

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 9, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Report of Select Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures

THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY: — Mr. Skoberg, from the select standing committee on rules and procedures presents the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Skoberg as its chairman. Your committee has duly examined the undermentioned petitions for private bills and finds the provisions of rules 56, 57 and 60 have been fully complied with in each case: of Western Christian College of the city of Weyburn, of Congregation Agudus Israel of the city of Saskatoon, of Sisters of St. Martha of the city of Regina, of Montreal Trust Company and Montreal Trust Company of Canada, of the Northern Saskatchewan Co-operative Stockyards Limited, of Notre Dame College of the town of Wilcox, of Canadian Baptist Theological College of the city of Saskatoon.

MR. SKOBERG moved, seconded by Ms. Duncan.

That the first report of the select standing committee on rules and procedures be now concurred in.

Motion agreed.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of 30 high school students from Tisdale, the grades 10, 11 and 12 social studies classes. They have their teacher, Mr. Ted Degenstein with them and the bus driver, Betty Andrus, who is also a chaperone and Mr. Neil Burns from the Department of Co-ops. I hope their trip from Tisdale has been a good one and that they will enjoy their visit to the legislature. I look forward to meeting with you students this afternoon for pictures and refreshment. I hope you have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome through you a group of 15 grade 12 students from Clavet High School. They attempted to come here last week but the weather went against them. I'm glad to see they made it this week. I hope they enjoy their visit here and I'll be chatting with them later.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a few words of welcome to the students from Clavet School who are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Barnett. I hope that you find proceedings this afternoon interesting. I'm sure you will because my seatmate will be speaking very shortly. Have a good trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Impact of Removal of 2,4-D from Market

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture. I'm sure you are aware that the bleeding hear environmentalists are at it again and this time the target is 2,4-D. Mr. Minister, recently Agriculture Canada asked your department to do an impact study as to what the effects would be were 2,4-D taken off the market, as far as the Saskatchewan agricultural grain economy was concerned. I understand that your department has submitted a report concerning 2,4-D to the Department of Agriculture. Would you tell this Assembly exactly what you people found would be the economic impact on the removal of 2,4-D in terms of dollars and cents, on the farmers of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take note of the question from the hon. member. It may well be that the department has completed the study. It may well be in my office. I only say that I have not had an opportunity to look at the report if it is there. Until I do so, I simply cannot answer the question.

MR. THATCHER: — I accept that, Mr. Minister, but in my supplementary could I ask you a very general question as to the position of your government. I think it is generally accepted that 2,4-D, which is our cheapest and most effective herbicide, probably would conservatively cause losses of 15 to 20 per cent in yields in the prairie provinces. That's a conservative estimate. Mr. Minister, what is the position of your government? A loss of 15 to 20 per cent is tremendous in terms of dollars, if those figures are remotely accurate. In other words, Mr. Minister, my question very clearly to you is this: is your department prepared to battle the federal government over the issue, particularly when the evidence being put forward to ban 2,4-D is very flimsy, very remote, and has only recently been picked up in the most minute amounts by highly sophisticated techniques recently available?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, the position of the government is that the use of chemicals in agriculture is essential to crop production in this province. I don't think there is any question when you look at the past history that the benefits which have accrued from the use of chemicals are very, very obvious. Certainly anyone who came up through the Russian thistle days, anyone who has attempted to control wild oats, will see the merits of the use of chemicals in agriculture. I think in my remarks to the Assembly on the Speech from the Throne on Friday I indicated that that is one of the areas which will have to be pursued in terms of a program of expanding production in the province. It is an area which has to be researched and an area which has to be experimented in. that is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that while we take that position, there shouldn't be better testing of the chemicals before they are used in agriculture. We say that it is Ottawa's job to do the testing of those chemicals. It is not the province's job because the chemicals are used right across this country, and we have been arguing with Ottawa that it should proceed immediately to establish a suitable testing program so that farmers know where they are in the use of chemicals.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in your speech, I believe last Friday, you indicated that your department was monitoring the situation as far as 2,4-D is concerned. Can you tell this

Assembly whether your officials based on the evidence that the Agriculture Canada people have developed in terms of potential dioxin contamination, have made a recommendation to you to pass on to the Minister of Agriculture in cabinet? In short, my question is: have your officials decided whether 2,4-D is safe or not, based on the material available, or are they doing their usual procedure, still groping around and trying to determine if there really is an environment out there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the department has not made any recommendations to me for passing on to the Minister of Agriculture. They have not, at this point in time, concluded one way or the other the safety factor or the margins of safety, or whether or not there is a critical necessity to deal with the question of 2,4-D at this point in time, that is, so far as banning is concerned or otherwise. I want to indicate to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the decision basically with respect to the safety of 2,4-D will come from agriculture Canada, for they are the ones who license 2,4-D. The Minister of Agriculture Canada has already indicated his concern and the fact that he expects to have a decision for the public of Canada, including Saskatchewan I presume, before seeding of 1981.

Measures to Increase the Movement of Grain

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, whereas farmers net profits are declining and elevator companies' profits are inclining as a result of an increase in handling charges from 3.75 cents a bushel to 17.7 cents a bushel, from 1971 to present, and whereas we're in the midst of inflationary times, would you consider making representation to the Canadian Grain Commission, the elevator companies and the farmers, of course, who are concerned about this matter, and make proposals whereby the handling rate formula is revised to encourage the movement of grain as opposed to storage of grain?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I think I answered the same kind of question yesterday for the hon. member for Thunder Creek. If the hon. member for Moosomin would check the record, I indicated at that time that we do not have a position at this time. I did indicate that when a further request for an increase from the elevator companies or the grain handling companies comes before the board of grain commissioners, we would consider the situation.

I would point out to the hon. member that the grain handling companies will have to watch very closely their grain handling charges, because the producer has available to him the producer car and that will have some impact on the charges levied by the grain handling companies.

MR. BIRKBECK: — In light of the Minister of Agriculture's reply that he is going to go to make representation, why were you and your department not at the hearings when the elevator companies made representation to and requested the increase in the ceiling of the handling charges from the Canadian Grain Commission? That's one question that I would like you to answer.

Mr. Minister, I would also ask in the light of your long stand regarding the crowrate and increasing costs of handling grain, why you won't take a firm stand on this matter, as it takes as much money to dump grain 12 feet down an elevator pit as it does to haul it 1,200 miles. So, Mr. Minister, very simply, why don't you answer that question (the first

one) and the second question as well? Take a position on it.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say we were going to appear before the board of grain commissioners. I said that we would consider appearing. I point out to the hon. members that he may well have a position on the crowrate that's different from ours. Ours is very, very clear.

I point out to the hon. member as well, that the grain handling companies do have a responsibility to carry out in the movement of grain. It is providing the country elevator system. Perhaps the hon. member opposite does not support the position, which we support, of a strong country elevator system. Whether we should have it or not, we have the responsibility of providing terminal service and I think that has to be considered in any proposal for increases in elevator charges. As I indicated to the hon. member for Thunder Creek, we would consider that at their next request to the board of grain commissioners.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I think the question addressed to you was a question of priorities and it is simply: why do you and your government continue to dwell on an issue of the crowrate, when it is costing more money (as my colleague for Moosomin just indicated) to drop that grain 12 feet down into the pit to the leg (for those of you who don't know what a leg is, it's an elevator) than it does to truck that grain or take that grain by rail 1,200 miles?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, we take a strong position on the crowrate. We take it as a key priority in the grain handling and transportation system, because there are people in this country (I don't say they are in this House) and in this province who propose that the rate increase not by 2 per cent or 3 per cent, but by 5 or 6 or 7 times. Now if we don't take a position against that kind of gouging by the railways, we would be making a very serious mistake. If they think otherwise, that they should take a position in favor of the railways gouging the producers then that's fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — To bring the question period back into order, I might say that I get the distinct impression we are in a debate.

Implementation of Ward System for School Boards

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. I see there is continued great concern by the board members regarding the institution of the ward system. Do you not feel it is incumbent upon you, as Minister of Education, to meet with these elected officials to discuss the ward system that you are trying to implement in their jurisdictions?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I have never refused to meet with any school board that has asked to meet with me and I am certainly prepared to meet with any school board that wishes to discuss this issue.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary question. Why did you not meet with the school boards that are affected by this before you brought in your report?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I have met with school boards

which have asked to meet with me. School boards made submissions to Professor de Vlieger in the course of the preparation of his report. I think the school boards are now exhibiting certain opinions through the media. That is certainly their right and I don't intend to try to interfere with that right in any way. However, I cannot impose a meeting upon any school board. I will meet with the school board that asks to meet with me and I am quite prepared to do that as I indicated in my answer.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary. Mr. Minister, just two years ago, we had the White Paper on Education in this province which resulted in a new education act that was to calm the waters in education and make a better system. Will you not now agree that your inflexible position on the ward system is doing very little to create a good working atmosphere between the major urban boards in this province and the Department of Education?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — No. I will not agree at all. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have worked with the school boards in the urban centres of Saskatchewan as well as the rural centres. I think we have had some very successful and progressive developments. I would mention the community schools program which is developing in Saskatoon, Regina and Prince Albert through agreement of my department and me with these school boards as an indication of what is possible when we work together. I would say to the hon. member that I think the legislation with respect to education in Saskatchewan is always subject to evaluation and where that evaluation leads to a suggestion of change, I am not going to be one who is afraid to change if there is good reason for change. I would suggest to the hon. members that the case for the ward system established itself very well in Regina and Saskatoon. We have large cities which have grown very rapidly over the past few years due, I would say, to the very progressive policies of this government. I think with that kind of change we must be prepared to respond and one of the changes that will bring about an improved relationship between the elector and the representatives on the school board is to implement the ward system such as we have announced.

Suggested Appointments to Cabinet

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It is my understanding that the Premier still has not named the two vacancies that he has in the cabinet. Since he asked me yesterday for suggestions, has he considered the member for Regina Victoria for his cabinet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Are you ruling me out of order on that question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I am.

Tenders for Hopper Cars

MR. LANE: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the layoffs of 120 workers (out of 190 workers) at Westank-Willock yesterday, can the Minister of Agriculture please advise this Assembly why, when he placed an order for some \$50 million worth of hopper cars, no opportunity was given to the local Saskatchewan industries to apply and tender for that particular order? Would the minister not admit that if the tender had gone to Saskatchewan industries, such layoffs would not have

taken place?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will check back to the history of the purchase of the hopper cars and if he will look at the information that I provided to the hon. member for Souris-Cannington, the Leader of the Opposition, who has been kept up-to-date on the transactions relating to the hopper cars, the hon. member will recall that what the Government of Saskatchewan did, was to pick up an order that had been placed by the Canadian Wheat Board, an order involving some 2,000 cars. We picked up 1,000 of that order. The federal government and the province of Alberta picked up the other 1,000. That order has been placed with three companies: National Steel Care in Hamilton, and Hawker Siddeley which has plants in Trenton, Nova Scotia and Thunder Bay. Our 1,000 cars were assigned to the Hawker Siddeley plants and they will be shortly in production.

MR. LANE: — I'm sure central Canada is very happy with your policy of assisting central Canada in its time of need, but that certainly begs the question. Why did the Minister of Agriculture not insist, through the Canadian Wheat Board, that the \$50 million spent by the province of Saskatchewan on hopper cars be spent in the province of Saskatchewan to encourage the build-up of Saskatchewan industries? Secondly, will the Minister of Agriculture not admit that it would be highly advisable, since grain cars are predominantly a prairie need, that the industry supply that need should be here in the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I think I outlined the circumstances of the purchase. I think all hon. members would agree that there was a need at that time for the purchase of rolling stock to move the grain. I don't think they have raised a voice against that kind of proposition. If you are going to raise a voice, please do so now so that we can hear it. I don't view the purchase of hopper cars by the Government of Saskatchewan, through an arrangement with the Canadian Wheat Board for delivery of cars from Trenton and from Thunder Bay, as being from central Canada. I will say to the hon. member that, if the Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation should decide to purchase further hopper cars for the movement of grain, certainly the purchase would be considered in terms of which industries in western Canada are available to deliver those cars.

MR. LANE: — At least \$50 million of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money is being spent elsewhere. Will the minister not admit that his failure to take any action in that regard is, in fact, a disservice to the manufacturing industry of this province? Secondly, I suggest that it is a failure of the government opposite to do what it can to expand the manufacturing facility in this province. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Kinistino who feels that it's a laughing matter is, in fact, missing.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Policy of Saskatchewan Government re Use of Chemicals

MR. PREBBLE: — Question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker. In light of the findings by the National Research Council a few short years ago that some 20 per cent of farmers and grain elevator operators in Saskatchewan when interviewed were suffering ill effects after seasonal spraying of 2,4-D, and in light of the problems which have recently come to light with respect to the link between the use of lindane and cancer, is it not time for the Government of Saskatchewan to pursue a policy of systematically encouraging not the elimination but the reduced application of 2,4-D

and other chemicals which are suspect with respect to safety in this province, and to promote research in the area of biological and cultural control of pests?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the issue to be addressed by the Government of Saskatchewan and by all those interested in seizing the opportunity that the province of Saskatchewan has, in terms of agriculture production, is to address the issue of production. I agree with the hon. member that in the research and experimentation on expanded production in the province of Saskatchewan, there has to be consideration given to the use of chemicals. I agree with the hon. member that in the examination and experimentation we should look at different ways of increasing production. It may well be we can reduce the level of chemicals, but it may well be that we cannot reduce the use of chemicals. But whatever chemicals are used by farmer's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to skate with the hon. member for Regina, the lawyer from Regina, any time — the member for Qu'Appelle.

I think that the hon. member for Saskatoon makes a good point. Before further chemicals are used by producers they should be properly tested and that's what we are asking the federal government to do. The Minister of Agriculture, according to our Minister of the Environment, has responded and will say to us and to producers whether 2,4-D is safe for us this coming spring.

MR. PREBBLE: — One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that we are facing a cancer epidemic, as I see it, right across the country and escalating cancer rates here in Saskatchewan and it is now known that 70 to 90 per cent of cancer is environmentally caused (obviously agricultural chemicals are one possible cause), would the minister not agree, since the federal government is not acting to test the chemicals we are concerned about, we should set up testing facilities here in Saskatchewan to look at the testing of chemicals of special concern to Saskatchewan farmers?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, it may well be, as the hon. member points out the Saskatchewan government will have to do some testing. I don't think that is so, given the commitment of the federal Minister of Agriculture. I think we should allow the federal Minister of Agriculture to assume his responsibilities and do the testing and report on the basis of that testing, before this government makes any move toward testing.

Taxation of Payments Through Options North Program

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kindersley raised some matters yesterday on which I took notice. I would like to report to the House and to the hon. member with regard to the matters he raised which were given such prominence in the media yesterday.

My office has been in contact with Revenue Canada, both the minister's office in Ottawa and the office of the director of taxation, the district office in Regina. They have advised that the allegations made by the member for Kindersley are totally false and without substance. I point out to the Assembly that I received a call today from the chairperson of the Options North students association. She, like the others in Regina, is writing final examinations. While they are naturally concerned with the allegations made yesterday, I assured her (and I want to assure the other students now, as well as members of the Assembly) that Revenue Canada is not investigating the Options North program.

I have also been in touch with the provincial auditor and while he has indicated that the allowances paid under this program may, in his opinion, be taxable, he has asked us to provide him with a copy of Revenue Canada's ruling. I point out to the House that on more than one occasion in the past, officials of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have been advised by Revenue Canada that these allowances are tax exempt. This will be communicated to the provincial auditor.

I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the allegations raised by the hon. member for Kindersley are nothing more than a continuation of a direct attack on native people and native employees of the Government of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Minister's Knowledge of Las Vegas Trip

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the minister. I think time will tell, Mr. Minister, whether or not there is investigation. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: last week you indicated to the Chamber, or to the media outside the Chamber, that you were unaware that various members were going to Las Vegas.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if the Chamber could restore some order and decorum so we can get the last question out of the way.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Minister last Friday you indicated your were complete unaware of the situation relating to the two employees going to Las Vegas. Would you not now admit, Mr. Minister, that all along you were aware of this situation, that Mr. Dagdick, the person you claimed made an oversight, is in fact your landlord and that you have been misleading this House all along?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if we can return the order and decorum so we can get the last answer out of the way.

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I suggest that the hon. member for Kindersley, before he places himself on the vanguard of morality, would do well to check his own back yard. The statements of Friday that he imputes to me are false. I would suggest that before members opposite attack native employees of the Government of Saskatchewan for taking two days vacation on their own time, they look at the member for Qu'Appelle who has not (as I have not) attended one meeting of the special committee on rules and procedures to date and who is proposing to travel on a tax . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Point of Order on Question Period

MR. COLLVER: — Before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of order. I think a point of order, at this time, is particularly necessary.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the operation of a government than the cabinet ministers who are named by a premier.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will caution the member that I want to hear what the point of order is. I don't want to hear a debate, because I can't get into it, unfortunately.

So I just want to hear what the point of order is.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to give you the point of order as briefly as possible.

As I said, nothing is more important. Today, and every time, which is four times since this session started, you have ruled me out of order when I asked a question about the Premier's appointments to his cabinet, which have not been forthcoming. Mr. Speaker, I believe that to be in appropriate and ill-advised. That's my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I have what the member is talking about. I have ruled the member out of order four times, if that is what he says, because I had four good reasons for ruling him out of order. I'm going to deal only with the reason that I used today to rule him out of order. As for the other three, he should have raised them when I ruled him out of order. He's a little late with those.

Now with regard to today, questions that are raised in the Legislative Assembly in the oral question period are governed by the rules that are set down for this question period. The rules are quite clear. Questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance to require an immediate answer. Further, it stays in Beauchesne's, Fourth Edition, citation 171(a):

A question: oral or written must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain epithet, innuendo, satire, or ridicule.

They must not "be trivial, vague, or meaningless."

By citing this ruling I'm not suggesting for a moment that the selection of cabinet members is trivial, vague, or meaningless. I'm suggesting to the member that that is the purview of the Executive Council and the chairman of the Executive Council and is not the purview of any leader of the opposition — or the leader of another body in the Chamber.

I think the member has the intent of my ruling.

MR. COLLVER: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Premier himself invited my suggestions for his cabinet. Second, Mr. Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — We're getting into the debate now. Members every day are inviting other members to do any number of things. That has nothing to do with the rules of this Assembly. If a member were foolish enough to accept an invitation from the Premier to suggest names for his cabinet, that is his problem. The decision is the Premier's decision, and it's not something that is going to occupy the question period in this House — unless the members wish to change the question period. I'll be quite willing to deal with it if the rules are changed with regard to the question period.

MR. COLLVER: — You still have not given your reasons. Either it's not important or it's trivial. Now, I prefer to accept Mr. Speaker's ruling that it's either not important or it's trivial — either one. But for goodness sake, give a reason for your ruling!

MR. SPEAKER: — I think if the member is to go back and read the transcript of what just transpired he will see that I cited the rules that govern the question period. One of the

rules I cited was that questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer. For that reason the member was ruled out of order.

They should also not be trivial, vague, or meaningless. I think that was the category the question was in. It was just absorbing the time of the question period in a meaningless way.

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, suggested during his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order. The member is debating my ruling . . .

MR. TAYLOR: — Is it not a rule in this House, Mr. Speaker, that when you are on your feet the members are to be in their seats? Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I appreciate the member's interest in the order of the Chamber. That touches me deeply, and I'm very glad to deal with the matter.

Now the practice over the years, as I have observed it, is that when the Speaker is up saying something there is nothing to prevent a member's getting up and leaving the Chamber. I think at certain times when the Speaker is entering or leaving the Chamber there is a more rigid form followed. I know the members sometimes lapse from observing that form of decorum but I am not aware, over the years, that there is anything to prevent a member from rising and talking to another member . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order! Let's get back to the decorum here.

Rule 18, which refers to decorum in subsection 2, says:

When Mr. Speaker is putting a question, no member shall enter, walk out of or across the Assembly, or make any noise or disturbance.

I'm glad I had the opportunity to quote that rule.

MR. COLLVER: — The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that it is the tradition of this Assembly and all other assemblies that the Speaker shall give a reason for his rulings.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of your information today you cited two rules. After the first rule you cited you said, 'I don't want to suggest that the choosing of cabinet ministers is not important,' thereby overruling your own statement. After the second ruling you cited you said, 'I do not want to suggest that the matter is not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I don't want to spend endless time on this. The member is debating my ruling. I have made my ruling. I think it is quite clear.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I had a very simple point of order: you indicated in your ruling that because the choice of cabinet ministers pertained to the Executive Council we, on this side of the House, did not have the right to raise that question in question period. And very respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I say a ruling like that is unadulterated balderdash. We have the right to ask the Premier why he hasn't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the member is overly emotional about this situation. It is meaningless for the member for Nipawin to occupy the time of the question period, which is supposed to be for matters of urgency and importance, by

suggesting who should be in the cabinet to the Premier. I think that is exactly what the member for Nipawin was doing. And that is meaningless use of the question period, and I don't think the rules permit that.

GOVERNMENT MOTION

Bylaws of Professional Societies

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I move, seconded by the member for Regina North-East, by leave of the Assembly:

That the bylaws of the professional societies and amendments thereto, tabled after March 18, 1980 as addenda to sessional paper no. 7, 1979-80, and the bylaws tabled as session paper no. 5, 1980-81, plus addenda tabled to date, be referred to the special committee on regulations.

Motion agreed.

On the Orders of the Day

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2 — Celebrate Saskatchewan

MR. PEPPER moved, seconded by Mr. Chairman:

That this Assembly commend the people of Saskatchewan in hundreds of participating communities for their boundless enthusiasm and involvement in making Celebrate Saskatchewan, 1980 a memorable success, and further that this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for its exemplary leadership in marking Saskatchewan's 75th year in confederation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before the assembly this resolution commending the thousands of Saskatchewan people, especially the volunteers, who contributed to the success of the celebration of our province's 75th year in confederation.

There may be those who regard this resolution as unimportant, as window-dressing but I say to you, sir, it is not put forward in that fashion. Quite the contrary. To me it represents an opportunity to deal with some rather serious business, and I hope my remarks will demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, why I feel and I think this to be the case. First, I believe it would be a serious oversight for the members of this Chamber to neglect to register their satisfaction and high compliments to those people responsible for carrying off a year-long program of this nature — virtually, Mr. Speaker, without a hitch in it. When we look back over the year and evaluate it, we have to regard it as an unqualified success. I think that each of us can say that of practically every community we represent here.

About 870 communities held special events or sponsored projects numbering more than 3,600. More than 7,300 committee members were involved in planning and organizing these events and projects and literally tens of thousands of people. Mr. Speaker, took part and celebrated our anniversary. I am sure that all members will join

with me in saluting all those people for what I would say is a job well done. But we salute as well those people in the corporation who had a hand in helping to organize such a successful year of events.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as serious as I am about registering these compliments to all involved in the organization, I put forward this motion for a second and equally important reason.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, allows us as members to reflect and to evaluate more than just the past twelve months' celebration and the events within those twelve months. It allows us to reflect and evaluate where we have been as a society in the past, and to take stock of where we are now, and to look forward to the kind of society that we wish to shape or to see 20 or 25 years — or even longer — ahead of us. So, Mr. Speaker, I regard that as important business. It is important from the provincial — some might say parochial — point of view. It's just as important when we include our vision of the future of our country.

We do well to reflect on our past. It most assuredly is no waste of time, because it helps us to understand ourselves better as individuals. It gives us insights into the kind of community, yes the kind of society, that we have built. There is likely an element of truth in the statement that those who don't know history are doomed to repeat the failures of the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to suggest that I reject trial and error or experience as a good teacher, far from it. There is nothing wrong with making mistakes, unless we don't learn from them. We ought to be able, by examining our own past and not that of our ancestors, to avoid at least the most obvious of the pitfalls that may lie ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, we should look at the origins and the history of our people, for I believe there are some important judgments that we can make about our future dispositions.

We should know and understand the developments of some of our major institutions — those things that caused us to shape them as they have been, are and need to be, to meet people's needs. We need a healthy appreciation of our institutions of government.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that other members may wish to organize their examination of our roots in a different fashion and that's all right. But I make this examination to register my concerns about issues that I regard as important to us as we face our future, as we traditionally have, with confidence, with a strong provincial sense of self-reliance and with a positive attitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we speak of our people, we need to focus on that period of our history that began with the British and the European settlements, just a little more than 100 years ago. French explorers were the first Europeans to come to our province in 1731, accompanied by missionaries. The initial wave of French immigrants occurred between 1890 and 1914. The 1971 census figures suggest that about 5 to 6 per cent of our present-day population can trace their roots to French soil. Today, Mr. Speaker, these people are proud of their heritage and actively promote it through the Franco-Canadian Cultural Association.

Now, the British, Mr. Speaker, were the next major group of immigrants, and taken together, their descendants might comprise 30 per cent of today's Saskatchewan

people.

I believe it was the turn of the twentieth century that saw the beginning of the great influx of central and eastern European settlers. In today's terms, perhaps 20 to 22 per cent of our people can trace their ancestry to Germanic roots, 16 per cent to Slavic, 10 per cent to other origins such as Scandinavian and so on.

Mr. Speaker, as they came, they took up allegiance to their new-found country. But the pattern of settlement was such that the face of Saskatchewan became a fine tapestry woven from the fabric of an old world. The speed of the settlement and the pattern meant that many of the different ethnic and cultural or religious groupings were able to preserve their heritage through family, church and social organizations. It was not until the end of the first quarter of the twentieth-century until this situation underwent a great upheaval. Conditions of the times resulted in an attempt to use the schools and other institutions to rigidly Anglicize, or Americanize, the whole society. In today's context, it's worth noting that this move, when it was seen for what it was, was soundly rejected at the first opportunity.

The people of Saskatchewan freely elected or opted for a society which is a mosaic of our ethnic and cultural heritage. Our province proudly displays that today. I would say that they rejected the melting-pot notion so frequently used to describe our fine southern neighbors. Nearly 50 years ago, the Saskatchewan people opted for what in today's terms we might call unity in diversity, what in yesterday's and today's terms we can still call tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, it is this tolerance that we need to reach out and find again today as we celebrate our 75th anniversary in confederation. We need to find that tolerance in abundance — yes, right here in our own back yard.

I mentioned earlier in my remarks that when we describe our people, we tend to focus on or think of the white population. And we are by far the majority. Yet let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that less than 150 years ago, this land and all of its riches belonged to several different groups of people who we now lump together and describe as natives. Anywhere between 15 to 20 per cent of our population can only trace their roots to right here, to this soil. And it has to sadden all of us, and I say it should concern all of us, when we consider their share, their lot as a people in what today is a fairly affluent society in our province.

There may be those whose concern it is to fix their attention on whether or not our affluence, or to put it in another term, our per capita income (or whatever measurement you like to take), can match our neighbors to the west or in Ontario or elsewhere. I don't criticize, but I do think it's of equal importance to concern ourselves with how well we do at sharing, at spreading around those considerable benefits we do enjoy. Nowhere, and with no other groups in our society, is this more required than with respect to how well we treat our native population. This is an area requiring great tolerance from all of us and an abundance of it. I say to you that we need to get on with the job before our next 75th birthday to be sure.

Mr. Speaker, the new people who came here to put down roots faced great adversity. They had to be a sturdy lot and they had to be innovative. About that there can certainly be no doubt. But when you review our history there is another thread that runs through it in almost every story and in almost every community. That thread is the story of how well our forefathers banded together to help each other meet and deal with the tough conditions that they faced. It is that spirit of co-operation, practised out of necessity by

the first settlers, which formed the basis for birth and development of our more formal co-operative organization in later years when our people were put to yet another severe test in the depression years.

That spirit of co-operation resulted in our people building for themselves what today is some of our strongest institutions, instead of accepting the institutions serving comparable needs which someone from outside might have wanted to sell us. I'm referring to our farm pools, our consumer co-op organizations, our credit unions and a host of other community and/or co-operative-styled organizations. They are in every community and they represent a very good part of commercial Saskatchewan. I say to you that it is partly because of necessity and partly because of that early forced disposition to work together.

I guess I could say that the development of our entire school system could be viewed in the same or a comparable manner as the development of our co-operative systems. Again, in large part due to necessity. I use as an example the institution of the larger school units in the late '40s at the instigation of the late Woodrow Lloyd who recognized that people wanted changes and improvements in education that the small school district just couldn't supply. So it was through co-operation among themselves, the larger units could use the local resources of money which were augmented with equalization grants. Through pooling of staff resources and local leadership they could thereby provide for themselves and their children a superior education system. yes, it was the spirit of co-operation that helped shape that system.

That spirit, Mr. Speaker, had its influence too, on the institution that we refer to as government.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this influence forced a succession of governments to take an activist role, an innovative role. That is why the Government of Saskatchewan, in fact the people of Saskatchewan, can boast so many firsts: first with hospitalization, first with medicare, first with comprehensive drug care, and children's dental care. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we can be proud today that we built Saskatchewan Telecommunications, Saskatchewan Power, Saskatchewan Government Insurance — organizations we own, organizations that we direct, a litany of examples of doing things for ourselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is our heritage. It is something to celebrate. I believe that in general our people reject the simplistic view which suggests that we need to bring people in to do things for us, or the view that the best government is no government at all. I say to you, in any test of adversity that view would be rejected as it was in 1971. The real test, Mr. Speaker, of our ability to work together to build a caring and a sharing society is whether this motion can survive and flourish in terms of relevant prosperity. For my part, I certainly hope it can. I hope to contribute my part to making it do that.

I have already mentioned one group in our society, our native people, where we need such tolerance. We also have emerging severe social problems, perhaps as a result of the relative affluence, and I refer to what I consider as alarming trends on family breakdown and problems like alcoholism. I may misunderstand these things. They may be more related to faster communications and rising expectations, which could stand

to be tempered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't avoid referring to the squabble in our own country. Too much of it is motivated in a nasty kind of way, about whose share of today's pie ought to be the total share. The future, I would say, will judge if we can meet these challenges, and others of perhaps equal importance that I haven't enumerated. The question is: can we moderate or govern ourselves? Can we share? Are we prepared to give something of ourselves, as individuals, as it applies in our own province and in our own country? Do we care about the welfare of our neighbors, next door, or in the next community or outside of our borders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my earlier remarks, I suggested that there was a value in looking to our past, not to predict the future but to help us in shaping the future, and the fact that this was part of what our celebration was all about. As we stand ready to close the door on our first 75 years as a partner in confederation, I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we ought to confirm that in Saskatchewan we opt for the "we" generation, not the "me" generation, because we honor the past. We ought to confirm that we can moderate ourselves. We can and will share, because we do care. Without commonwealth, I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be no individual wealth.

I have an abiding faith, looking at the history of our people, our institutions and our government, that we will make that confirmation. To me, that's why Celebrate Saskatchewan, 1980, was a memorable success. That's why I have confidence as Saskatchewan marks its beginning of our next 75 years in confederation.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to move this resolution, seconded by the member for Estevan constituency, Mr. Chapman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join with the mover of the motion, the member for my neighboring constituency, Weyburn, in commending the people of Saskatchewan in the hundreds of participating communities for their boundless enthusiasm and involvement in making Celebrate Saskatchewan, 1980 a memorable success, and to commend the Government of Saskatchewan for its exemplary leadership in marking Saskatchewan's 75th year in confederation.

Over 870 communities held special events recognizing our heritage, celebrating our present and reflecting on our future. In total some 3,100 Celebrate Saskatchewan events have taken place. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity, the same as any other member in this House could also take the opportunity, to mention a few specific events, in particular in my constituency of Estevan, of how communities recognized their heritage, celebrated the present and reflected on the future.

The village of Torquay and the community of Outram, along with the surrounding municipal communities, an estimated community of only some 500 people, held a homecoming event on the weekend of June 28, 29 and 30, 1980 with some 1,700 people participating. On June 29, 1980, some 220 local people were involved in a pageant "Let's Celebrate Saskatchewan — the 75th Year," with two parts entitled "Heritage — the Past to 1905" and "A salute to Saskatchewan — The Province, 1905 to 1980."

The town of Bienfait in my constituency held a gathering of pioneers on March 8, 1980 with the Bienfait Junior School in its final years of operation. Grades 1 to 3 gave a tribute to the Saskatchewan pioneers through a pageant, followed by a unique experience of having all the children present shake hands with the pioneers, drawing the children's attention to the roughness and the lines of history in the pioneers' hands. Many of them were coal miners and farmers.

The village of Roche Percee and surrounding municipality, a community of some 200 people, published a newspaper, "Roche Percee Celebrate '80," recognizing the rich Indian heritage of the community and outlining the coal mining and agricultural history of the community of Roche Percee. July 5 and 6, 1980 were reunion days with some 300 guests registering, celebrating and remembering the events of the community in their 1980-renovated community centre.

Macoun and the surrounding municipality held a very successful homecoming event on the weekend of June 28 to 30, with some 800 people of Saskatchewan celebrating their heritage in the community of Macoun.

Estevan chose to document its history and by year end the Estevan 1890 - 1980 "A Tale That is Told" history book is in its final stages prior to printing. Also a very successful Celebrate Saskatchewan peoples parade was held on June 19, 1980, followed by an outdoor multicultural program featuring dancing and folklore of our heritage.

History written and pictorial, homecomings, tree plantings, park development, community centre renovations, plaques and cairns erected, church celebrations, parades picnics, threshing and machinery of the past displays were events taking place throughout my constituency, and I'm sure right across the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the success of Celebrate Saskatchewan has reaffirmed the strength and vitality of our people, our respect for those who built Saskatchewan and our confidence in the future of this great province in Canada.

I take great pleasure in seconding the motion and supporting concurrence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter into discussion of this motion congratulating the people of Saskatchewan on the Celebrate Saskatchewan functions that took place in this past year of 1980. I, too, like the member for Estevan, attended many of these functions throughout my constituency, as I am sure did every other member in this legislature. I think we all were impressed with the things we saw, the various functions that took place, the nostalgic activities. I suppose the most impressive thing was the homecoming — the coming home to Saskatchewan of people from all over this dominion, all over North American, in fact from various parts of the world.

I think that was the great essence of this reunion — this sharing of memories with old school chums, for the pioneers to be reunited and for many of these people to see their old chums and mates and neighbors and relations, perhaps for the last time. I think that was the essence, the thing that struck the hearts of everyone in Saskatchewan and

that's what made this celebration the great success it was.

I give total congratulations to the people of Saskatchewan, the people in the small communities of numbers of 600 or so, which were able to attract 1,800 people to their banquets and pancake breakfasts, their dances, their competitive spirits and all the things each one of us enjoyed so much during this last year. That is a good example to us as legislators, I believe, to realize that no matter what program is developed, it takes the honest commitment of good and honest people in this province of Saskatchewan to make it a success.

I had noticed one shortcoming, though, in Celebrate Saskatchewan. I don't think it was intentional, but I would like at this time to address it. We focussed upon our last 75 years in this province, that we were having a 75th birthday and rightly we were. But if there was a weakness, it was that this province and many of the ideals that I stand for and that you stand for, and the people of this province stand for, were well established in this area prior to 1905. Let us look back to those founding families of the 1880s — 1881 and 1882 — especially the constituencies of my two comrades who are sitting beside me from Souris-Cannington and Moosomin where the early settlement of this province originated. I believe that we should, in paying true respect to our ancestors, remember those who were here and who fought the elements of the climate and set down the institutions — the churches, the schools, the hospitals — and all the foundations that we, their descendants, have built upon.

So I wanted to mention that we in Celebrate Saskatchewan maybe got a little excited in celebrating the last 75 years, but I think we owe a tribute to that which had come before.

I would also like to just point out some of the things that people did and some of the things that I saw. I'm not going to reiterate every place I've been or every parade I rode in. I was proud to ride in them and I had my wife ride beside me in the sidesaddle that her grandmother rode in in the early 1800s in this province. I'm telling you, it made a smashing hit. I was proud of her and the people in the towns that we rode in were impressed to see this type of horsemanship still available in the 1980s.

However, I would like to point out one particular project. This will touch the hearts of all of us because it is where we came from — the old rural Saskatchewan school I saw two things happening in this. I was in the town of Montmartre and their parade focussed upon each little school that has come together to make up the Montmartre composite school which had about 700 students. So all those communities got back together and these were their floats, the various school districts. Let me tell you they put forth some fantastic floats. They all had their little school reunions and it was just a wonderful experience. In the Wolseley School District, two energetic teachers originated this within the staff and the whole staff co-operated. They went out to one of the small red schools that still exist and renovated it. They then conducted school for about four days.

I was invited out there one afternoon. The kids were making homemade ice cream. They had ball games. The kids were dressed in their overalls — like those in which some of us grew up. They had a big picnic. I'm telling you, it was the type of thing that those children are going to remember for a long time. I congratulate those teachers and many other teachers in the province who did the same thing for the young of our Premier so they'll remember this heritage. That experience is better than any history lessons the best of teachers could put forward.

To culminate this, I understand the same staff are coming forward with a real old-fashioned Christmas concert which certainly will warm the hearts of all the senior citizens in that area. So I say, these are the things that make Celebrate Saskatchewan the success that it was.

All of us could go on and give example after example in our own communities and constituencies. It happened throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I enjoyed it; I think we all enjoyed it. I think though that we have to give credit to the people who made it successful. Those are the people of Saskatchewan, and all of those good people who at one time lived in this province and saw fit to come back and join in their celebration. That is what made it a success.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by the member for Moosomin, Mr. Birkbeck:

That resolution no. 2 be amended by substituting the words “the people of Saskatchewan for their” for the words “the Government of Saskatchewan for its” where those words occur in the fifth line of the resolution.

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments to those already made in the House with regard to the motion put before the Assembly by the hon. member for Weyburn. I want to take the opportunity to congratulate my own riding, and the people within that riding for the way in which they handled Celebrate Saskatchewan. They as well as the member for Estevan, had a very successful homecoming. Many of the events listed previously by other speakers were also held in my riding. I’m not about to give a poll-by-poll description of them as the member for Estevan has.

What I want to say though, along the lines of the comments made by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, is that a lot of our history and, if you like, the course of Saskatchewan history, was set by the people who came to this province prior to 1905. I’m very proud to say that my grandfather was one of those people; he came here from England in 1904 and settled on the present site of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Rocanville Division. He found it to be a rather stony area and thought that that wasn’t suitable for farming. He moved a little further to the south where he farmed until his death. The significance of that, Mr. Speaker, is that he, at that time, did not realize the great resource potential which lay right beneath his original settlement in the province of Saskatchewan. I suppose that that’s something which we today can look forward to — that great potential which Saskatchewan has. What other great resources are there in this province which we today are not aware of?

The comments made by the member for Weyburn in introducing the motion to the Assembly were well taken from my point of view. There were some things which I wanted to touch on with regard to the greatness of Saskatchewan. Certainly this province is a great province. As I said, boundless potential and wealth exist here in the province. The member for Weyburn touched on those subjects. I would like to just say that the Celebrate Saskatchewan success was a success of the people of Saskatchewan — that great homecoming, the great events which they had.

But I think there is a basic question which needs to be answered. If in fact so many people came home, one has to ask himself, Where did they come from and when did

they leave?" Obviously they had to have been here and have left the province in order for them to have come back. That was the thing which I noticed most about Celebrate Saskatchewan; these great numbers which came home to Saskatchewan. I met many of them, and I said, well, when did you leave? Where did you used to live? Did you start your life here in Saskatchewan? What caused you to leave? So, Celebrate Saskatchewan serves a very important purpose in providing those kinds of answers to me.

With reference to tolerance for government, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the question is faith. Do we have faith in our government today? Do the people of Saskatchewan have faith in their government? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the best government would be a government which would allow people to build on their own. We look back to our great heritage and we've spoken of the past, the present and the future. We look at how that foundation was laid. Certainly in my grandfather's case, and in the case of those people who were here prior to 1905 and arrived around 1905, there was not the assistance then from government. Mr. Speaker, I think that is very significant. As we moved along through those 75 years we found that, as people here in this province, we've become more and more dependent on government. Mr. Speaker, that bothers me. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that bothers my family. It has reached the point (and I give you this example to exemplify my strong feelings about that) that my son is not concerned. My son, of all people, is not concerned about whether or not he will be able to hold a job or obtain a job because he feels, in his mind, that social services will look after him. I find that very upsetting. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking there is a fourth generation member of a family which has come through that 75 years. That, Mr. Speaker, is the result of those 75 years with top-heavy government involvement.

I am very thankful to the member for Weyburn for having introduced this motion in the Assembly. I am very happy because it has given me an opportunity to speak of the very basis of my involvement in politics. It is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I have a concern for the next 75 years of history in Saskatchewan.

I can appreciate the comment made that no government is the best government. I don't accept that. But I don't accept either, Mr. Speaker, that total government control is the answer. When you look here in Saskatchewan today, you can very plainly see that the government has control and is working to get further control of the resources. They are working to get control of the rural agricultural base. They are working to get control (and in fact have a large degree of control) of the airways, anything that is in the air. So we have what is under the ground, what is on the surface, and what is in the air. You have a fair measure of control of all three of those entities in our day-to-day living.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you look under your bed before you go to sleep at night?

MR. BIRKBECK: — No, I don't look under my bed. I am fearful I might find you there. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am very glad that the member for Weyburn has introduced this motion to the House. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the line of commending the people of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan in this motion, that it is any more acceptable to discuss the great wonders of telecommunication through Sask Tel and Sask Power (I don't know what that has to do with the motion either) and the greatness of Saskatchewan people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the decision of people in this province used to be in the hands of the people. I suppose the motion gives me an opportunity to suggest that if we intend to build another 75 years as great as that original foundation which was laid by

our forefathers, then we need, at all times, to look at providing as much individual control by the people of Saskatchewan of their own destiny because I trust the people of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, I have little faith in governments of any political stripe today.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the sharing attitude, it is definitely agreed that both sides of this House adopt the sharing attitude. We speak of the plight of the natives, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem there which needs to be addressed, and needs to be addressed now for those native Northerners in particular. But when I look at the record, Mr. Speaker, I find their plight about as great today as it was 75 years ago, which I suppose, Mr. Speaker, lead us to the constitution and the question of whether or not we care, of whether or not we want, within our own selves, to develop a sharing attitude, whether or not we can compromise, or whether or not we can accept the various nationalities and establish a national identity. Those are the kinds of things we need to address ourselves to. And if we're talking about nationality I suppose we could raise the question — what nationality were Adam and Eve? I suppose an answer could be, if it were coming from that side of the House, a Russian, or course — nothing to wear, only an apple to eat, but living in paradise.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's that attitude of blindness from the government side of the House in addressing themselves to the past, the present and the future that would lead us to wonder if in fact the next 75 years will be as secure as have the past 75. I would conclude by saying that I agree with the member for Weyburn that in fact we must have a respect for our past in order that we can understand the present. And if we better understand the present I am confident that the people — not the Government of Saskatchewan but the people of Saskatchewan — will most adequately provide for our future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be quite brief, but I do want to say a few words today on this resolution. I want to say that I am very disappointed in the hon. member for Moosomin in speaking to this resolution, because I do believe he has really corrupted the resolution by the remarks he has just made. I want to touch on a few of the point he has mentioned. He's talking about leaving. Well I notice that the hon. gentleman himself is now leaving. But if you look at the historical background of Saskatchewan . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if you could get some order on that side of the House, because I can't hear myself think here.

If you look at the historical background of this province, it was made to order, and I don't know whom you would blame for the drought that occurred on the Prairies, but I have a sneaking suspicion that it wasn't man-made; it was probably God-made. I don't know whom you would blame. Conditions were such that people had to leave Saskatchewan, and they left Alberta and they left Manitoba. I don't really see what relevance that has to this resolution commending the people of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan for Celebrate Saskatchewan, and the tremendous way in which it came off.

The hon. member for Moosomin talks about his son expecting to receive social services. So be it. I don't know, and only he would know. I just do want to say that my wife and I have four children. We have one at home; we have three of them who work out. At no time have they ever felt they would be relying on social services. They are productive citizens. They don't have fancy jobs, but certainly they never were told by my

wife or me that social services would look after them. I'm wondering what the hon. member has been telling his son.

I do want to mention something about control. Mr. Speaker, it's a well-known fact that the more complex a society becomes the more control there automatically has to be on the part of government. I don't know if he want to go back to the old Hammurabi law code of about 3,000 years ago where if you were caught stealing they chopped off your hand or, if you were very unfortunate, the head bone. but if that's what he want to go back to, I suppose maybe they could present that to the people of Saskatchewan as an election platform in the next campaign.

I do want to touch on one other thing. You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting thoroughly irritated with that side always mention Russia, the Ukrainians, etc. It is almost to the point that someone of that descent is not quite to be trusted 100 per cent. Well, I'll tell you, if that hon. member want to walk down the streets of Blaine Lake (and I've only been there a couple of times), I'm going to say he had better take along a personal bodyguard, because the people of Blaine lake, who are primarily of Russian descent, will not take kindly to that kind of nonsense.

There are always these racist overtones. If your ancestors come from eastern Europe, then somehow they are not 100 per cent Canadian citizens. Well, I totally reject that. I get sick to my stomach at that kind of garbage coming from members on that side of the House.

I want to say one other thing. Yes, we certainly do want to commend the people of Saskatchewan for having made Celebrate Saskatchewan the tremendous success it was. But certainly, you have to commend the Government of Saskatchewan for giving leadership, in showing common sense, in proving, in comparison to another province, it is not the amount of money you spend. I understand in Alberta they were shovelling the money, throwing it out, trying to get rid of it. They couldn't get rid of it fast enough. And what happened? The Celebrate Alberta was not nearly as good as ours. The reason for that is that the government did provide money (I suppose the Government of Saskatchewan could have provide more money), but probably the right amount of money to get things rolling, the right amount of money to bring out the initiative for which Saskatchewan people have always been famous.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 5 — Grain Embargo

MR. BANDA moved, seconded by Mr. Long:

That this Assembly urge the federal government to fully compensate Canadian grain producers for the total financial loss suffered due to depressed prices and lost sales as a direct consequence of the grain embargo imposed by the federal Clark government on western Canadian grains.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to move this motion of great importance to every farm family in Saskatchewan. In fact, the issue dealt with by this

resolution is of importance to everyone in our province. I'll try to tell you why.

Agriculture dominates the economy of Saskatchewan to a greater extent than is the case in any other province in Canada. Almost 50 per cent of the improved farmland in this entire country is located here in Saskatchewan. Total farm cash receipts last year amounted to over \$2.8 billion. This is a figure that only comes into clear perspective when you compare it to something like the total value of all of our mineral shipments out of this province in 1979. And the total at that time was under \$1.8 billion. That means that the value of all our oil, our potash and uranium, and all the other minerals shipped out of Saskatchewan last year amounts to a little over one-half of the value to our economy of agricultural production.

There is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, that says, "When agriculture is healthy, Saskatchewan is healthy," and I think, that is very true.

Now, when one talks about Saskatchewan agriculture, it is worthwhile to keep in mind that wheat accounts for over 50 per cent of the cash receipts farmers receive in an average year. Barley sales amount to about 6 per cent, rapeseed to 10 per cent, and all other grains to about 6 per cent. Livestock sales were worth 24 per cent of total farm cash receipts last year, and of that cattle accounted for over 18 per cent, and hogs, 2.6 per cent. So even for someone who does not live in Saskatchewan and has not spent any time here at all, it would be pretty clear from a quick look at these figures, that grain sales are a vital part of our economic well-being. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this present federal Liberal government and the previous Conservative government have subjected us to an embargo on grain sales to Russia without in any way compensating us for the adverse economic effects.

Mr. Speaker, a little over one year ago now, Russian troops moved across the border into Afghanistan. They did so in order to prop up a Marxist regime which was having difficulty suppressing Moslem rebels. There are some who say that Soviet tanks rolled across the Afghanistan frontier to prevent a Moslem fundamentalist revolution like the one which had taken place in Iran. They may be right. The Ayatollah Khomeini had called for just such a revolution throughout the Islamic world. In any event, the Soviet action was one of aggression against a sovereign neighbor. We could argue all we like about Afghanistan being in the Soviet sphere of influence and about the relative merits of having yet another of the world's nations run by ayatollahs and mullahs, but we are still left with the fact that the Soviet Union committed an act of aggression in Afghanistan in the last week of December 1979.

Mr. Speaker, my party and I condemn this aggression just as we did following similar events in Czechoslovakia in December of 1968, in Hungary in 1956, and in East Germany in 1953. I want to point out while I am on this issue that the New Democratic Party, and the CCF before it has been consistent in its stand against big-power aggression. Unlike the Tory party, we have managed to condemn those incidents which I cited earlier, and also the violent aggression by the United States in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Chile, El Salvador, and so forth.

Aggression by the big powers is wrong. I am proud to say that the New Democratic Party has been the only Canadian political party to stand up and condemn it, regardless of who commits the aggression.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Carter administration in the first week of January of this year issued a number of statements critical of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Finally, on January 4 President Jimmy Carter announced that the United States would immediately institute a partial embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union. The Carter administration pledged the United States to export only that amount of grain to Russia that it has described as normal trade volume. Any sales beyond 8 million tonnes would not be allowed to take place.

The Canadian government, whose foreign policy was guided at that time by the genius of Flora MacDonald and Joe Clark, quickly followed the American lead. The Clark government announced on January 11 that Canada would not increase grain sales to Russia above (in their words) traditional levels, which they set at 3.8 million tonnes annually. The Clark government was in the midst of an election campaign in early January. Their December budget had been defeated and the election called for mid-February. The Carter administration was fighting for its political life as well. The primaries were going on in a number of American states, with Senator Edward Kennedy running neck and neck with Jimmy Carter for the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party. That election campaign is an important point to keep in mind in considering the grain embargo.

It is my opinion that the embargo was announced in both countries for political reasons. Not one Soviet soldier would be removed from Afghanistan territory as a result of the sanctions. Carter and Clark were very well aware of that. The real reason for the embargo was that both Jimmy Carter and Joe Clark found themselves in close re-election races and they decided to engage in a little 1950s style cold war sabre rattling. Commie-bashing and red-bating have always been popular with politicians who have no constructive program of their own. That is why the Clark government leaped at the opportunity to practise a little of it on the electorate. I think it says something for the intelligence of the Canadian public that they rejected the aspect of the Clark government along with all the others.

Mr. Speaker, the Clark government was quite careful to assure Canadian farmers that they would not be hurt financially by the grain embargo. They were just as careful to avoid spelling out a formula for compensation to grain producers. When the Liberal government came back into power they announced that the grain boycott would continue, but again there was no specific proposal to reimburse grain growers, only vague talk of some form of compensation. If the Conservatives and Liberals were just half as interested in getting compensation to farmers for losses due to the grain embargo or last summer's drought, or as they are in getting the railways the full compensatory freight rate, farmers would be well off indeed. But we have had no compensation paid to farmers despite the fact that the embargo has cost each grain producer at least an average of \$800. That \$800 figure is from a study done by members of the agricultural economics department of the University of Saskatchewan including Dr. George Lee and Dr. Hartley Furtan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if the hon. member says it is, that's fine. He might have something right. I don't know.

The study examines the price drop which took place in the one international market after the embargo was announced. I understand my colleague, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, will be referring to specific figures, so I will simply point out that the Canadian Wheat Board was forced to turn down sales and also sell grain at prices lower than necessary, and both were a result of that Soviet grain embargo. The grain embargo was ill-conceived and short sighted right from the beginning. We would have been better off expressing our opposition to military aggression by diplomatic means and through all of the traditional international forums available to us.

The invasion of any sovereign nation by another deserves to be condemned, and the Canadian government was right to condemn it. But what is not right is to expect one group in society to shoulder the full financial responsibility for some dim-witted demonstration of our disapproval.

It is Canada as a whole that has a foreign policy, not just one group in the nation's population. And as it stands, the farmers of Canada, and even our athletes in the country that make up our Olympic team, are paying the full price for all of us. The federal government has talked about support for our farmers and our Olympic athletes but has really done nothing in terms of tangible support since the decision to honor the U.S. embargo was made by the Clark government. The entire farm community in Canada is suffering because of the U.S. boycott. Western farmers were losing \$40 per metric tonne in May on wheat and other crops have also been affected. Why? Because of the embargo . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Why don't you listen? For example, Ontario farmers were also losing \$25 a tonne on soy beans, and an equivalent amount on corn. Western rapeseed producers are losing up to \$1 a bushel because of a general depression in grain, caused by the decision to ban 17 million tonnes of U.S. grain that could have been shipped to the Soviet Union. This is overhanging the North American market.

The livestock producers, as well, all over the country have been affected indirectly by lower prices generated by that embargo. In contrast though, Mr. Speaker, to Canadian farm losses, farmers in Argentina were making substantial profits by selling to the Soviet Union. Argentine bread wheat, which, in the past has sold at substantial discounts on the international market because of its low quality, as commanded a premium this year.

Canadians should realize that exports of food amount to close to 10 per cent of the foreign exchange we earn. the embargo is not only cutting off markets in the Soviet Union, but it is also costing us very dearly in terms of the devaluated dollar and higher interest rates. As a foreign policy measure, an embargo is an ill-advised knee-jerk reaction to U.S. policy. As an economic measure aimed at punishing the Soviet Union, the embargo is not working in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I looked through some of the *Hansard* of the federal government and when I assessed the response made by some of our federal ministers and what their views were on the matter, I was most disappointed. In *Hansard, House of Commons Debates*, April 15, 1980, page 21, the member of parliament for Prince Albert (who was a newly elected member and fighting for his constituents), asked the Minister of Transport, the Hon. Mr. Pepin, about the effects of the embargo. I want to quote from those debates, Mr. Speaker. The member for Prince Albert asked the following question of the Minister of Transport.

In view of the fact that the decision by the Carter administration to put an embargo on the shipment of grain to the Soviet Union has already hurt the Canadian farmer to the extent of 80 cents per bushel since December 28, 1979, will the minister tell us if this government plans to follow the policy suggested by the previous administration to make up those losses to farmers so that the nation as a whole (not just grain producers) will pay for the effects of this embargo?

Mr. Speaker, here is what the Hon. Minister of Transport had to say in answer to this question:

Madam Speaker, this is a very debatable subject, but my information and knowledge at this time is that western farmers are not being affected by the policy that Canada has had with respect to the export of grains to the Soviet Union.

Well it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker; that that minister is not up-to-date on what is happening in western Canada, and indeed what is happening in the export world.

I went on to look a little further at some of the debates, Mr. Speaker, and on November 17, 1980 (which is not that long ago), that same member of parliament for the NDP again pressed the federal government for some answers. He again got some contradictory answers. If we look at page 4742 of November 17, 1980 we find the member for Prince Albert asked the minister in charge of external affairs:

Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and concerns a statement made by a fellow cabinet minister, the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board, on Friday, in Regina. He told Saskatchewan Wheat Pool delegates that Canada has removed any fixed ceiling placed on export grain sales by the Canadian Wheat Board to the U.S.S.R. That statement means that Canada has dropped its policy of embargo on grain to the Soviets. Can the minister confirm that this policy change has taken place and that the Minister of State speaks with the knowledge and the approval of the entire cabinet?

That was the question, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Mark MacGuigan, Secretary of State for External Affairs, answered, and I quote:

Madam Speaker, no change has taken place in the government policy that only normal sales will be made to the Soviet Union. What is occurring is an attempt to define what "level of normal sales" should be interpreted to mean for the coming year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here again on one hand they say that the policy is changed. On the other hand the minister says that it is the same "normal sales" to the Soviet Union. They don't know what they are doing.

I am sure that members opposite would be most interested in hearing some of the comments of some of their members of parliament. I know this member is held in very high esteem in the Conservative ranks. I am looking at an article in the *Ottawa Journal*, June 13, 1980 where the newspaper interviewed one of the Conservative federal members, Jack Murta. Jack makes some very prominent statements from time to time. I was interested in this Mr. Speaker, because he is commenting on the grain embargo. I want to read a part of it, and I quote:

Jack Murta is a farmer, a member of parliament, and by his own estimation a pretty patriotic Canadian. But on weekends when he gets home and gazes over the wheat field of his Manitoba farm he can't suppress a trace of resentment about the \$30,000 that is missing from his balance sheet this year because of Canada's embargo on Russian grain sales. It's like watching your profits go down the drain, the 37-year-old Conservative said in an

interview yesterday. Murta's 3,000-acre farm outside of Winnipeg is larger than average. A more typical prairie farmer would be looking at \$10,000 biting his income.

Mr. Speaker, that's a Conservative member who supported that motion and supported the government of Joe Clark in an embargo in the first place? Now when it's hitting his pocketbook he's concerned. That's typical of the members opposite. I want to go on and quote some more, Mr. Speaker, and I am again quoting from this article.

Although he was a firm supporter of former prime minister Clark's decision to join the U.S. in limiting Russian grain exports following the invasion of Afghanistan, he has serious doubts about the effectiveness of the embargo now. It's doing more harm to farmers than the good it is accomplishing on the foreign policy side. For one thing, Argentina, a large grain exporter that never joined the embargo has increased its Soviet wheat sales dramatically, making up for some of the lost North American supplies.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that even the member recognizes the mistake the Clark government made, a mistake that is costing taxpayers of this country and producers — a very costly mistake.

Members opposite continue to shout across about the policies of this government in rural Saskatchewan. But what did they do when they had the power in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker? And what have they cost the producers of this province? I think they should be condemned for that and it shouldn't be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, as the government appears to be phasing out of a policy they find uncomfortable, I think it would be more morally and economically straightforward if they dumped the embargo and let the Canadian Wheat Board go back to its statutory job of selling the most wheat at the best price for western Canadian producers. Not only has this embargo been morally bankrupt, because it uses food as a political weapon against civilian populations, it is also bankrupting financially. Canadian farmers are suffering from the severe crops this year . . . to the Soviets, at prices from \$40 to \$50 a tonne . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite will give me time to finish. We will hear after whether they're going to defend the Clark policy or not — we don't hear too much about that.

Mr. Speaker, other countries and the large trading countries have either ignored the embargo or made a profit by selling grain for shipment to Soviet bloc customers. The net result has been to allow the Soviets to obtain more than 30 million tonnes of grain on international markets and Canada has paid dearly for being one of the few countries that observed the embargo. Surely it is time for a major look at a policy that was neither made in Canada nor has been of any use to the Canadian Wheat Board or western farmers. It is time that the federal government did more than pay reluctant lip service for the financial burden farmers have been carrying as a result of the Soviet grain embargo.

The \$800 for each family farm would be a very welcome addition to the gross income of grain producers this year, and it is nothing more than is deserved. The New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan has called on Ottawa to compensate farmers fully for their financial losses. In keeping with that policy, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

MR. LONG: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to second this motion moved by the hon. member for Redberry, Mr. Banda. I am in agreement with the remarks he has just made, and in particular, I share his view that the federal government must compensate farmers fully for the financial losses suffered as a result of the Soviet grain embargo.

The member for Redberry referred to the study done by Dr. Lee, Dr. Furtan, and Mr. Smith of the department of agricultural economics at the University of Saskatchewan. The section of the study dealing with wheat was released in mid-July. It is an excellent piece of work and well worth reading. The study looked into two things: first of all, the revenue wheat farmers in the Canadian Wheat Board region lost because of the grain embargo, and secondly, it compared that to the revenue those same grain growers would have gained by Canada's not participating in the embargo. The study team assessed the evidence and came to the conclusion that the cost of the embargo was \$62.5 million for prairie wheat farmers. The fact that the United States placed an export embargo on roughly 4 million tonnes of wheat and 10 million tonnes of corn destined for export to the U.S.S.R. and that Canada agreed to limit its sales to 3.8 million tonnes in the 1979-80 crop year, had a significant depressing effect on the international price.

As an example of the fall in price, when trading in the Chicago wheat market commenced just hours after the Carter administration's announcement of the embargo, prices dropped significantly. The drop in price was the result of the increased volume of grain placed on the world market that had originally been destined for the U.S.S.R. Between January and April 1980, grain prices fell some \$38 per tonne, and even near the end of the crop year in July, grain prices were still approximately \$20 per tonne below the early January price.

The University of Saskatchewan study examined Canadian wheat sales and the revenues those sales generated during the first six months of 1980 and compared them to the revenues which would have been received in the absence of any trade sanctions. In order to do that, forecasts were made for both prices and volume for the Soviet market using a model developed by Agriculture Canada. And as I said earlier, the loss to wheat producers in the Canadian Wheat Board region from the grain embargo was \$62.5 million for the period January to June 1980. This cost, when divided by exports, is approximately \$9.30 per tonne or 25 cents per bushel.

The situation if Canada had not joined the embargo, of course, is more difficult for the researchers to analyze. The price Canada could have received for exports to the U.S.S.R. was taken to be the Argentina export price of wheat to the U.S.S.R., discounted slightly for the effect of the increased sales. After completing their calculations, the researchers determined that prairie wheat producers could have received \$108.5 million more by not joining the embargo. That was on wheat, Mr. Speaker — \$108.5 million, which is over \$18.50 per tonne, or in language we all understand, 50 cents per bushel.

In mid-November the University of Saskatchewan research team released their findings as they applied to barley sales in the first six months of 1980 and their figures showed losses of \$9 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you total the losses due to Canadian participation in the Soviet plan embargo, you arrive at a figure of \$117.5 million. For the 145,000 grain producers in

Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, the loss works out to an average of 50 cents per bushel on wheat and 22 cents per bushel on barley exported between January and June of 1980.

In addition to the money that Canadian producers lost due to depressed prices, we also lost sales during the period the embargo was in effect. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool president, Ted Turner, quoted in the June 19 edition of *The Western Producer*, said that Canada could have sold, at the very least, an additional 700,000 tonnes of grain to the U.S.S.R. in the 1979-80 crop year had it not been for the embargo.

According to recent statements by Wheat Board Minister Hazen Argue, the Canadian Wheat Board came very close to the government's imposed 3.8 million tonne sales limit in the '79-80 crop year and that meant turning down sales.

The Americans, on the other hand, exported some 15.3 million tonnes of grain to the U.S.S.R. between July 1979 and June 1980 — a new record, Mr. Speaker. While the United States did not exceed the 8 million tonne limit on exports after Carter's January 4 announcement, grain sales to the Soviet Union over the whole crop year dwarfed Canadian sales for the same period.

Of the other grain exporting countries, Argentina, which ignored the U.S. embargo entirely exported record high levels of grain to the U.S.S.R. during the period of the embargo. Similarly, Australia set new records for grain sales to the Soviets in the last crop year. American exports of corn in the past year have been at record levels and it is anticipated that U.S. wheat exports will set new records as well.

Much of that increase in U.S. grain exports was to eastern European countries which has led to much speculation that American grain shipments to eastern European countries are ending up in the U.S.S.R. simply by a less direct route than normal.

With the exception of Poland, western Europe had a very good to excellent crop in 1979. Yet the Carter administration has allowed Cargill, Continental, and Bungs to pour grain at unprecedented volumes into eastern Europe.

Clearly the Soviet Union has not been brought to its knees by the grain embargo. In fact, as Dr. Lee, Dr. Fourteen and Mr. Smith indicate in their report, it is not clear whether the Soviets were hurt at all by the embargo. The embargo caused the price of grain to drop and the U.S.S.R. was able to make the purchases they required from countries, like Australia and Argentina at reduced prices. Other wheat importers like the embargo as well. Countries like Brazil, Japan and China clearly benefited from the lower grain prices caused by the embargo. Domestic consumers in some of the countries participating in the embargo also benefited. As I said earlier, Canada's traditional competitors in the international market, like Australia, Argentina and the United States, were not hampered by the embargo at all. They did a thriving business.

I am beginning to think that the only ones hurt by the Soviet grain embargo were the Canadian grain farmers. I say it's long past the time when they should have received compensation. When I say compensation, I don't mean some token amount. I mean the full \$117.5 million. I mean 50 cents per bushel on every bushel of wheat and 22 cents per bushel on every bushel of barley sold in the first six months of 1980. In that way and only in that way, will the federal government be honouring the commitment made to producers that they would not be forced to absorb the cost of the sanctions. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the seconder of the motion for a well-researched and well-presented speech. I wish I could say the same for the mover.

Economic stupidity is not the sole property of any political party. It just happens that the New Democratic Party has a disproportionate amount of it. I agree with the member who just sat down that the grain embargo was ill-advised. A grain embargo cannot work when you're as insignificant in the world market place as a Canada, without a blockade, which is the next step to war. The member for Redberry has said that food should not be used as a weapon against communist aggression. At the same time he condemns the United States for rolling out the canons, so to speak, in Vietnam and other places. Either you accept communist aggression as a fact in the world today, or you have to take a position against it, one or the other. You can't have it both ways.

I want to talk briefly about the losses to Saskatchewan farmers and Canadian farmers because they have been significant. I haven't heard this government once utter a word to the Trudeau government saying, "Pay the Saskatchewan farmers the subsidy which Clark promised them." Clark recognized, when he brought in the embargo (however ill-advised it was) that this burden shouldn't be borne by the farming community of Saskatchewan. It should be borne by the federal government, because national policy is just that — national policy, and shouldn't be borne by the farmers of Saskatchewan, Manitoba or any place else. But this bunch . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . (not you, because you gave a terrific, well-researched speech) has not once condemned Trudeau and company for their lack of action in this regard.

The member for Redberry made it very, very difficult for me to support this motion but you softened me up and quite frankly I'm going to mellow a little. I want to talk a little bit about normal, traditional levels. It seems to me that that was the catchword in the whole program — normal, traditional levels. Isn't that what you used? We'll talk a minute about normal, traditional levels. These are wheat board figures. In 1970-71 we exported to the U.S.S.R. 0.3 million tonnes; 1971-72 it was 3.4 million; 1972-73, the record year to the U.S.S.R., 5 million; 1973-74, 1.1 million; 1974-75, 0.3 million; 1975-76, 4.6 million; 1976-77, 1.1 million; 1977-78, 2.3 million; 1978-79, 1.5 million. The average over the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, has been about 2.8 million tonnes exported to the U.S.S.R. In the year that we had our embargo, we exported 3.891 million tonnes to the U.S.S.R., or something just a little over the ceiling placed on it by Clark.

There were a few questions raised in the House of Commons just last Monday . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it wasn't last Monday. It was December 3, whenever that was. These questions were responded to by the parliamentary secretary responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. One question that I want to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Stick around and listen.

MR. BERNTSON: — I hate to interrupt, but if you're interested in just what's going on with this whole embargo situation, I'd appreciate it if you'd just perk up your ears a little. The question was raised, what is the minister's reasoning behind his definition of normal if it exceeds yearly average? Now, normal this year has exceeded the yearly average over the last ten years. The answer — it has been normal for Canada, as the only country in the world which has exported grain to the U.S.S.R. every year since 1963, to

sell at levels in relation to Canadian supplies, transportation capability, and world and U.S.S.R. demand. This sound reasonable.

During the same period, under the stewardship of Don Mazankowski and Dr. Horner, our exports were increased by 20 per cent — not quite — 19.2 per cent, which is a fairly healthy record.

The next question was: does the minister feel that more than the embargo limit of 3.8 million tonnes of grain could have been sold and delivered to the U.S.S.R. in the last crop year, and if so, on what does he base his assumption? the answer is simply no. The transportation system was taxed to the limit as it was. To increase our exports by 20 per cent. . .

We encourage Trudeau to pay the Saskatchewan farmer the subsidy promised by the Clark government. But that subsidy is not coming as a result of lack of movement; it's coming as a result of the embargo's effect on world prices. Our movements were at an all-time high.

Does the minister agree with steps taken in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? And does the minister support the United States in its effort to ensure that such communist aggression is not ignored?

Well, the answer is yes indeed he does. It is clearly on the record that two parties in Canada are somewhat concerned about communist aggression in the world. But here we have the member for Redberry standing up today saying that you can't use food as a weapon; you can't use Canada as a weapon. Well, what are you going to use? If you're concerned about communist aggression you either ignore it and let it happen or you do something about it.

Getting back on the subsidy that Saskatchewan farmers, and all farmers, deserve and should have — and we have encouraged on many occasions — we agree with it. I'm going to support your resolution but only because your seconder did such a great job, and with those few qualifications that I injected.

I do have an amendment and I want to read the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I may then want to amend it again before I move it because the amendment was to read as follows and to be seconded by Mr. Thatcher:

That the resolution be amended by adding "and that this Assembly communicate the text of this debate along with the resolution to the responsible ministers in the House of Commons of Canada thereto."

Now the reason I may want to amend it is that I would be embarrassed if this Assembly sent down the comments of the member for Redberry. But on the other hand, I'm sure that most members in the Conservative Party in Ottawa will consider the source and just take it from there. So, I will move the amendment, Mr. Speaker,. And we will be supporting the amended motion.

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to second this motion in this momentous debate, one of the more momentous debates in the 1980 legislative session. I suppose we could maybe even call this particular debate the highlight of the

session so far, although the biggie on the destruction of the prairie lily boggles the mind also.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You haven't been here very much, Colin.

MR. THATCHER: — Oh, now, you can say that on some occasions but not this time. That was an unfair cut. The people keeping tabs will verify that is an unfair cut.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the subject at hand, I have to confess that I do find the motion somewhat amusing. In many respects it is typical of members opposite because, as is the case with so many of the backbenchers' motion, it is, "That this Assembly urge the federal . . ." Now, from there on the words tend to vary, but you take the bulk of their motions and really those are the initial words. Now that is really not so surprising because everybody knows the socialists haven't had an original thought in 100 years so why should we suggest they should be original in their motions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, "That this Assembly urge the federal government." I would like to pose the rhetorical question that on the issue the government of Joe Clark happened to believe a peanut farmer from Georgia knew what he was doing on this particular . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Another socialist.

MR. THATCHER: — Yes, another socialist on this issue. But I ask members to remember that Joe Clark also told the Canadian farmers that they would be compensated for any loss of revenue. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the Trudeau government is obligated to fulfil this very basic commitment from one government to the next.

Then I would like to pose the rhetorical question: where has your Department of Agriculture been in urging the Trudeau government to make good on this commitment? Now the Minister of Agriculture may very well have made that request. But if he did, he did it in a very quiet, not spectacular fashion. May I very respectfully suggest that perhaps an additional motion from the member for Redberry and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster should be directed to the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, urging it to press Ottawa because when did you ever see Ottawa do anything for Saskatchewan without being pressed and pressed hard? Where as the Minister of Agriculture been on this issue?

Mr. Speaker, it is a shameful thing that the farmers in both Canada and the United States had to bear the brunt of this embargo because that was not the intent. If the food was going to be used as a diplomatic weapon, you may debate the ethics of that proposal. You may or may not have a point. But one thing was indisputable: it was grossly unfair of the governments of Canada and the United States to ever expect the producers of that commodity to bear the burden. That is what has happened this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think our Department of Agriculture has been remiss in not pushing its federal counterparts into some form of action, but then that's not really new either because our provincial Department of Agriculture has been remiss in so many things . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That one just brought up a brand new speech, but you know, always following the directives of the Speaker, I shall abide as always, without question.

Mr. Speaker, might I suggest to the member for Redberry, and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster that they may very well wish to re-evaluate the intent of this motion. Perhaps they would like to add another motion onto ours. I considered doing it but since I'm already seconding one, I can't. But perhaps you would care to tag your original motion with a direction to our own provincial Department of Agriculture, to urge the government of central Canada, the regional party which presently governs the country, the party of Ontario and Quebec . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wasn't going to put it quite like that. I was going to say, in concert with their western extension over here . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Honest to goodness, you know, so many times you bring up an interesting point! I wonder what Jimmy Gardiner would think if he could see the Liberal-NDP relationship right now. It just makes me cry. I'm sure if he could see the connection between your party and the present Liberal Party he would cry as would many of the other Liberal giants of the past. In fact they might even throw up if they could see the way the present New Democratic Party of the West has jumped in bed with the federal Liberal Party and has become the western extension of the Trudeau-Liberals and the central Canadian government.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'll return to the issue. I can't help but make a closing comment to my remarks in that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The government across the way always seems to find some fashion to condemn any government which is operated in concert with the Americans. Always, and it doesn't matter what issue it is, if they have done it in some sort of harmonious action with the Americans, it has been wrong.

I suggest that probably because of your natural affinity and natural proximity to the philosophy of the Soviet Union it's no doubt that you should, over and over again, be anti-American. And anytime the federal government operates in some sort of concert with the American government, that has to be wrong. That has invariably been the tradition of the New Democratic Party. Certainly this action, even though it is only remotely related to Soviet expansionism and aims, somehow rings a familiar note here in Saskatchewan. The Soviet Union like to control. It likes to own things. It likes to take things over, whether it be ethically or otherwise. Does that sound familiar? Does that have a familiar ring? Has anybody ever heard of that?

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I would like to say that I will support the motion. I'll support the amendment in conjunction with the motion and I repeat my challenge. I invite the members for Redberry and Cut Knife-Lloydminster to consult with their colleagues. Consult with them and see if you can tag this original motion with a note for your own provincial Department of Agriculture. Let's press Ottawa to do something for a change instead of starting out with the usual repetitive line that this Assembly urge the federal government. I take pleasure in seconding that amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask all members of the Assembly to support the amendment, as put forward by the member for Souris-Cannington, as I'm going to ask all the members of the Assembly to support the resolution as put forward by the member for Redberry and seconded by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster. In asking all members to support the amendment, I would hope that the government at Ottawa tends to ignore some of the outrageous remarks put forward by the member for Thunder Creek because I don't think they're going to have very much influence on their decision in support of this particular resolution, which is calling for payment of 50 cents a bushel for wheat, and 22 cents a bushel for barley to producers

in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I'll just comment briefly on the remarks made by the member for Thunder Creek. I ask the hon. member to consider the history of the embargo, as it relates to the call for a commitment to the producers for any loss suffered as a result of the embargo. And I ask the hon. member which government in western Canada, which government on the Prairies called for a commitment to the producers? It was the Government of Saskatchewan. I ask the hon. member which government in western Canada, which government of the prairie provinces called for the study, and provided funds for the study to identify the amount that the producers lost? It was the Government of Saskatchewan. It was the Government of Saskatchewan which contracted the University of Saskatchewan to provide the figures of loss. It was the Government of Saskatchewan which, upon receiving the report of the university, forwarded it to the federal government and asked them to commit themselves to payment to the producers of 50 cents a bushel — not 25 cents a bushel, but 50 cents a bushel. It was the Government of Saskatchewan which contracted the University of Saskatchewan to deal with the barley, and they identified a 22 cent loss. We have put forward the position of the Government of Saskatchewan to Ottawa. We have put forward the position of the Government of Saskatchewan as identified by the University of Saskatchewan, and we've put it forward clearly, and we've put it forward distinctly at every opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, today in this Assembly we have an additional opportunity to put forward the position, not only of the Government of Saskatchewan, but of the legislature of Saskatchewan on behalf of, not just the producers of Saskatchewan, but the prairie producers — the producers in Manitoba, and the producers in Alberta. Let's do that by unanimously supporting the resolution, and unanimously supporting the amendment. Mr. Speaker, it may be that that will put the Government of Saskatchewan, the New Democratic Party government, with the Tory opposition — put us in bed together. I don't mind being in bed with the Tory opposition on the issue which will give producers of Saskatchewan and producers of western Canada 50 cents a bushel for wheat and 22 cents a bushel for barley. I say that the federal government must meet that commitment and they must meet it as part of their final payment coming out early in the new year. I ask all members to support the amendment and I ask all members to support the resolution.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 36

Pepper	Snyder	Bowerman
Baker	Gross	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Hammersmith
Kowalchuk	Engel	Feschuk
Byers	Matsalla	Shillington
Lusney	Poniatowski	Prebble
Johnson	Nelson	Berntson
Birkbeck	Duncan	Taylor
Rousseau	Swan	Hardy
Pickering	Muirhead	Katzman

Thompson
White

MacAuley
Garner

Long
McLeod

NAYS — Nil

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 37

Pepper
Baker
MacMurchy
Hammersmith
MacAuley
Byers
Lusney
Johnson
White
Duncan
Hardy
Katzman

Snyder
Skoberg
Mostoway
Kowalchuk
Engel
Matsalla
Poniatowski
Nelson
Berntson
Rousseau
Pickering
Garner

Bowerman
Gross
Banda
Thompson
Feschuk
Shillington
Prebble
Long
Birkbeck
Swan
Muirhead
McLeod

NAYS — Nil

The Assembly adjourned at 4:52 p.m.