVER:** — But since the committee is at the call of the Chair, and since you are the chairman of that committee, might I ask you today to call that committee, the Rules Committee into session with reference to the question period to perhaps establish a new set of ground rules for question period, that will alleviate the confusion that exists in the opposition benches with reference to some of Mr. Speaker's decisions in the past.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well I was planning on calling the Rules Committee back into session at least in the not too distant future, and I will look forward to sour member on the committee raising that subject on the agenda at that time, Member for Lakeview.

**MR. MALONE:** — I wonder if you could explain, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, your decision to cut off questions, because questions and answers become argumentative. You have cut me off, presumably after hearing the Premier's answer. That to me, was the argumentative part, but you didn't allow a third question. I wonder if you could just explain that to me.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well I think . . . Order, order, order! I think the members will have to rely on the record. They can go back and check the record of the question that the member for Lakeview asked, and I will go back and check it too, and the answer of the Premier again. I don't think that the Premier's answer was more argumentative than the question that was given. I think they were both getting into the area of dealing the issue, rather than question and answers. I seem to recall that I cut the Premier off on that question before he completed his answer.

#### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — AGRICULTURE — VOTE 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I believe when you adjourned yesterday evening, we had a motion before us and the motion was prepared and presented by the member for Morse. Is the Committee ready for the question?

#### **ITEM 1 (con't)**

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — Just a few more brief comments in regard to that particular motion which we had before us. Let me say initially that I was rather pleased with the high level of debate which took place in regard to this particular motion. There was some disagreement as to the level of severity in the concerns expressed in the motion but on the whole, I felt it was good because it did allow us an opportunity to debate the issue and to talk about it. I thought the level of debate was good except for the last half hour of committee last night. I think it was a very unfortunate display by the member for Nipawin, in the rather light and political way in which he treated a very serious and important question. I feel that the level of debate was lowered dramatically by the diatribe of the member for Nipawin last night, and I do not wish to waste the precious time of this Assembly by lowering myself to his level, or other members of this House to

that level, by answering some of the ridiculous comments which he made last night.

Mr. Chairman. In regard to this particular motion which we have before us, comments were made by all members of the House and by the press as well, that the motion which I raised was a “mother love: issue. What definition does one attach to that particular word? Does it mean, one is in agreement with an issue such as that? Or, does one say that the importance of that motion is not that great? I would hope that the latter definition would not, in turn, be the one that applies, because I believe the motion represents the very serious situation which the province of Saskatchewan agricultural now finds itself in, and that is, the serious situation which is developing at the College of Agriculture in regard to research, teaching and education of agriculture facilities.

The minister, in some of his comments last night, listed some of the grants and programs that his department has made available and compared them to what took place in 1971 and so on, which is fair game. Yet one looks at the percentage of the budget for agriculture in 1971 and it ranked just as low as this percentage of budget does today — between 3.4 per cent and 3.8 per cent in 1971, and this one this year runs around 3.1 per cent. It has been a result of successive governments and successive budgets that have not put a great enough priority on agriculture to allow our college to slip to the position which it is today, and I think that the issue is serious enough because the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, in it brief to the government, which represents the views of the majority of our agricultural organizations of the province, themselves felt that it was a serious situation and let me just read excerpts from the brief which they presented to Cabinet yesterday, and it reads:

SFA is also patiently waiting for the College, the University of Saskatchewan Commission and the provincial government to come to grips with the future financing of the College of Agriculture. As we all know the college is grossly understaffed and has very limited space in relation to other agricultural colleges in Canada. Without increased finances to improve space requirements and increase staff numbers, the College of Agriculture's teaching and research efforts will continue to suffer.

The fact that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture has realized the problem, I think, endorses or emphasizes the resolution which I have presented and placed before you. I made comment, last night, about comparing our college in this province to other colleges in Canada. The minister, in his reply, tried to refute that claim. I stand by that claim that I made last night that our college has sunk badly in comparison to other colleges in Canada. I would just like to quote some figures which were presented to the government of Saskatchewan, the Cabinet of the government of Saskatchewan, by the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists in regard to the College of Agriculture, University of Saskatchewan.

Let me just use some of the statistics which they used in that brief. I might say that the statistics, I understand, were prepared by Mr. John R. Peters and Mr. Herb R. Clarke, who is the president of the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists at the university.

They go on to say — full time academic staff by colleges of agriculture in Canada, today. In 1965-66 Saskatchewan had 38 staff members; Alberta has 42; Manitoba, 51 and Ontario, 197. This shows the low level of staff which our college has in comparison to other colleges.

Let's go on to have a look at the total number of students by the colleges of agriculture in 1976-77 Guelph, Ontario, 2,464 students; Manitoba, 1,089 students; Alberta, 1,121 students; Saskatchewan, 861 students.

Let's go on to what, I think, is a rather interesting figure. Let's look at the amount of dollars which this province provides to agriculture in comparison to the gross national product of what agriculture produces in Saskatchewan, the relationship between farm cash receipts and the number of agricultural faculty positions by selected provinces. Saskatchewan, total farms receipts other than Ontario is second highest. Saskatchewan, total farm cash receipts is \$1,942,000,000. Staff per billion of farm cash receipts in a ratio is 25.8. Compare that to Quebec who has a total farm cash receipt of \$1,000,107,000, considerably less than ours. Theirs is 127.4 staff members per \$1 billion of farm cash receipts.

Let's look at Manitoba whose total farm cash receipts are \$820,000, half of what our total farm cash receipts are in the province of Saskatchewan. Their staff ratio per \$1 billion of farm cash receipts is 104, four times as great as ours. So in effect the level of contribution by Manitoba in comparison to the dollars which are produced in Saskatchewan in regard to agriculture is four times as great.

One goes on to Alberta, which is slightly less than ours in total cash receipts but they are way above us in terms of staff that is provided.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that these are very concrete figures. I am sure that the minister still has a copy of this particular brief that certainly demonstrates the fact that we are not upholding our share of agricultural research and education in Saskatchewan in comparison to what other provinces are doing throughout the Dominion of Canada.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that this particular motion does not specify any amount of dollars that are needed. What the motion does is recommend that the government does consider an increase in grants. I think it is a resolution or a motion that all of us should support. I think it is a motion that government members on that side of the House can support without really putting their particular government or their agricultural department or agricultural budget in too great a jeopardy. It will show to the agricultural sectors of Saskatchewan and it will show to the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture as well, which does represent the views of many farm organizations in Saskatchewan, that we are concerned about the problem and that we are prepared to do something about it. I would urge all members to support the motion.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, just a few words in reply. I would like to have gone back over some of the figures that I quoted last night to indicate the rapidly escalating level of support which had been forthcoming from this government with regard to the research capacity.

I would like to say that there are ongoing discussions at the present time between the College of Agriculture, the University Commission and the Department of Agriculture with regard to getting a better priority in the funding for College of Agriculture in Saskatoon. We are hopeful that those discussions will result in some upgrading of the capacity there to provide additional student capacity. However, I want to indicate to the member and to the House that the School of Agriculture has been able to accommodate all of the applications which have been made this year and, therefore, there isn't a backlog of students who are not being accommodated at the school. You

might consider that because of our lower population in Saskatchewan that there wouldn't be as many students normally as there would be in Ontario or in Alberta. I think that you would expect that our student enrolment would be somewhat lower.

I think another thing which should be considered is that figures in terms of dollars and cents and numbers of students aren't always comparable. I don't think they always indicate the measure of need that there is in a province. I think you would recognize that in Saskatchewan our agricultural industry is a little less diversified than it is in most other provinces to the extent that most other provinces are dealing in fruit products, vegetables products to a much greater degree than we are. We are more or less in a grain growing and a livestock growing area, so that there isn't quite the need for the diversity here that there is in other provinces.

With regard to his comments on the brief by the Institute of Agrologists, I read the brief and, of course, read the criticism that was there about the fact that they thought we should be providing more services and more facilities. I would suggest if he would look at the briefs that they have written to almost any provincial government across this country that they would have had the same criticism. I was looking at the Canadian Institute of Agrologists brief not very long ago and I recall a fairly strong criticism of the federal government for not providing enough research capacity. As I said last night, I believe that would go on whether we had \$50 million or \$5 million in the research sector. I simply want to point out to the members that although I appreciate the intent of the resolution, I think that we should also recognize that this government has put substantial emphasis on research and, therefore, I would recommend that we defeat the resolution.

Motion negatived.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am just wondering with regard to some of the debate which took place in the House on Monday last, regarding the Farm Fuel Cost Reduction Program which was in effect in the province, I believe the last year it operated was 1976, I am just wondering for that particular year, for the last year of operation, if the minister could give me — it is my understanding that in the applications that were sent in for the grant that the farmer had to list the total amount of gallons of diesel fuel, purpose gas and so on that he used on his farm — the figures of the total gallons of gasoline used by farmers in the last year of the that particular program as indicated on the applications that were received, not the total amount that was paid on but the total amount that was actually used.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, the figure I am given is about 185 million gallons of purple fuel, that's gas and diesel fuel for farm use — 195 million, I'm sorry.

**MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Just a short question, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister, he is well aware of the kind of drainage problems that we've had in Saskatchewan with respect to agricultural land and the problems, I've brought them up to him before. I have brought them up to the Minister of Environment before. Nobody seems to be prepared to do anything about it immediately. I would like to ask the minister, however, if he is aware of any experiments being done at OAVC (Olds Agriculture and Vocational College) with respect to burying a perforated pipe to drain sloughs in Saskatchewan which potentially could eliminate the surface drainage problems and the problems of right-of-way and downstream damage?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I am told that the cost of that particular method is very

high and is not considered as being economically viable to use that method.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that any conclusive research has been done on it to this date and my request was simply to the minister if he will undertake his department to check with those people who have been involved in the research of the use of perforated pipe to find out exactly what the costs are that are associated with it. Obviously we can't assume that it is going to cost the same as a nine inch plastic pipe, solid pipe, that's being used to drain sloughs but then again we have to consider that in the long run it might be a lot cheaper than civil litigation, one neighbor against the next in Saskatchewan. I would hope only that you could give me the assurance that your department will undertake to do a thorough study of that option and its potential to alleviate some of the surface drainage problems we have had in Saskatchewan in the past few years. It appears that it will continue because of the lack of action from the provincial government. All I am looking for is the assurance.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can advise the member that there are at the present time some experimental projects going on at the Outlook Irrigation Project and they are looking at the whole aspect of whether it's economically feasible and what the mechanical problems would be with that kind of program.

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Minister, when one looks at the total overall picture of agriculture in terms of the overall provincial picture which is budgetary cash outflows and the amount that is going to be spent on agriculture, I think it is a pretty astonishing figure here in this Budget and in too many of the budgets that have been brought down by your government and that is the amount that is actually spent on agriculture. Mr. Minister, I think it is a pretty shocking indictment of your government and you, as the minister, when we are dealing in a Budget of \$1,700,000,000 or \$1,695,000,000 if you want to be specific. About the best that you can come out of this about \$54 million. Mr. Minister, that's about 3.1 . . . (interjection) . . . No, as a matter of fact I wasn't, I wasn't out helping your opposition.

Now, Mr. Minister, my friends to the right tell me that you made a speech last night but maybe you wouldn't mind very briefly paraphrasing it and tell me why, out of a budget of \$1.7 billion that you can only find 3.1 or \$53 million to spend in agriculture? Seeing you are well oiled on that speech I am sure you can cut it a little shorter this afternoon.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to accommodate the member. I'm sorry he wasn't around last night. However, the argument about the numbers of dollars spent in agriculture, I think the important issue that you want to look at is whether you want dollars spent on supplementing income or whether you want dollars spent on programs. We tend to want to put our money into programming, support programming for the agricultural community in Saskatchewan and we think that the level of funding we have here does a pretty effective job of that. We are providing, what I think, is a very adequate regional service out in the country in terms of extension personnel. The research work is done at the university although some people may criticize it as being inadequate, I think that people will have to recognize that there has been a substantial improvement in that area in terms of direct available capacity in the offices in and around the administration are. It seems to me that we are doing a very commendable job in taking care of the immediate problems of every area which would require some kind of assistance. The question I suppose is whether you use dollars out of the Consolidated Fund to provide income for the farm community. I know that the member opposite would not suggest that we do that. I know that he has always been

opposed to subsidization and I am sure he continues to be that way. So I don't think that he would ask that we should have some income transfer programs in our budget. I would like to have him point out to me an area where he thinks that we are not providing adequate service.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. G.N. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Chairman, thank you and I thank members of the House for allowing me to interrupt. I would like to introduce a group of some 78 or 80 students in the gallery who are here today on this Options Canada Interchange on Canadian studies. They are the second portion of the group that were introduced to the House a little earlier. I want to apologize to you for the fact that I wasn't here when you entered. But I do want on behalf of the House to welcome you here and hope that you will find that the time that you spending the House will be very worthwhile. I would like to recognize the teachers who are with the group, Glen Grieves, Gerry Jean, Albert Sullivan and Glen Reeves. We are glad that you are able to be here in the company of the Saskatoon students and also those from across the nation. I look forward to the opportunity to meet with you a little later this afternoon.

**HON. H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Buena Vista):** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the member for Eastview in welcoming the students from Interchange on Canadian Studies. We spend some time with them last Sunday night at the banquet and the enthusiasm that they displayed at that time certainly put a lot of us to shame. I think maybe they have expended much of their energy and are resting a little bit today. We do hope that they have a very worthwhile experience in Saskatchewan and in Saskatoon, my home city. On behalf of all the other Saskatoon MLAs on this side, I would like to wish you a very pleasant experience in Saskatchewan. I hope you have a very successful day here and that you have a very pleasant trip back to your own province. I would also like to at this particular time give a personal invitation and welcome to Albert Sullivan and Gerry Jean who are personal friends of mine and former colleagues. I do hope that you have a worthwhile day here. We will be meeting with you very shortly. Thank you very kindly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — AGRICULTURE — VOTE 1**

#### **ITEM 1 (continued)**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you tell me how much, if any funds are transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Saskatchewan Research Council, or is that a separate fund?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, the Research Council is refunded out of Industry and Commerce Budget. We do have them do some work for us on a contract basis. But the funding of the Research Council is through Industry and Commerce.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you say that you have them do some work for you. Is that on a pay for service basis or is it just a service that they provide for you?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, it is done on a contract basis.



**MR. BIRKBECK:** — How are the rates set on a contract basis? Could you elaborate a little bit on that.

**MR. KAEDING:** — They are usually negotiated on the basis of the kind of project that you are doing, depending on whether it is staff time or mechanical or whatever. It is negotiated on the basis of each project.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I see by the Saskatchewan Research Council report that they do a lot of research which pertains to agriculture. I see that they have been doing work in terms of farm products, economic uses, strong defeating value of crop residues from unusual crops, micro-organism treatment to improve the feeding value of low quality forage. There are number of things here which I feel are very worthy projects which are going to enhance agriculture, maybe not immediately but surely sometime down the road.

What I would like to know is, is the Saskatchewan Research Council report, on your behalf, or is your department, doing any studies whatsoever in the province of Saskatchewan, on the bio-mass theory?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, I think we have no direct funding going into that particular area at the present time.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Well, Mr. Minister, do you intend to direct any of your attention to that area, either through your department or by contract with the Saskatchewan Research Council?

**MR. KAEDING:** — These kinds of projects are handled through Industry and Commerce and we haven't got any direct involvement with it. Industry and Commerce and the Energy people would be involved in those kinds of projects.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Well, I suppose, Mr. Minister, it would be inappropriate for me to ask you what studies the Department of Industry and Commerce is doing on behalf of your department, indirectly, but the fact remains that the bio-mass theory, the theory of processing animal waste into various components, namely, methane gas and high protein products which can be used in turn to feed cattle. Now, I would like to know if you are placing any effort on any department to do such studies. That is primarily what I am asking you.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, we have a limited contract with the Research Council for energy research this year. There is a certain amount of work being done in Manitoba in this regard and we tend to split up some of our research projects between different provinces so that we aren't duplicating research in three or four different provinces. In terms of this kind of research, most of that is being done in Manitoba.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Minister, this is now the third department of government which we have found confessing to the fact that they are not doing research in certain areas in the province which would be in the interests of Saskatchewan people; they are relying on research being done on the same topics in other parts of the country or possibly in the United States. Now, Mr. Minister, I am not altogether too sure that that is necessarily the most effective way to do research on projects which we feel can very quickly and within 10 years I think is quickly in terms of the bio-mass area, bringing it on stream where it can be of economic value to agriculture, and in turn, to the economy

of the province. That is not necessarily the route to go.

Obviously, since you have no pilot projects that are in operation in the province, and there are no measures by which you provide assistance to individuals who may want to attempt this process, surely the information which you are relying on is not adequate enough to place your own department in a position where it can announce a program of information and possibly assistance for those who want to experiment on that basis. Now, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that that is the case?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, as I indicated before there is a kind of co-operative arrangement between provinces whereby certain kinds of research is carried on in Manitoba, some is done in Saskatchewan as I indicated last night. We have the research capacity here in the veterinary field in terms of livestock disease and so on. That has been given to Saskatchewan as a kind of an area where we do all of the research, at least the major party of the research, and the other provinces draw from that. In this particular case, in the energy field that you are talking about, most of that research is carried on in Manitoba and we try to draw from that.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Minister, it is my opinion that with the information that has been available from various sources throughout North America on this topic of bio-mass processing of animal waste, that we are far behind and in fact, should be the province should be the vocation in the North American content that is leading the way in this regard. We are going to have to take some measures as soon as possible, to place ourselves in a number one position, to place that as a priority. Surely now, as you have suggested, with the energy shortage and agriculture being asked to bite the bullet, and the energy shortage as it pertains to agriculture and the industry itself having to face possible gas rationing if the federal government brings in its contingency plans, that surely this is one direction you could be moving into and moving into it more quickly than you are. If we can look at it in terms of an example, of a farmer who has a large hog operation or livestock operation or any description, we could see where he was draining off methane gas from those animal wastes, using them to power his machinery, his tractors, or for that matter, depending on legislation and regulations permitting, allow him to power his half ton truck which he uses in his operation. Also, on a larger scale, where we have concentrations of cattle in feedlot operations, whether they be a co-operative organization, or numbers of farmers getting together and feeding their cattle out in a feedlot operation, this could be applied in those instances as well, and very effectively, in terms of the production of protein. It would be far more economical to reprocess these animal wastes to use them in the form of protein, rather than the use that we are now making of animal wastes, and that being, fertilizer. If you compare the figures, and I have them (I don't have them with me unfortunately), but it is a great difference in the economic return, the dollar value return, per ton of animal waste if it is processed into a protein form, rather than being used in its raw form, for fertilizer.

So all I am saying, Mr. Minister, is that I see the day (not too long now, as I said, maybe 10 years) when these practices are going to be in place. I also see the day, with the present direction that our government is going and in particular, through your department, that we are not going to be able to look back and say, well, we took the initiative in that area; we started this; we got this project off the ground. What we are going to be doing is looking back and say, somebody else did the research; somebody else put the money in, and now it is starting to pick up here in Saskatchewan. Why do we have to be a "Johnny-come-lately" type on these types of things?

Now, Mr. Minister, I think that is a very important area in which your department could be placing some strong emphasis. Obviously because of your budget, you are unable to do that. And that seems to be at the heart of the whole problem, that you don't have the money. I think if your department had the funds it could put more funds into those kinds of things, which in the long term, (which is getting back to what I suggested to you repeatedly) long term policies to look after the future needs of the farm industry.

Mr. Minister, would you not agree then, and would you not accept my suggestion, that you should look very seriously at this and, hopefully, in the next budget, we would like to see a substantial increase (at least in the neighborhood of 15 per cent increase) in the Department of Agriculture Estimates for funding, in order that you might direct some more financial assistance in those areas of research?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I recall sitting here last night and hearing a tirade from the member for Nipawin about how research money gets wasted. And one of the reason why we are not involved in this kind of project is because it has been decided, co-operatively between governments, that certain governments should do certain projects, and do research in certain areas, and I would suggest that to suggest otherwise would be totally ridiculous. There is a need for us across Canada to concentrate our dollars in the areas of research where each area has a special benefit to be derived from it. In this case, research in Manitoba is being federally funded to a large extent. They have provided funds for a pilot project there, and they are trying to develop the technology and apparently has not yet developed to the stage where they are prepared to suggest to the other provinces that they are at a point where they say it is practical. I think that this is a worthwhile kind of co-operative effort to go into. I think we should consider what it would cost each province, if each province was going to set up, for itself, all of these little experimental research projects. It couldn't be handled in terms of dollars and cents. In this case, we are prepared to let Manitoba do that kind of research. We are prepared to say that we want to let them have the forefront in that particular area. We are doing it in research in animal disease and Alberta will have other areas that they are dealing with. It might be interesting for you to know that last year and the year before we have been involved in a special project with straw ammoniation and you may have heard that through the winter, that we were dealing with experimental projects on straw ammoniation which does tend to provide a higher level of protein out of a very clean roughage and one which we think has real potential in Saskatchewan for winter feed for livestock and we spent something the neighborhood of \$12,000 last year just showing farmers how to use this new technology. That is the kind of thing that is coming out of this research.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am sorry I wasn't able to quote catch what the Minister was saying, I didn't understand what he was saying with regard to Minister of Environment has got his buttons undone again. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, again I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you couldn't just explain to me a little bit more in detail, you mention \$12,000, is this in terms of straw, what did you say? What was your terminology there?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The straw ammoniation project where ammonia is injected into a pile of straw, it is covered, and then ammonia is injected into that and as a result of that process there is higher protein capacity and it makes a much better feed than the straight straw alone much protein.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, a much better feed than what?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Than straight straw, by itself. It improves the quality of the straw and brings a better conversion.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, earlier on your were commenting with regard to research that Manitoba was doing, in terms of this bio-mass process. Now what you are saying is that Manitoba is telling you at this point in time it is their opinion it is not economically viable and therefore, you are not promoting it here in Saskatchewan. Is that true?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, certainly we are prepared to accept their research which they are undertaking in Manitoba in this particular field, as they are accepting our research in other areas and I think that is the most reasonable way to attack the research problem.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am sorry that I had delayed for a moment after you had asked me that question and I have forgotten what it was, it must have been a real winner, so if you don't mind I'll continue asking you one or two. Mr. Minister, as I recall you replied that you were justifying a sum of \$54 million dollars which was such a magnanimous sum and that the Department of Agriculture was on strings so far, that you were doing so many marvellous things for people in rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, very respectfully, I would like to suggest to you that the Department of Agriculture hasn't had an original idea since the member for Kelsey-Tisdale was taken out of that portfolio. I didn't very often agree with the philosophy that that particular member took to the portfolio but during his tenure there, agriculture was where the action was, things were happening and granted I was on the opposite side philosophically, agriculture is where the action was. Very respectfully, Mr. Minister, again I would like to say that agriculture, since you became a Minister has declined quite sharply insofar as a priority of your government. I'll base that very simply by saying that your estimates, the amount that you have been allocated by the Budget are 7.3 per cent. Everybody in this Assembly knows full well that budgetary expenditures across the board are up 12 per cent. Therefore, Mr. Minister, when it comes to the tough battle within the Treasury Board, when the various departments and various ministers apply for funds, you have got the hell beat out of you, to put it very bluntly. You lost 4.7 per cent, Mr. Minister, so Mr. Minister before we move on, I will let you respond to that that one and then we will just get on.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, first of all I would like to respond to the extent that I suggest that he look across the border to his neighbor in Manitoba and see what agriculture got out of the budget in Manitoba. I note from the figures that I have here that the agricultural budget is not 3.7 per cent of the total budget, but 1.8 per cent of the total budget. That is the new Tory government in Manitoba. Now you are quoting a figure of 7.4 per cent which you say that we have got out of this budget and on the blue book figure that is probably the figure you would get. However, I think you said when you were comparing the budget, I think you said that consider that last year we had a large non-returning item, the item of \$1.7 million into the agribition building which is not in the budget his year nor will it be an item in the budget in the future. There are other small non-recurring items of something like \$1 million which are not in this year's budget which were in last year's. If you take those two out you will see that we have actually this year an additional \$5 million, approximately \$5 million in new programming in the new budget and which really brings our budget up to 15 per cent over last year's, if you take out those non-recurring items.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, frankly, I'm not particularly interested in what

they are doing in Alberta or in Manitoba because I don't live in Manitoba. I happen to live in Saskatchewan although I must say at times I sure wish it was Alberta. Mr. Minister, that's interesting about the expenditures that you have mentioned of \$1 million here and a \$1 million there. You could find the agribition building doesn't amount to much — a \$1 million here and \$1 million there that he doesn't define. Nonetheless the figure is still 7.3 per cent.

You know, Mr. Minister, I just took one of your subvotes at random and I took item 1 under Administrative Service. Last year you had 34 employees. This year you've got 36. Mr. Minister, I note, just talking this one at random, the first one that was there. I noticed you saw fit to jack the salaries up the full 12 per cent, the full 12 per cent that the overall provincial Budget went up. You sure jacked the salaries there and yet your total overall budget when you take in the capital and everything else, comes out at 7.3. Perhaps, Mr. Minister, you have a \$1 million here or \$1 million there that you care to take off that particular item.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that you will recognize that there are two new positions there in that particular area. They are not particularly new positions in the department. They are simply changes of positions from another department into the administration and because of that it does create an increase in administration in that particular subvote. However, I think you would recognize that our departments, every other department, has to meet the salary commitments which are made by the Public Service Commission and that's reflected in that particular subvote. It is no more or no less. The extra two positions are simply two positions which are transferred from other areas of the department.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, that's a very interesting analogy because while I was waiting for you I took another one at random, on that's a little nearer and dearer to my heart known as the Animal Industry Branch. The Animal Industry Branch has got some pretty capable people in it, Mr. Minister. Some of them I really don't know why are sticking around here. Nonetheless you are fortunate to have them. So I took their permanent positions and I quickly ran that one through. You've declined from 61 down to 60. It was very interesting, Mr. Minister in this very key subvote, the Animal Industry Branch, a very key department, you only went up 6.7 per cent salary. Now, can the minister kindly tell me what is so special about Administrative Services that you would go up 11.6 but the Animal Industry Branch which I think is a very vital department to the province of Saskatchewan, certainly to the livestock industry and which has some very top quality people, they get 6.7?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, that position out of Animal Industry was simply transferred again to another section to the Vet Lab which is related to that particular area so that person is not lost to the industry. Again, the member likes to juggle figures because he was taking a comparison between an item of subvote which lost one person and comparing it to a subvote where two people were added. Again, these are interdepartmental switches not new people and it's some real mathematical gymnastics when you try to make those kinds of comparisons with 6 per cent here and 11 per cent there and I think the member knows that.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Come on, Mr. Minister, now you can do better than that. At least let's surely to goodness hope you can do better than that. The way I did item 1, I simply took 36 people, divided it into 715,000 and you get 19,887. Conversely I took 34 people into 605 etc., and got the average salary, punched it through and you get 11.6. Now go over to item 20 and take 60 people, divide it into 97,590, do the same in the

next subvote and you get 6.7. Now give us an answer and don't be so ridiculous.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I think again the member because he doesn't know what happens in these subvotes is trying to confuse the issue. Under Administration, as you know, all of our executive director positions come under Administration and these are, of course, the high paid position Department of Agriculture or any department, the executive directors, most of the people who are sitting here. Their salaries are covered under item 1, administration. They are higher salaries than you would have in the regular civil service. So you would have a higher percentage in that area.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Oh, now just a minute, Mr. Minister, we are not talking about absolute salaries and nobody is disputing that particular aspect. We are talking about percentage increase. Now we have just taken these at random. Now if you want to take a little time, I suppose I could punch another one through, but absolute salaries. No question about it they are the people who are with you. They are our top quality people and they are the ones, I assume, when there is a crucial decision to be made, that they are the ones that you call in. And disputably if to keep your top quality people, you must be competitive with other governments the federal, or the provincial, or the private sector. But the Animal Industry Branch also happens to be a very important department.

Again, I will ask you, since you have had a little consultation, take your time. Why would you only give Animal Industry employees 6.7 per cent versus the administrative services of 11.6 or 12 per cent?

**MR. KAEDING:** — There is an item in the Administration Budget which provides for salary which was not paid out of Administration last year, an item of \$30,000, a top executive position, which was in a different subvote last year and is in here now. And that makes the difference in that particular area.

I think the regular increase rates . . . Mr. Chairman, there is a little difficulty comparing numbers as well because of the fact that in these figures is not only regular time, but overtime is also calculated in these figures. So it is difficult to identify from department to department exactly at the percentage of increase would be in terms of salaries and so on, depending on how much overtime these people had to do and so on. So it is very difficult to compare every department on a percentage basis.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, this is not exactly a momentous issue that I suppose the government should fall on. But I suppose what is amusing, Mr. Minister, is your contortions trying to go around this because obviously, you don't know the answer and the people you have with you don't know the answer.

First off there was an item taken off, now we are talking about overtime. Mr. Minister, we are not talking about actual figures; we are talking about budgeted figures and I am sure every year your accountants or treasury board has a constant factor for overtime, which they insert into your budgetary figures. Now, Mr. Minister, let's get moving on to something else. Give us an answer to a very basic and simple question that makes sense. I am only asking the same question that any adequate financial critic from your side would ask were he over here.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, again, I have to indicate that it is very hard to make comparisons because when you are transferring personnel you are not always transferring people in the same salary range. In the particular, he was pointing to Animal Industry, and in that particular are the people who transferred out of there were low salaried people; the people who were transferred into Administration were in senior levels. That would make some differences in the percentages. It is very difficult for us to compute here just how those percentage do compare, but certainly, there are no areas in either one of those budgets which indicate any padding of dollars or anything like that. There certainly is none of that.

**MR. THATCHER:** — No, Mr. Minister, I was not suggesting there was any padding of dollars. I just would point out to you that if they transferred into animal industry at a lower level, lower salary level, the percentage increase would be much higher and administration much lower, the reverse of what you just said. But since obviously the budgetary considerations are beyond you, let us move on to something else.

Mr. Minister, there have been questions raised within the livestock industry, as to the value of some of your stockyard inspections, that the inspections that are conducted at both stockyards and auction marts, that perhaps . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

That's right. As my colleague for Shaunavon points out, the one where an inspector determines whether the animal is alive or dead. Now, it really is not quite that bad but I think he does allude to some questions that are raised. Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you, what does this total program cost? When you get into the overall thing of the stockyard inspection, the brand inspection, breaking it down, what is your budgetary cost on this? Or what are you budgeting specifically for this area?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The total number of dollars for livestock inspection, \$616,000.

**MR. THATCHER:** — What about brand inspection, Mr. Minister? Does that include brand inspection also?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes that includes brand inspection.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Pardon me?

**MR. THATCHER:** — That is, brand inspection and stockyard inspection, right?

**MR. KAEDING:** — yes, I think that includes all the livestock inspection.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, would you comment on the success of the program. Do you really think that by tossing in some of this bureaucracy into normal movement of cattle health inspection, would you tell us what exactly your objectives are, what your department's objectives are? And do you really think that you have been successful?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, I think there are a number of valuable items performed by these inspectors. I think you will recognize that one of the major things that is involved is protection of the livestock industry; to make sure that there is not any rustling going on by the brand inspection, that sort of thing. This guarantees that at least we can find animals, if they are rustled. The other important area of course, is the health area where you want to make sure that animals are not getting on the market which are not suitable

for human consumption, that sort of thing. We have to make sure that those sorts of things don't happen. I would imagine that those two would be the major areas; make sure that the health is protected, and identification of animals.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, what kind of people do the inspection or do your health measures inspections, and what procedures do they use? What qualifications do they have?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The inspectors generally get an in-service training course and they must qualify in this in-service training course before they can be appointed as inspectors. They are taught there, I presume, the inspection procedures that they have to go through and the health checks that they have to make.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, for the number of people that you have got working on this program, between brand inspection and your health inspection, I respectfully ask you, is \$616,000 all that program is costing? What are you showing that as. Is that \$616,000 strictly salaries or what is involved in that? With all due respect, that does seem rather low. Are we isolating something out there in error?

**MR. KAEDING:** — I think that covers salaries and travelling expenses. There really isn't very much else to go into inspection, except the salary of the inspectors and the travelling time from one auction mart to another.

**MR. THATCHER:** — How many people are employed?

**MR. KAEDING:** — There are about 30 permanent inspectors and about 75 who do part-time work, people who to go to individual auction marts and maybe do two or three in a week.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, I note under capital expenditures that the increase is not very substantial, about \$6,000,063 to about \$6,000, 154. Mr. Minister, that is really not very much capitalizing into agriculture. Now, before you spring up and tell me about all the capitalization that is going into the Land Bank and buying land, let us not stretch a point and call that the purchase of capital.

Mr. Minister, any province where so much of its income, where so much of the budgetary inflows into this budget that we are talking about, comes directly from agriculture and such a small percentage of budgetary outflow goes back to agriculture, would the minister not agree that he has been, let us say, a trifle remiss, or his government has been a trifle remiss is not getting that figure of capital expenditures into agriculture expanded? Mr. Minister, I apologize for going into a situation in my constituency; I will be very brief about it but there is an irrigation group that has been down to see your government every year for about seven to eight years. All they wanted, I think from the outset, started out at maybe \$50,000. I think the cost of the project now is maybe up to \$65,000. It is again land irrigation thing and they have been down every year. I have made appointments with them for your people. They have even been to see your deputy minister.

Now, Mr. Minister, a project like that up in grain land, making use of a — well, I suppose it was a dream some years ago that really never materialized, meaning the Diefenbaker Dam; the dreams were there but the results from it I guess for some reason have just never been materialized. Maybe it just was not there to being with but, Mr. Minister,



\$65,000 is not all that much for that many people.

Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you why year after year (what I think on the surface is a pretty good project, what I think on the surface your officials think is a reasonably good project) can you not find \$65,000?

Now I am sure you are going to say, well there are people from 61 constituencies who come up and want \$65,000, and that is probably a valid concern. Mr. Minister, where are your priorities on capital expenditure? That is really what my question is.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, when you are looking at a capital expenditures you have to look at the cost benefit ratios and in that particular project, although it looks like it is the kind of project that could be developed, our estimate cost per acres there runs well over \$400 per acre. It is a question I suppose of priorities, of whether you spend \$400 an acre for a benefit there as opposed to spending dollars on smaller irrigation projects across the province. This particular project is still under discussion and is one which has not been rejected but in this year's budget it was decided that it was not a top priority because of the cost benefit ratios and we thought we could do better with our dollars in other places.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I thank the minister for his answer. That is the same answer they have been getting for a good many years, but Mr. Minister, in true style I am sure that we will be back to see you again. Perhaps we should try you personally instead of your officials.

Moving to another area, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you a little bit about your Lands Branch. Your Lands Branch has moved into a policy which I suppose is rejecting a former practice that was held and that was the assignment of leases. In other words, over a period of years, some deeded land in conjunction with some leased land came to form an economic unit and then for one reason or the other there was the transfer from father to son or the sale or retirement of the individual and for some reason this policy has now been dropped.

Now, Mr. Minister, I think the way the policy worked in the past was that if the deeded land of this economic unit was to be sold, it was possible for both parties to come down and have a discussion with the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture officials would take a look at the situation and they could then judge whether that land should be posted, or whether without posting, it should go to the buyer, whether that buyer be outside or within the family.

Mr. Minister, very respectfully, the job of allocating land leases in the provincial Lands Branch has to be one of the sorriest, pardon me, the easiest way to get an unpopular name in Saskatchewan. I have always had a great deal of sympathy for Mr. Taylor who must sign all of these lease form letters — for a long time it was Mr. Rice. They are two names that are very well known out in the country and I do feel sorry of them because every time there are ten applications, only one can get it and nine are automatically mad, and I have always felt sorry for those two gentlemen who have had tossing form letters going one way or the other.

Mr. Minister, I think basically these people did a reasonably good job of coming to the right decision as to whether that lease should be assigned or whether it should be posted. Mr. Minister, it is my understanding that you have now moved your department to a policy where automatically assignments are not possible without posting. Now,

Mr. Minister, I am sure that you have had these problems recited to you many times but I will go through them again very briefly.

A situation occurs where somebody wants to sell out. The lease part is an integral part of the unit to make it economic. He is faced with the situation of first, having to drop his lease. He cannot simply sell it subject to assignment by you; it has to be posted. Mr. Minister, respectfully, I think there has been a regrettable situation. I think this program has been in for about a year now. You have had an opportunity to assess it. I know I have encountered problems with it in my small local capacity. Could the minister tell us if his department is considering a re-evaluation of what is now a very hard and fast policy?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, the member has spoken truly when he says that the allocation process is a tough process and one which is not an easy one to deal with. The assignment of lease policy as we now have it was put in there for a number of reasons. You will know and you indicated that all assignments have to be posted. That is not true. The father and son transfers are still being handled on an assignment basis and in most cases, those are the kinds of transfers that are taking place. There are a few non father-son situations and some of them have come to my attention. I went down to Maple Creek and one of the reasons that I went down there was to discuss with the farmers there, and to hear their problems with regard to assignments and land transfers and so on. I can tell you there are those people who don't like the policy. There are also people who do like the new policy.

It seems to me that when a lease is granted to a farmer, it is granted to him on the basis of his particular need and he develops his packages around that lease. When he has used the lease for the length of time that he intends to use, then that lease is no longer his, at least it shouldn't be, in my opinion. There is no reason that he should be able to expect, that because that lease was his while he needed it, it should automatically go to the next person who comes along. We know and we have a great deal of evidence to show that because some of these leases were being assigned with the value of the land, that the owner was in actual fact, capitalizing on the fact that he had the lease to transfer with it, the assignments of lease.

When I was in Maple Creek I asked some of the farmers down there what they were paying for land and the average price that was quoted to me on that day was something like 30 times the assessed value. Partly, that is because some of them thought they could assign leased land with it. Anyone knows that in that area you can't pay 30 times the assessed value for land and make it worthwhile.

Now, it seems to me that when a farmer has used a lease for his lifetime or as long as he is prepared to be on that land, that then he has derived the benefit which he should be entitled to and at that time there are other farmers around in that areas who should have the option when the land comes up for disposition. There are other farmers in that area who should have an equal right to apply for that land as a new prospective owner coming in. Now I know that in some ways that will disadvantage existing adequate units. It may also have the effect of making an inadequate unit in an area completely adequate and viable so that you are really not changing the fact that they are viable units. You are changing the people who have those viable units and it seems to me that the people who are in that area would have the first right or the first opportunity make their units viable as opposed to someone coming in from wherever. And that is not to say that the person coming in and having made application for that particular piece of land may not get the allocation. But I certainly don't think that we should be

under any obligations to ensure that he will. I simply think that there is a good reason why the other local people in that area should be able to also have an opportunity to bid on that piece of land.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, I don't dispute what you say and those situations that you describe are very true. What I am questioning is the inflexibility of your new proposal because well, what you described I don't think that has happened. What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, is that if the circumstances are there, if there is a young fellow coming in that is going to buy out an existing unit and the lease has become an integral part to make that operation tick, that before that young fellow borrows that money, puts his neck on the line, on the assumption that he is going to get that land, that lease, and should he not get it he has suddenly got himself an uneconomic unit in his hands. I am saying that that guy should be able to come down to your department and present his case, in which case your departmental officials whom, goodness sakes, Mr. Taylor and the likes of that, they've been there for years, they know this Land Bank backwards and I don't pretend to, but surely the people, some of those people who have been running that Lands Branch are certainly capable of making a decision as to whether this person has a valid situation or not, in which case they would then have the authority, of course with your approval or with some sort of approval, to send this lease with the deeded land. On the other hand, if he hasn't got a legitimate case then very definitely they would say, No, it's going the regular way, it has got to be posted. All I am saying, Mr. Minister, is that would it be so terrible to increase the degree of flexibility that you have got in that Land Branch right now?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I think again you have to consider the kind of proposition you are putting. If our Lands Branch people were in a position of flexibility as you indicate and I have some feel for that I like to see a little flexibility in some of those operations, but if you are going to put your field staff in that flexibility position then what do they really say to the guy when he's coming. Now they have a policy which they know they can identify and they say this is the way it is if you put them in a flexible position and if they give that particular person a concession, then of course someone will come along immediately, and accuse them and say, well, look, why did you do that? And if you can't give a lot of good reasons you are in trouble and you are in hot water right way in the community. You can argue that. A person can come in and make a very good case and say, well look, I should have that lease because I need it to go with my parcel. But how are we to know that there isn't someone else in that same community that doesn't have exactly the same problem in needing additional land to make their unit viable. Why should we say to the guy coming in, you get it but the guy that's sitting there next to you we're not going to give him a chance, we're not going to give him an opportunity to bid. This is a real tough problem.

When we met in the southwest and we talked to some of the farmers down there, we came back and we looked at our policies. We feel there is a problem in the whole area of leasing land and I have asked the department to do a thorough review of the whole issue of land leases and how it should be done and whether there is a better way to do it. I am not sure that we are going to come up with anything different that we have but we are going to be making a major effort this summer to see whether there is some way that we can accommodate some of those situations. I might add that I have already directed the department to look favourably on transfers, parcel transfers. We know of a fair number of units where a farm where a man will have three or four pieces of deeded land into one area so we have a block and will you consent to the transfer. I have asked the department to look at those

favourably wherever we can as long as we don't lose any money in the operation and as long as it doesn't disadvantage the department to any great degree. I suggested that we should be flexible in that particular area and I think that would help quite a bit. There are numbers of situation where farmers maybe have an adequate block but it's scattered around and certainly in this particular area we are interested in providing some assistance.

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for saying at least they are looking into the problem in that area. Secondly, of course, I'm familiar with one of the problems that we had in that area last year in relation to this consolidation of land. But I certainly wouldn't want the minister to leave the impression here that the people in Maple Creek were satisfied with the present policy. Now I agree that probably you did meet some individuals as you travelled through and visited various locations. The few days you were down there were happy, probably the people who did receive some land from existing units, say, under the existing lease program. Certainly the meeting that you had in Maple Creek, the night you were there, which from what my understanding is, was a rather controversial type meeting in which you were, sort of, on the hot seat for a couple or three hours that night. The indications and the feeling at that meeting were that the present policy regarding leased land, and the distribution was not satisfactory. There was a feeling from what I understand, and I live with these people day in and day out, that they would like some possible arrangement where they are selling a unit, that they could make some arrangements to transfer this land with it.

I believe, if I am correct and you can correct me if I am not, that under your previous lease policy you did have the right to refuse transfer of lease land if you thought that too much land was going to any one individual. You did have that right. I can't understand why you don't exercise that right, rather than right now having a damaging effect from the very fact that the property being sold, you can't guarantee that the land is going to go with it; this has a detrimental effect on the price. As I said, I hope the minister will certainly consider this. The feeling in the Maple Creek area, I can assure you is, that they would like a change, or change made in this present lease policy. I don't know where you got the figure of 30 times assessed value. Or did that happen to be a quarter of land with a lot of buildings on it, a ranch, house, or whatever it may be that wasn't accounted in the assessed value?

I happen to have a little bit of land in that area and certainly would sell it for an awful lot less than 30 times the assessed value. I just find it very, very difficult to believe. And, certainly, from my information, this is not a general pattern of what is happening down in the Maple creek area.

While I am on my feet there is another area that I have some concern about and that there is some concern in our area about, and that is this whole matter of Indian land claim settlements. Now, I understand and, again, the minister can comment on this, that there might be a possibility when it comes to settling Indian land claims that the whole point system of awarding lease land might be abolished. In other words that you might take an existing ranch unit and there is a possibility that the deeded land may be sold as part of Indian land claims and then the entire block of lease land will be transferred en bloc to whatever band happens to purchase

Now again, I don't know whether this is fact, but certainly it is rumor in our area, that this might be one instance where the existing lease land policy might not be followed. I

would like the minister to comment on that.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I can't outline for you the policy under which we are expecting to settle Indian land claims, but I do know that we have made it very plain to the federal government and in our negotiations, that we would not be making any transfers without having the consent of the owners. It would have to make a satisfactory settlement with the people who are now on the land and who are now using the land. That is one of the criteria which we have put in any of negotiations that we are undertaking with the federal government. I can assure you that that will be honored.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Just to comment further. I realize that is your position, that the owner of the existing property will be satisfied, but this doesn't necessarily mean that all other people in the area will be satisfied with regard to the transfer. The question was, are you going to abide by your existing lease land policy when it comes to distribution of the lease land?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well again, I indicated that we have made it quite plain that in order for any leases to be changed or abandoned, there has to be consent on the part of the people who are using the existing property. We have made that quite plain in any of our negotiations with the federal government, that it must satisfy the person who now has the control of that land, whether it be lessee or owner.

**MR. STODALKA:** — I recognize that fact, but the minister is missing the question that I am asking and that is this, if a large block of land is sold the deeded land, naturally, will transfer, but then there is the question of the lease land. Are you going to advertise that lease land? Is it going to be posted so that all people in the area will have an opportunity at that time to be awarded that lease under the point system, or will the lease land be transferred en bloc as part of a sale?

**MR. KAEDING:** — You are assuming that a block of deeded land would be purchased and then there would be surplus land. Yes, if that was not part of the package, if that was not part of the package which was being negotiated, then all of that land would, again, be allocated out on a point system, but again, depending on what kind of arrangement was made in a land entitlement claim. If the entitlement took in some of the lease land as well. Then that lease land would be excluded from any future allocation. You understand that?

**MR. STODALKA:** — Yes, I think so. Would the minister give me some assurance then, that in the case of any land claims settlements, that all lease land will be awarded under the point system, if it is in effect at that time?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, I think we can give that assurance. That if any land which is not involved in the claim and which becomes, let us say orphaned, because of some land entitlement, under those circumstances that land would then be put up for, would be posted, and would be eligible for anyone else in the area who would want to use it. It would be allocated on the present point system.

**MR. STODALKA:** — One final comment. Your expression that is "involved in the claim" bothers me. It seems then you could taken the lease land and put it within the claim and therefore it would be excluded from the point system. What I am simply asking is this, as in all land transactions in the area presently, lease land must be put up for allocation for the point system. Would that not also be the case of any other land that is purchased by any other body?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No. If it becomes a part of the Indian Land Entitlement, then you would have to deal with the Indian Band involved. As I understand it, in many cases where they have been talking about purchasing or obtaining land, that they are not particularly interested in keeping land for themselves. They would be prepared to lease it out, but they would have to do that on their own. We would not be involved in that allocation.

**MR. STODALKA:** — In summary then, the rules for the ball game will be different. If Indian land claims are involved and there is a purchase of a ranch with attached lease land, then it would be, if another individual came in and purchased that same land, deeded land with the attached lease land. It would be different ball game and different rules.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well again, as I say, to the extent that if the owners were then the Indian Band, if the owners were the Indian Band, then of course they would have the right to dispose of their holdings in any way they see fit. They would be able to lease that holding to other people. We would not have any part of that. Am I still not on your wavelength?

**MR. STODALKA:** — What I am asking . . . you know, we are just on different wavelengths here. There is no communication I don't think with what I am asking . . .

**MR. KAEDING:** — In the case where Crown land would become vacant, and there was an Indian land claim in that area, then I think we would have to determine whether that would fall within the purview of what the Indian land claim was. You know, if land became vacant before it was actually taken up under the entitlement, but we were reasonably sure that this was an area they were going to acquire, then we may not put that out on lease. We may just put it out on a temporary lease until that decisions was made. I think that would be reasonable. Because if here was a reasonable assurance that there was going to be an Indian land claim in that area, we wouldn't . . . you see we wouldn't be disadvantaging anybody except that you would not be giving them a long-term lease, until the decision was made whether it was going to be turned over to the Indian Band or not.

**MR. STODALKA:** — There is a possibility then that some of the present Crown land that is leased to people in our area, will be transferred over under any Indian land claim without going under the point system for allocation to anybody else?

**MR. KAEDING:** — If it becomes vacant in the meantime.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Yes, becomes vacant by purchasing the deeded land?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, again I say, at this point in time we have not identified any areas like that, and I would think, you know we have said that when a claim is made, everything that is there has to be honored, in terms of existing leases and so on. We would require that that would be honored. And until such a time as we have identified exactly what the Indian claim would be, we would probably go on leasing in our normal way, and until it was very definitely identified.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Chairman, the member for Thunder Creek had . . . I would like to go back to the issue which he raised, in regard to the posting of land requirement in regard to the individual selling his land and that land then being posted. As the minister remembers, we had quite a lengthy debate on that policy change last year in estimates

and I think all of us on this side of the House were unhappy with the final decision that was brought down but we were prepared to see the new policy go into effect for a year and see the reaction to it and whether there were any problem encountered by . . .

I think the suggestion of a change to flexibility in this is an excellent one and I wish the department would consider it. I have a few cases in my constituency where problems have occurred because of this. The minister will recall my discussions with him on one of these just recently, in which a young lad of 22-24 purchased a piece of land. He competed for the lease and was not granted the lease and he is in the process now of appealing that decision. The outcome, if he should not be successful in the appeal, is going to make his operation and the money which he has invested in that operation a very bad economical situation because, while the point system is there to choose, maybe the person who was awarded the farm may have scored more points or the point structure may have been relatively close. But by using the criterion of that point system only, this young farmer, who did have the need, as a result has lost it and it puts his new operation now in jeopardy. We will not know the outcome of it until of course the appeal board has a chance to hear the appeal and make its ruling on it.

I would think that in a case such as this one which we have discussed with you, possibly the department should be in a position to be able to assess the value of the individual who did purchase the deeded land and that possibly some extra system could be worked in, some extra points or something, that would apply to that individual, that young farmer, because of the fact that he did purchase that land. Take close look at all the deeded land or the lease land that is involved. It could be possible that the young farmer who made the purchase might not require all the lease and that part of that lease could be transferred to him and the other part of the lease be open for normal competition.

I think these are areas where I would certainly like to see your department in their review of the leasing policy that you mentioned is going to take place this summer. I hope that they will take a very serious look at these suggestions and make some allowance, especially in the case of young men such as this who are under the age of 30 and who have invested a considerable amount of money in operations such as this.

Now, while I am on my feet as well, it is my understanding that there is a possibility of further changes in regard to lease allocation for present leaseholders. It is my understanding that that decision has not been made and I would hope that they take a very, very serious look at it before they do make any changes in that decision. I am talking about individual ranchers, who presently hold leases. When their leases come up for renewal it is my understanding that there might be some consideration being given to having that particular land posted so that they, in effect, though they may have had the leases for 10, 15, or 20 years, will have to compete again with their neighbors for particular leases.

I hope that your department will look very, very seriously at not making any changes in this regard because it would have quite an effect on present leaseholders within the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, there is no real change in our policy at the present time with regard to that. What we are looking at is a 10-year review. We give him a long-term lease but subject to review every 10 years so that if circumstances change substantially in those 10 years, if he acquired a huge property in the meantime or had some major

shift in his production base, we could then review it at the end of each 10-year period and identify whether his requirements were still those which he had at the beginning, or reasonably close. I think you would recognize that as being a reasonable proposition.

**MR. WIEBE:** — O.K. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, yes I can certainly agree with that concept, if the individual, when he does renew his lease or sign his lease is of the understanding that in 10 years hence that lease will be renewed.

The question I have now which leads from that is that, say, for example, you decide to adopt this policy, say for 1979. An individual's lease comes up, will he automatically be granted the renewal of that lease with the provision being put in the renewal at that time, that 10 years hence it will be renewed or will it be renewed at the time that lease expires next year?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, our intent is to have an automatic renewal unless there was a circumstance at the end of the 10 year period; unless there was a circumstance such as him having disperse of most of his livestock and he doesn't need the land base anymore, or having acquired another huge land base. Those kinds of things could take it away from him but under ordinary circumstances it would be an automatic renewal unless there were those kinds of circumstances.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Now, just a minute. Would that apply then, for example, say you put this policy into effect for 1979, it is not in effect for this year. I understand that the normal procedure now is that if a lease comes up for renewal, there is some investigation of the lease but about 99 per cent of the time it is automatically just extended for a further period of time.

If you put that policy in this year to go into effect next year and if someone's lease comes up for renewal next year, are you going to say, O.K. your lease is coming up for renewal? We are going to apply the same policy as we did the year before, which is normal, but we are going to put a rider in your new lease now that there is going to be a review of that lease periodically from that point in time on. The point that I am trying to make is that the individual who presently does have a lease, does not know that this stipulation is there and has not governed himself accordingly, whereas it is going to give him an opportunity to govern himself according if he knows that in future years that stipulation is in his lease.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Really what we are looking at is a longer term lease with a review. We are not saying, renewal. He may not have to renew it at all. It will just be review at the end of 10 years to see that his circumstances still remain reasonably the same. So he would not have to renew every 10 years but simply review.

**MR. WIEBE:** — I go along with that and I agree with that 100 per cent, but . . .

**MR. KAEDING:** — The policy hasn't been announced yet but it will take effect on any renewals after that announcement is made.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Now, just as second. O.K. any renewals that take place after that announcement date. Will that policy affect the individual renewal that someone has had, say for the last 20 years? Say, for example, that I have leased land that comes up for renewal in 1979 and I have had it for a 20 year lease. When that comes up for renewal are you going to use the criteria of the new policy in determining that lease or will you automatically grant me renewal of that lease under present conditions with the



stipulations written in that lease that there will be that periodic review?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, existing leases will not be affected until they come up for renewal. And when they come up for renewal, then the new lease which there will get at that point in time will have that clause in it, the review clause in it. I think that is what you are getting at it.

**MR. WIEBE:** — That's good then. So in effect then, if my lease came up next year and I had four quarters of lease, I would not have to worry about that lease being posted and competing for it? I would be granted a renewal of that lease, but then say, for example, I find in my contract with my renewal that I have to be careful in regard to expanding my operations because it could be subject to review later on. Now, that aspect of it, I agree. I think that to initiate the policy — the policy is good as long as the individual knows that he will be subject to renewal. That part of it I accept and I hope that renewal, the stringent rules of the renewal, will not take effect when someone comes up for renewal for the second time at this point in time. He is going to have the opportunity for the renewal and then the new guidelines will apply for the next lease which he signs. Is that my understanding of it?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Of course every time there is renewal, and you are talking now about existing leases, every time there is a renewal there is a review anyway. That always takes place before another renewal is granted. In this case now, they will be given longer term leases and then just be subject to review at 10-year intervals.

So the existing policies will come up for renewal. They will be looked at when they run out, but when they sign the new renewal agreement then they will be automatically reviewed. It is not any different than it is right now.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Chairman, could you tell us in your budgetary projections or in budgeted expenditures for this year, what grants are contained in them for farm organizations? I don't mean every trifling little grant that you may make, but what basic farm organizations do you support in terms of grants like Stockgrowers or Western Canada Cow-Calf or you know . . . Would you just briefly tell us what farm organizations you support financially or with grants and how much money you provide them with?

**MR. KAEDING:** — In terms of direct farm organizations, we are not funding any direct farm organizations. We are funding things like Livestock Association and Poultry Councils and those sorts of things. We are supporting, for instance, certain funding for projects for other organizations and so on but direct funding to organizations — none, in terms of actual organizations.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, you are saying that there is no such thing as say, an outright grant to Palliser or an outright grant in any form to say, the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers and organizations like that. I don't specifically mean them, but you do none of that? Do I understand you correctly?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, that is right.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, would you tell us the funding that you do indirectly, your larger ones?

**MR. KAEDING:** — There is \$30,000 to 4H Clubs for competitions or completion of projects, etc., \$1,500 for the provincial 4H Council, \$1,000 for the Royal Fair,

\$18,000 for Canadian Western Agribition, \$1,000 for Poultry Council, \$18,000 for Livestock Association, Furbreeders Association . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — Which livestock association was that, Mr. Minister?

**MR. KAEDING:** — The Saskatchewan Livestock Association, \$18,000, the Furbreeders' Association, \$1,000, the Horticultural Society's Association, \$1,000, Agricultural Society's Association, \$1,000, the Manitoba Provincial Exhibition Livestock Show, \$5,500 (and that is a kind of reciprocal arrangement we have between Manitoba and Saskatchewan with regard to Agribition), and a \$30,000 grant to the National Farmers' Union for a leadership training program which they have undertaken.

**MR. THATCHER:** — That would just happen to be at the bottom of the list. Mr. Minister, would you tell us, in such laudable projects as 4H, 4H Council, Royal Winter Fair, Agribition, Saskatchewan Livestock Association, would you tell us what laudable program the National Farmers' Union is up to in the leadership - -what did you call it? Leadership . . . never mind, spare me. Just tell me what it is.

**MR. KAEDING:** — They identified a project under which they are undertaking a project of leadership of young people to be able to handle meetings and that kind of training program that they have. It is well documented and we have a report from the previous one which they undertook and it is a well-documented program and I think, a fairly well run program. It does help to develop leadership in the community and anyone is eligible to enter those kinds of leadership programs.

(inaudible interjection)

**MR. THATCHER:** — Yes, I think I have about four in my constituency in total. I think we have — what, about 100 in the whole province?

Mr. Minister, now . . . all right, \$30,000 to the National Farmers' Union. You are a member of the Farmers' Union and you make no secret about it — fine and dandy — fair enough, but what has the NFU got in their particular field that Saskatchewan Stockgrowers don't have? What have they got that the Palliser Wheat Growers don't have? Why the National Farmers' Union? For goodness sakes, we have farm organizations all over Saskatchewan. Some of them are very, very good and some of them are — well, let's say they have a different philosophy. Obviously I have my biases and my prejudices and the ones that I like the best and I think are doing the best job — you have obviously got yours, but tell me, the NFU is singled out over Palliser, over Saskatchewan Stockgrowers, over so many other worthy farm organizations for \$30,000. Now, Mr. Minister, how in goodness sakes can you justify an outright grant under the guise of a phoney thing like leadership or whatever you call the blasted thing?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, this grant is based on a well-documented program which they have outlined to us and we are expecting to hold to that program. It is not available to them for espousing their philosophies or whatever; it is definitely designed for a particular leadership training program and if they don't hold to that certainly they won't get another grant.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, will you table the results, will you table the details of the programs, will you table whatever documents, over the past two years in this Assembly, of your relationship with the National Farmers' Union and this \$30,000 grant?

**MR. KAEDING:** — This is not an ongoing grant. This is on an individual project a base and, yes, we can table it for you, the proposal which was put to the department on that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think we can do that. I think, if I recall, I've got a complete report of what they undertook the year before.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, can we expect the tabling of this report before the end of the Agriculture Estimates? Obviously, we are not going to get through all of the items by 5:00 o'clock, can we expect tabling before your estimates receive passing of this Assembly.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, I think we can give you that before the end of the estimates.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now, Mr. Minister, first we have centred on the National Farmers' Union for a \$30,000 grant for leadership, would the minister agree that we have some other worthwhile organizations in this province? Let's just take one at random, let's say the Palliser Wheat Growers, a group of grain farmers that have a particular purpose in mind, a particular objective in mind, a group of independent farmers who, with no government assistance whatsoever, have probably done more accurate studies of problems at the West Coast, more precise documentation of problems of grain-handling and grain transportation going to the West Coast than any government agency, any railroad and probably any other organization. Mr. Minister, this is an organization that — certainly they have their far-out people — but they are an organization, Mr. Minister, that probably more precisely defined the bottlenecks, the horror stories, that our grain must go through as it leaves the prairie provinces for its ultimate destination to the terminals at the West Coast, they are probably an organization that finally wakened many people in this province up, to some of the mythology that was being fed to the farmers in western Canada by the railways, by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Minister, whether or not you agree entirely with the philosophy of Palliser is immaterial. But nonetheless, Mr. Minister, I think you would concede that they have very borrowed point of view, which represents a good deal of grain farmers in this province.

Now, Mr. Minister, how are they differentiated from the National Farmers' Union? The National Farmers' Union gets \$30,000, what does the Palliser get? Or why doesn't Palliser get a comparable grant?

Now, Mr. Minister, I am sure that you are going to tell me that you paid for a banquet, maybe; that you picked up the tab for a banquet somewhere, so spare us that one. But what differentiates one from the other?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I am kind of glad you asked that question, because the evidence is here. In 1975 we provided \$10,000 to Palliser Wheat Growers for our utility wheat research and they applied for that on a reasonable basis. They put their case and it was granted. So they got for that particular project and we also have the results of that program. We have that and we can table that as well.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the Minister's comments to the question from the member for Thunder Creek.

Would the minister agree, that all farm organizations offering to give a leadership program to its members in a similar kind of fashion as that of the National Farmers'

Union would be granted a similar grant from the government of Saskatchewan immediately upon their application to you?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Every request would have to be judged on its own merits and, certainly, we wouldn't agree that we would fund anybody just because they were putting in a project.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite obviously make my point to the minister. Would the minister agree, today, that if an identical program of leadership training was sent in by any other farm organization, that the farm organization would get the same grant as the National Farmers' Union.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I point out, again, that what we need to do is have a proposition. You can't really deal on hypothetical cases. We want to have a proposition.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the facts are that the minister's so-called leadership training program is nothing more than an arrangement to bail out the farm organization that is dying for lack of funds, for lack of members. They have raised their membership fees to \$100. They are travelling around the province of Saskatchewan to a very great extent, some members of the executive are travelling around the province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, the comments coming across the floor now are certainly extremely intelligent. The fact is that the NFU for the last three years have submitted so-called leadership training programs to the government of the province of Saskatchewan, and have been authorized grants this year for \$30,000. My question to the minister is quite simply this. The leadership training for the limited membership of the National Farmers Union could conceivably be carried on by other farm organizations. The Flax Growers Association, the Rape Seed Growers Association, all of these organizations could carry on leadership training programs. And if the minister is saying that the leadership training program of National Farmers' Union is a terrific program, and is an obviously continuing kind of program for the government, because it has been carrying on for some years, would the minister not accept the fact that other farm organizations should be encouraged to apply to the government of Saskatchewan for a grant for the same kind of leadership training program? In other words, should not the minister today, state to all the farm organizations, in order that the government of Saskatchewan appear to be fair, if you will (other farm organizations) submit an application to the Department of Agriculture for a leadership training program, the same NFU, you will get the grant? Don't you think that that is the way to make other farm organizations believe that your government is not backing one organization over another?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, we are not encouraging people to apply for these kinds of programs, but if they come forward with a reasonable proposal, we will review it. I put it as simply as that. We don't commit, in any case, funds. We have not committed to the National farmers Union ongoing funds, on this kind of a program. I might point out to the member that the Farmers' Union (as far as I am aware), don't restrict people coming into their leadership training program, to National Farmers Union members. It is an open kind of training program and they are, I am sure, welcoming anyone who that wants to come into it.

We have identified here a fair number of additional programs which we have provided funds for. We have, for instance, in 1975 a grant to Palliser Wheat Growers for a Korean trade mission. We have one here, flax seed growers' tour, flax processing plants, \$1.7 thousand beef breeding mission to Korea by the Saskatchewan Aberdeen Angus

Association, \$1.7 thousand — There are kinds of these kinds of programs which we have funded to try to develop ongoing program for some of these companies or groups.

**MR. COLLVER:** — But none of them were for leadership training. They were all for specific things like sending beef cattle for Korea or that kind of program. My question now is then, on what date did the National Farmers' Union apply for the grant for this forthcoming budget year in 1978 and 1979 and what date was this grant application received by your government? Will you table a copy of the grant application?

**MR. KAEDING:** — We do not have a request at the present time for another program. The program which is funded here is one which they undertook last year and we are running through this season.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, Mr. Chairman, so what you are saying is that the National Farmers' Union applied a year and a half ago, approximately, for a one-year grant program? Then the grant authorized in this budget, they would not have applied for last year. They would have applied for it two or three months ago to be included in the forthcoming budget, because this budget is for 1978-1979. Am I not correct there, Mr. Minister?

**MR. KAEDING:** — This budget contains no funding for the National Farmers' Union. This report which I gave you was . . .

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, and you are saying that there is no allocation or authorization budgeted for this year, 1978-1979, for the National Farmers Union. Is that correct?

**MR. KAEDING:** — We have no commitment to the National Farmers' Union for an ongoing program this year.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Do you have any requests for money from the National Farmers' Union for grants of one kind or another for the fiscal year of 1978-79?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, we do not have a request at the present time.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Minister, do you have any grants requested from the Department of Agriculture for the current 1978-1979 fiscal year that have been allowed for in this budget, or conversely, have you got any moneys allowed for in this budget, out of which you would make grants such as the grants for the cattle to go to Korea, the grant to the National Farmers' Union and so on. If so, how much have you got allowed for in this budget for that kind of grant?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, we have a figure of \$30,000 which is available for funding of miscellaneous organizations and requests.

**MR. COLLVER:** — So the minister is saying he has a \$30,000 budget in this total Agriculture Budget for miscellaneous requests and that the National Farmers' Union might be one of them and might not, but he doesn't presently have an application on his desk or in the department from the National Farmers' Union for any funds for 1978-79 and only \$30,000 is being allocated in this budget?

**MR. WIEBE:** — Just go on to a different field. I would like to spend a few moments on a

question which I raised during question period yesterday with the Minister of Agriculture regarding a recommendation which SFA made to Cabinet in regard to a problem which could occur to producers of livestock products within Saskatchewan as a result of a dispute arising between labour and management. I am referring to the request made by SFA that the government establish a broadly representative committee to look into the whole question of strikes in what they consider essential services. I would like to rather limit that to essential services within the agricultural sector and we can use the recent dairy strike as an example. As I said earlier, as a rule the innocent third party, who in this case were the dairy producers, were really left out in the cold with no bargaining power, no say whatsoever in regard to that particular dispute. What I would like to suggest to the minister is that he take a very serious look at the request made by SFA and does go ahead and establish such a committee, a committee which could consider of, I would recommend, members from government, members from labour as well as members from some of the agricultural organizations throughout the province of Saskatchewan as well as some representatives from management as well. A committee to make recommendations that would not be binding on the government of Saskatchewan but a committee that could study the situation with recommendations as to possible guidelines that the government could use in the event that a situation does occur again such as what happened in regard to that particular dairy strike.

I think it is something that we are going to have to look at ; we are going to have to face quite sincerely. I think it is a sincere recommendation made by SFA and it is one that, I think, does not jeopardize your government's position in regard to relationship between labor and management with the province of Saskatchewan. All that they are asking and we are asking is that you set up a committee, comprised of labor and these other areas to just take a look at the situation to see if there is a better way.

As I mentioned in my debate in regard to the Dairy Producers' strike, this Legislature and the government is basically the only support, or the only individuals, or groups that the Dairy Producers in that case could turn to. They did not have an organization that was present at the bargaining table to fight or debate on their behalf. So in turn they had to appeal to us and it is going to be the government or the Legislature that is going to have to deal with the situations if they arise again in the future. I think it is a concrete recommendation made by SFA. It is one that, as I said earlier, we are going to have to take a serious look at.

I was very interested in some of the comments made by yourself, yesterday, on televisions in regard to the brief. You indicated, at that time, that you did not feel that there could be anything gained by adopting the suggestion made by SFA. I think we have a lot to gain by adopting that suggestion. We could set up a committee that could look into this, that in no way would jeopardize the position of your government. You never know, by setting up that particular committee, with labor involved in the committee, with management involved, with government members involved (not government MLAs, as such but members from within the civil service,) as well as members from farm organizations, you never know we could come up with a solution that none of us have thought of as yet. It could be a solution that could be acceptable to labor; it could be acceptable to management and could be acceptable to all the other groups concerned.

I think that under those kind of guidelines which I have suggested, I would certainly hope that the minister would reconsider the position which he took yesterday and take a serious look at the recommendations which I have presented. I would like to

emphasize the point, Mr. Minister, move a resolution by myself, and seconded by Mr. Nelson, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg:

That this Committee recommend to the government, acceptance of the SFA proposal to establish a broadly representative committee, in the interest of better public relations between Labour, Industry, Producers and Government, to investigate and recommend on workable guidelines, to provide settlements in essential and perishable product industries.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to downplay the seriousness of the motion which is before us, but I think that in our discussions with the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, we looked at this when we talked about it, and there is no doubt there are innocent third parties involved in many of these strike situations and we need to look back to the situation which happened at the West Coast a couple of years ago but they did agree with us that, generally speaking, this needs to be approached at a wider level than just at a provincial level. We suggested to them that they should be looking at and trying to get some kind of co-ordination of labor-management relations in all fields on a national level and there was some agreement the part of the Federation of Agriculture that that is the level at which they should be working. That is not to say that there may not be areas on the provincial level which we could be looking at but I do believe that, in the main, the problems are on a wider than provincial level and I think we should allow the SFA — in fact, they will be taking that position I believe in going to a more national effort in this regard — to try to develop a capacity on the national level to deal with labor-management relations. I think again that when you go back to what actually happened in this particular strike, although there were some real tense moments and there were a few people who lost a few dollars, that the efforts that were made and the kind of co-operation that we all got around was very good. Had we gone to some kind of a compulsory resolution of that issue even if it had been simply to have a cooling off period or whatever, that really the only other mechanism I could see that could have happened, then we would have had bad feelings all around. This way we've got the thing settled, I think very body is reasonably happy and no one has been hurt very much. So I suggest that at the present time the way it is operating it is probably as effective as anything we can do.

**MR. MALONE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a resolution that is an excellent resolution. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture when they met with our caucus did not indicate to us in anyway that there should be a broader body to study the problem. They were very pleased with the resolution that they had in their brief and they said to us that they hoped that we would support such a resolution. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the minister and to the Attorney General, we do support the resolution. There are some other people who support the resolution as well, Mr. Chairman. I think the Attorney General should know who those people are. Those people who belong to the Saskatchewan Milk Producers' Association support that resolution, Saskatchewan Swinebreeders' Association, the Saskatchewan Chicken Marketing Board, the Saskatchewan Commercial Egg Producers' Marketing Board, the Saskatchewan Turkey Producers' Marketing Board, Dairy Producers' Co-operative Ltd., the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the United Grain Growers Ltd., Co-op Hail, Federated Co-operatives Limited, SARM, Saskatchewan Municipal Hail Association, Saskatchewan Women's Institute.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that those who vote against this particular resolution, are voting against these organizations. They are going to be demonstrating in a very real way, Mr. Chairman, if they vote against the resolution, that they don't care about the

Wheat Pool; they don't care about SARM; they don't care about United Grain Growers. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that those who dare to vote against this resolution are going to be asking for a continuation of the existing situation; a continuation of labor strikes; labor management strikes. They are going to be asking, once again, for the Legislature to get involved in dealing with all labor disputes of a major nature.

Those who are in this House know full well how the milk strike was settled. It was settled because the Liberal party forced the government to get moving and settle it. We don't particularly like to be in that position. We want to avoid that situation from arising again, Mr. Attorney General.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution may be the start, may be the start of a process to bring about long standing labor-management peace. I suggest that those, Mr. Chairman, who vote against this resolution are simply there to oppose what the people of Saskatchewan have said in a very real way, through these organizations as to their wishes.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I hope the members in this House, all members in this House, will vote for this resolution and we can get on with doing the job of making sure that labor gets a fair deal; and, perhaps, most important of all, the innocent third party is protected from further disruption of their lives.

I am sure members opposite agree with that philosophy. I am sure that they will be pleased to join with these organizations and support the resolution that has been proposed by the member for Morse.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Order please. The member for Regina Rosemont.

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):** — Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to say a few words on this particular resolution. What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that when suggestions for labor and management peace come from the Liberal caucus, I am always suspect. I am always suspect.

I think that the people in those farm organizations were sincere likely in their belief that they are having a number of different problems and they think that maybe we will sit down and talk about. That is right. The Attorney General says you put it in the hands of the Liberals and you ruin it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ALLEN:** — If you look across this country — Look at the post office! Just look at the post office as an example of Liberal answers to solving labor-management problems. Every six months we have a strike in the post office. Why, why is this?

The reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the Liberal Party is opposed to working people. Working people in this country know that. They do not trust the Liberal Party and the people in the post office do not trust the Liberal government. They know what they would do in those workers as soon as look at them and our own province, Mr. Speaker. we've seen the Liberal's answer to labor-management problems. Their answers are — Bill 2. Bill 2 wasn't good enough for them. I remember the 1971 election, their answer there was labor court, for an independent labor court. We are going to sit down reasonably and listen to the workers' problems and then tell them to go to blazes. That's been the



record of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, and when they come into this House and suggest that they can talk reasonably in terms of labour-management relations, well, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that that's ridiculous.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, on this particular motion, as the Minister of Agriculture said, this is a national problem this is a problem that we have had with us for along time.

**MR. CAMERON:** — The milk strike was a national problem?

**MR. ALLEN:** — The milk strike is only one little part of a national problem that we have had in this country and the problem is basically this, that the Liberal party and those who have supported the Liberal Party traditionally, have been against working people and have shown themselves to be against working people. That has built up a friction in the country and now we have a situation where we have to remove Liberals everywhere if we are going to be able to solve the very difficult labour relations problem that we have in this country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — . . . attempts to throw up a smoke screen as he did yesterday, to try to get an issue out of something that was no issue at all. He should have learned a lesson yesterday. He took a bit of a shellacking and it seems that he does not learn a lesson easily.

Certainly this dairy strike that has gone on here a few days ago is just one problem. But it was a problem right there at home, and I think the Minister of Agriculture should have learned a lesson from them to try to see that it does not happen again. There was thousands of dollars lost in that and certainly, many individuals lost very much money. Now, the member for Rosemont said it is a very little thing. It wasn't a very little thing for those young farmers that were ready to go bankrupt! It wasn't a very little thing for their wife and their kids that are going to have to go without a lot of things because of the thousands of dollars they lost! It might be little thing for him, as union organizer, to go out so that he can get more pay for the union heads, but it is time that we quit wasting food as was done.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON (As-Gr):** — The Minister of Agriculture seems to O.K. the waste of milk being dumped onto the steps of the Legislature. There was only one other place they could have done that, and that was out on the manure pile at home. I think it's time that he sat down and took a good look at the agricultural industry and there has got to be a better way and it is time that you started looking for that better way and stopped hiding.

Read the resolution and you will see the better way, Mr. Attorney General. Quit waving your hands and shouting and read the resolution and let it sink in.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON (As-Gr):** — I say that it is time that this doesn't happen again. I say it deserves the support of every member in this Legislature and I say it deserves the support the Attorney General and the fellow who is sitting beside him at this time too.

Mr. Chairman, is it now 5:00 o'clock?

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 o'clock p.m.