

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 22, 1983

EVENING SESSION

PRIORITY OF DEBATE (continued)

MR. SCHMIDT: — I apologize to Mr. Speaker for being so short, but I have no control over that matter. If you can't see me you'll hear me, I assure you.

Today we're discussing what's wrong with the Pepin plan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We're not? I thought we were. I see it as the Ottawa Liberals' final plan to rape, loot and pillage Saskatchewan. I think maybe the opposition would agree with that.

There's nothing wrong with the Pepin plan if you live in Ontario or Quebec, or if you happen to own a railroad . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . With respect to railroads, the members opposite think that the CPR is a great friend of ours. Well I can say to the members opposite and to the CPR and to all voters that the only treatment the CPR will get from us is fair treatment, as any other citizen of this country. That doesn't mean that farmers should get unfair treatment because of the CPR or even the CNR. And one of the problems we have with the railroads (and they seem to be a lot friendlier with the Trudeau Liberals) is that their accounting practices are questionable. And they are smart, there's no doubt about it.

I think their system probably operates like a story I heard about Shell Canada in Calgary. The version was that if Shell Canada ever paid any income tax all the accounting department would be dismissed. I think the same thing applies at CPR. I've looked at some of their material on the rail line abandonment and their accounting practices are creative to say the best. Also with respect to their corporate organization, they show us how much money CPR rail loses each year, but they're wise enough not to have any losses in Marathon Realty, or in any one of their other corporations. They're smart enough to fool the Ottawa Liberals, but they're not smart enough to fool us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — Now there's nothing wrong with the Pepin plan unless you're a farmer. And farmers simply cannot afford to pay more. The plan has something for all Canadians except for Saskatchewan. There are jobs in rail construction in B.C.; there are jobs building hopper cars in Ontario and Nova Scotia. I've sure the Leader of the Opposition will have happier relatives with jobs; and there's worse. There's undercutting for our feed grain prices with subsidies to Quebec and Ontario.

They wish to take away any natural advantage we have with respect to livestock by evening things up for their friends in the East. And all of this is to be paid for by Saskatchewan farmers. Farmers always pay and, as has been pointed out by our Premier, it's the intention of Ottawa to have them continue to pay on everything from tariffs, diesel fuel and, further, on freight rates. Not only that, but farmers are to be inflicted with 6 per cent annual inflation, and that's their reward for efficiency.

But we've gone on and on today saying what's wrong with the plan. I'm going to suggest what should be done. First of all, the rail system must be improved. Everyone seems to agree on that. Secondly, the question is: who should pay? And I take the position, on behalf of my constituents, that the taxpayers of Canada should pay, because it's the

taxpayers of Canada as a whole who have had a free ride on farmers for 117 years. The only problem is that the bulk of the taxpayers who live in eastern Canada don't understand the subsidy farmers have given them all these years.

The third point that has to be changed, and what I propose, is that freight rates be a percentage of farm prices. Farmers are reasonable. Farmers of my constituency don't want to pay more but they realize that they would pay more if they could get more for their products. I say they're reasonable. But to ask them to pay more and get nothing in return is totally unreasonable.

Fourthly, the rates should be distance related. I think that needs no further explanation. Fifthly, the money, in my opinion, should go to the railroads, simply to have them guarantee some performance. There are other reasons. One of the main reasons is that if eastern Canada perceives this sum as a payment to the farmers of Saskatchewan it's not far away from the day when they'll decide that they shouldn't pay farmers that money. With respect to railroads, they seem to get their way and even if we're not in power in two years the railroads will get their money one way or another if they provide the service.

Now I want to tell you that something else has to be done. For us to decide what a good idea is is not sufficient. The Pepin proposal is a declaration of war on Saskatchewan. This afternoon I heard our Premier put our province in battle preparation. I'm challenging the members opposite, all of the farm groups in this province and all of the citizens in this province to join this fight regardless of their political affiliations. And I can tell you that the fight has just begun. We will do our part. We will throw in the blue army, and the blue army is ready to march to defend Saskatchewan. I invite the members opposite to join with us and bring the remnants of their red army and we will jointly fight in Ottawa. And I propose a truce — at least for this issue.

Today we have had disagreements on this subject, but we generally agree that we have to fight for Saskatchewan. And to make it totally non-political, I invite Ralph Goodale to join us for moral support, if nothing else. I suggest that we, as leaders of this province, whether we are in power, almost out of power, or never will be in power, that we all join together and join this fight.

I have advised my government on what I think should be the plan of attack, and I indicate to the members opposite that they will soon be asked to throw out their troops in with the large legion on this side . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, maybe that's what we need, but I remind you that it is we who are binge raped, looted and pillaged, not Ottawa. The hordes are descending upon us. The vandals have struck here, and it's our duty to defend the empire of our farmers, such as it is. It's taken them 70 years to build what they have, and we have to defend it. And I ask you to join us, and I ask you to support the motion.

Gentlemen and ladies, citizens of Saskatchewan, I agree with Mr. Engel when he said (and I apologize for not using your constituency, but it's so far from mine I need a map to follow it. Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, thank you.) I agree with you . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I agree with you that this is war, and I am prepared to go at my own expense with you to Ottawa, even if only you and I go, and I'm prepared to have at least two members of the opposing armies join forces and go to Ottawa, and if you will advise me we will go down there, and I'll lobby our members, and you lobby your members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I know it will take me a little longer, but he's going to have a harder time convincing his, because his members think the price of wheat is too

high.

You ask Mrs. Broadbent if she thinks the price of wheat is too high. That's what I want to know. It will take you twice as long to convince your members as I will to convince ours.

In any event, war has been declared, and I think that we should rise to the occasion and meet the challenge and defend this province.

I know that my colleagues on this side will rise to the occasion and meet the challenge. I'm not so sure about the learned members on the opposite side, but I think when the crunch comes they will stand with the farmers and they might stand in the back row and they might be half-hearted, but I'm sure they will stand. But I invite you to take part. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to get into this debate. I listened to the members opposite, particularly the last member, the member for Melville, and I hear him talking about the blue armies and the red armies, and how we're going to march somewhere, and I have some difficulty in really trying to understand what he is getting at. I thought that the issue today was how the change in the crowrate, the Pepin plan, was going to affect the farmers of Saskatchewan. I don't think it's an army that we need to go and voice our opposition. What we need is a government on that side of the House that's going to take a position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — . . . that's going to take a position, which they haven't done in the nine months they've been in power. They've been sitting on that fence; they sat on that fence until as recently as maybe a week or two ago, when they still didn't have a position. They didn't know just what side they should take — whether they should take the side of the railways or whether they should take the side of the farmers. And they sat there and they waited; it seemed that eventually some of the people of the province finally pushed them off that fence, and they made the decision that they are going to support the farmers of Saskatchewan.

They are finally going to do that. At least they are going to do that verbally — they've done that in the House; they've done that in the media. But so far we haven't seen any action from that government. We haven't seen any plan they are proposing that says what kind of action they are going to take and how they are going to help the farmers of Saskatchewan make sure that the Pepin plan does not go in, that they are not forced to pay more than they are presently paying for the transportation of their grain.

That, Mr. Speaker, the members on that side of the House are not saying. They are only saying out there that we've always said that the farmer cannot afford to pay a penny more. Well, the farmers know that a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. The members on this side of the House knew that a long time ago. They knew that the farmer cannot afford to pay a penny more, and the members on this side of the House decided that they would go out there and they would take a position. They would take action to help the farmers, voice an opposition to what was happening in Ottawa. But are we getting that from this government? No. They say the farmers cannot afford to pay a penny more and that is all. It appears that that is the only kind of action that members opposite, this Government of Saskatchewan, are going to take in support of the farmers: nothing more than window

dressings to make the farmers somehow think they're on their side. But they aren't really going to go and oppose the railways — no, they won't do that. They'll just say, "We're with the farmers and we'll drop it at that, and if the farmer loses, well, it's tough."

Mr. Speaker, I think we need more coming from this government; we need more coming from this House. We have to take a position and with that position we have to take some action. We have to meet with our colleagues in Ottawa. We on this side of the House have convinced our colleagues in Ottawa that the side to be on is the side of the farmer. But what is happening on the Tory side of the House in Ottawa? We don't hear all the members there saying they are going to oppose the Pepin plan. They are not saying that they're going to support the farmers of Canada, specifically farmers of western Canada. No, you get a few of them that get up and oppose what Pepin is proposing, but for every one of those that get up in opposition, you've got 50 that sit back and don't say anything.

Well, Mr. Speaker, much of that is happening here today. You get a couple of members getting up and saying that they are in support of the farmer, that they are going to oppose any change to the crow. But how many of them are really that sincere about doing that? How many of them are really that sincere, Mr. Speaker? I think that is the big question and that is the question that the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to one day make a decision on. They will know what side this government is on. They will know that by the kind of action that this government takes, by the kind of action that it takes in the weeks and months ahead, by the kind of opposition it puts forward against this plan. That is how they will decide whether the government is on their side or whether they are just trying to make them believe that they are on their side, like many of the other things they have been doing.

What do we hear from Tories in Ottawa? Well, I've said what we hear there. Very little. We have heard nothing from the Conservative Party in this House, or in this province, until just a day or two ago when they finally decided that they should support the farmers. We hear very little coming out of the Conservative Government of Alberta. We have no support from the Tories in Manitoba and yet somehow the Tories in Saskatchewan here are saying that they are in support of the farmer and they are going to oppose the Pepin plan, and they are going to stand behind the farmer so the farmer doesn't have to pay a penny more. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, that is not enough.

Just saying it in the House here is not enough. What the people of Saskatchewan want is action from this government, action which has been forthcoming for a long time but has not come yet. I think the time has come when that action should be taken by this government. They should get out there and fight on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, because changing the crowrate will not only affect the farmers. It will affect them, but in turn it's going to affect business people. It's going to affect the whole economy of this province. And that, Mr. Speaker, is something that you don't hear this government saying.

Today, the Premier, for the first time, made some reference to what the cost might be to Saskatchewan if this was done, if the crow was changed. For about the first time he is really taking a position and realizing that changing the crow is going to have a drastic effect, a dramatic effect, on all of Saskatchewan. And that must be because if he was out in the P.A. by-election or if he was out anywhere in the province during the break, he realized that not only the farmers are out there complaining, but the business people are starting to realize how it is going to affect them. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why the

Premier finally decided that he should get up and say something, that he should finally get up and say what side he is going to be on, and who he is going to support . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . the members opposite from their seats — and I don't know why they don't get up and say so — they say that somehow I'm not in touch. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to say that I was in touch with my constituents, and I was in touch with the people of Saskatchewan, a long time ago. I knew the problems they were facing. I knew the problems they were going to be facing a year ago. I know the problems they are facing now, and I'm going to know the problems they will be facing a year from now.

Mr. Speaker, I stay in touch with my constituents. I know the kind of effect that changing the crow is going to have on them. The farmers in my area know the kind of effect it's going to have on them and so do the business people of that area. They have said so to me and I am sure the change in opinion of the government opposite is because many of the business people have finally been telling them what they think and how it's affecting them. That, Mr. Speaker, is why the government has finally changed their position. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member has asked me if I support the motion. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that any motion that would possibly help the farmers in retaining the crowrate is a motion that I would support. But it has to be a motion that is going to be explicit in its recommendations and it's going to be a motion that is going to make very clear what position the people of Saskatchewan are taking, not only the farmers, all the people of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan and all the members in this House. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, the rest of my caucus, the member says, are they supporting it? Yes, I am sure the members of my caucus will support the motion and the amendment placed to it, because with the amendment that motion becomes one that is going to be a motion that can be taken to Ottawa, and a motion that the Prime Minister of Canada will have to say is one that is somehow going to give a very clear indication of what the farmers of Saskatchewan want, what the people of Saskatchewan want.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment to your motion will do exactly that. I think it would be in the interest of the members opposite and of all the farmers of Saskatchewan if this government would support the amendment along with their motion and let's get down to doing the job that the people of this province expect us to do. Let's get down to doing the job that they sent us here to do. Let's support the farmers, let's support the businessmen and let's support all of those people, the volunteers, that are let out there working — trying to keep the crowrate intact.

That is what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker. We should be getting out there and we should be helping them. Just merely saying that we are in support of whatever they are suggesting will not be enough. What we have to do is get behind the various groups that are out there. All of the groups that are saying that we should now be out there speaking on their behalf and speaking along with them to retain the crow are not only NDP supporters. That has been said in the past, that it's been a political gimmick of the NDP to try and make the crow an issue. No, we didn't try to make the crow an issue for political reasons. We were making the crow an issue because it was an issue of the farmers, an issue of the business people of Saskatchewan, an issue to all of Saskatchewan. That's why we were trying to make that an issue. Today there are people out there that are once again trying to get together and see that this is once again brought to the attention of everyone. To make it an issue, farmers, business people,

even chambers of commerce that support the opposition, are out there saying that we should not have any changes to the crow. Now that I think the members opposite should really consider strongly and seriously because all the chambers of commerce will very likely be members that voted for them. And if they have any real interest in what happens to the crow, then they should be getting out there and proposing some type of plan as to how they intend to battle Ottawa on this proposed change.

There is nothing in the resolution proposed to this House that suggest that they are going to take any kind of action. Nothing whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, and that is the one thing that is wrong with it. The debate today is good, but debating on a motion that has nothing in it really benefits no one. There has to be a plan in there that says what we are going to do and what action we are going to take. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is a job that has to be done in this House, that is a position that has to be taken by this House, and I think it's time that the government opposite made clear to the people of Saskatchewan just what kind of action they intend to take . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I know that the members are tired of hearing about the crow. They want to hear as little as possible about the crow, because the more you talk about it the more uncomfortable they get. They get very uncomfortable with it, because they have some difficulty in getting all their troops rallied behind it and getting all of their members to support it. That's why they feel uncomfortable with it, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, they say if I will sit down and let it come to a vote that they will see how the support comes out. I am certain that the members that are here, the few of them that are in this House today, will very likely support it. I see a good number of farmers sitting in there, and I don't think that any farmer in his right mind today, even on that side of the House, would oppose any move to retain the crowrate. So I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that we wouldn't have any opposition from the members that are there today, they would support the motion. I'm sure, because they know the effect that it is going to have on farmers, that they will also support the amendment, because that is a part of the motion that is going to make it a motion that we can all go out in the country with and say that we are working on behalf of the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite were a little critical when somebody brought up the fact that the CPR makes some donations to the PCs, and they say that that has nothing to do with the Conservatives of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the past record of the members opposite, the Government of Saskatchewan, and Tories across Canada, it's quite clear that the \$25,000 and the \$35,000 that goes to the PC Party has some impact on the kind of action which they take, because if it didn't they would have spoken up a long time ago. They would have spoken up against the railways. They would have spoken up in support of the farmer. They would have spoken up for some solution to the problems which were facing agriculture.

But no, they didn't say anything. They hoped it would somehow die, the railways would get their way, and they really wouldn't have to take a position. But the time has come when they have to take a position. The time has come when they have to take that position. But they have only taken half a position.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be the seconder of the amendment because if the members opposite listen to the amendment and if they read that amendment, I think they would realize that what they should be doing is not taking half a position on the

plight of the farmers today, but they should also be passing this amendment and taking a total position in support of the farmers of Saskatchewan. That is what I intend to do, and I hope that all of the members on that side of the House also will do.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to this debate. I was interested in a number of the comments made by previous speakers. I heard the member for Weyburn attempting to distil the policy of the New Democratic Party not from any statements which I made, and I venture to think I have made a hundred or so public statements on the crowrate, but rather from statements of what Mr. Mazankowski said that I said, or what Mr. Pepin said that I said. And it would have been a little more convincing had he attempted to state the words that I used and distil something from them rather than from the enemies of the crowrate, in the case of Mr. Pepin, and perhaps an uncertain friend of the crowrate, in the case of Mr. Mazankowski, and we are about to find out just how sturdy a friend of the crowrate he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: — An excellent fellow.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I have no doubt that he is an excellent man. I have some doubt at this time, and I put it in those words, whether he's a stalwart defender of the crowrate, and I am looking forward to him proving me wrong. Nobody would be happier than I if Mr. Mazankowski proved himself to be a stalwart defender of the crowrate and an opponent of the Pepin plan.

I want to compliment the member for Melville for a number of his comments. Certainly he indicated that we were in for a battle. He suggested it had just begun. I would take some small issue with him on that. I think we've been in this battle for at least a year from the first time that it was clearly indicated that the crow was going to be axed by Mr. Pepin, and when he indicated that Mr. Gilson would be appointed, I think the die was cast then. Because what we should be doing is not opposing the Pepin plan as such, although we certainly do that, but also defending the crowrate as such. And it was clear that that was under attack about a year ago. But that's a quibble.

We are indeed in a battle and I accept his challenge to join with him and join with members opposite in battling to keep the crowrate and to oppose the Pepin plan. I welcome this common front by the whole House. And I want to spend a little time on what I think we should do in the light of what I think is a common desire on the part of all members of this House, at least to defeat the Pepin plan. We may have some differences as to what should be there and I don't want to argue about that at the moment. Our objective is to defeat the Pepin plan.

And I doubt the member for Kinistino feels that he is harking back to the many statements of the member for Souris-Cannington, the Minister of Agriculture, saying that their caucus is split down the middle. I don't want to repeat that. I don't want to raise the fact that there are probably divisions among us. All I want to do is that we have . . . We can all agree on one thing, and that's that we oppose the Pepin plan. Let's build on that unity and see what we should do as a legislature. And I think the issue is not whether we, as an opposition, and you, as a government, oppose the Pepin plan. We can all decide that very quickly. The issue is what we do about it on the basis of that agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We can pass a resolution and certainly this House has seen no

absence of resolutions on the crowrate and the support of the crowrate. And I won't burden the House with reading several in the past, but indeed we've had a good number where members on all sides of this House have spoken in support of the crowrate. So it's not resolutions we lack. But it's follow-up on resolutions which we have not yet achieved. And I think we should show a consensus not merely by passing a resolution but by doing a number of other things as well. And I think we're by no means alone here in this House.

A great number of farm organizations and key farm organizations in this province agree with us in opposition to the Pepin plan. And the Minister of Agriculture outlined the views of a good number of organizations. Some of them may oppose the Pepin plan for one reason and some another. But there's no doubt that the vast majority of farm organizations oppose the Pepin plan and will join with us in mounting a defence of the crow or an attack on the Pepin plan. And I think that there's no doubt that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the wheat pool and the National Farmers' Union together represent a very large block of farmers. Their position is unequivocal in opposition to the Pepin plan. And there are other organizations whose views I don't know as well but who are similarly, in my judgment, opposed to the Pepin plan.

So we have a situation where I suspect both sides of the House oppose the Pepin plan, a large number of key farm organizations oppose the Pepin plan, and the question is: now what do we do about it? How do we mount a campaign? How do we join battle, as the member for Melville would say? Well, I think there are two fronts. One of them is in parliament, and one of them is outside parliament . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, the member for Meadow Lake has put it well — eastern front and western front. But the outside parliament one is not solely confined to western Canada.

We have really a two-pronged strategy. In parliament we would like to delay this thing so that western farmers might have another kick at the can, and if there is an election intervening, it won't be the can they're kicking, but something else they're kicking. And therefore . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Rosthern is enjoying that little witticism.

I think we all know what we're talking about. If there is another opportunity to voice an opinion at the polls, I think that there may well be a clear voice from western Canada in opposition to the Pepin plan.

But we need also to mount something outside parliament, because the present government at Ottawa is not impervious to public pressure. They sometimes seem it, but they are not impervious to public pressure. Anyone who has been a student at dealing with the Trudeau government (and we have tried to follow that study in the course of our work when we were in government), has found that that government takes a stand and a completely rigid stand, apparently impervious to all public opinion. But when they feel that the pressure is too great, they can make a 90 or 180 degree turn with great ease. And I have seen the Prime Minister do that on the constitution several times. Absolutely nothing could be done on Monday, but by Wednesday it was a 180 degree turn, because he had felt that his negotiating ground was gone.

What we must do on this Pepin plan is see whether we can mount that sort of a campaign. Now how are we going to do this? Our amendment attempts to put out some ideas. I think we must show that there is a consensus in western Canada, or certainly in Saskatchewan, against the Pepin plan. The Premier in his remarks today suggested the

same thing, that steps might be taken to show that there is in fact a consensus.

We are suggesting that a plebiscite of producers, a plebiscite of holders of permit books, on their views with respect to the retention of the crowrate, would show incontrovertibly and overwhelmingly that there is no consensus to change the crowrate. So we think a plebiscite is a good idea for the government to think of. We would like to think that this was a prairie-wide plebiscite. We would like to think that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Alberta could be induced to join in a prairie-wide plebiscite on the idea of retaining the crowrate. Possibly other governments might insist on some preference — do you like the Pepin plan, or the Argue plan? I think that would clutter it up, but whatever would be necessary in order to get a prairie-wide agreement would be useful.

But if that can't be, if we can't relatively quickly put forward or get an agreement between the three prairie governments to have a plebiscite prairie-wide, then the Government of Saskatchewan might mount a plebiscite. We don't say that's an answer. We say it is helpful in building a clear idea in eastern Canada that there is no consensus to change the crow.

But what else might be done? Well, when we were faced with a somewhat similar problem of trying to explain to eastern Canadians why western Canada should be able to keep some of the increased value of petroleum and natural gas resources, I know both Premier Lougheed and I went on extensive speaking tours in eastern Canada to explain the point of view. That might be something that could be done.

I recall speaking in Halifax and Montreal and in Ottawa a couple of times and Toronto a couple of times and then in Kingston and several other places attempting to put the argument. And one, you would be amazed how far back people in eastern Canada were about the actual conditions in the oil patch as they then were, and what our claim was to keep some of that resource money. And I suspect that if you went to Kingston or Ottawa and attempted to explain the Crow's Nest Pass rate, you would start a long way back. There would be a good deal of educating to be done. But I think it's worth a try.

I don't suggest that it only be done by way of speaking tours by the Premier or other people who are similarly placed. We are suggesting in our resolution that consideration might be given to getting a small group of people representing the government — opposition, if you felt it advisable but we'd leave that entirely to you — and some representatives of farm groups who would go down and hold press conferences and press briefings so that opinion-makers in eastern Canada might be aware of what we're talking about. Because I assure you they are not now aware of what we're talking about. All they hear is that this is a rate that's been around since 1898, and what are those western people talking about suggesting that they shouldn't pay any more than they did in 1898? "There's nothing that we buy that we have the same price that was paid in 1898," says the person from Toronto.

Well, that is a relatively simplified view of things, and we have a much better case than that. And we can put that case by having a group go to eastern Canada — not once, but several times, into Vancouver by the look of it now, and put our case.

Now I won't try to outline all our case, but you know much of it: the contribution — and reference has been made by some other members to this — of grain and the export of grain to our national economy, the nature and origin of the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement, and the fact that it was really part of a development of railways in western

Canada by which the railway companies got very, very liberal grants of land and minerals. And they got those over a series of years. But the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement certainly was directly related to some grants of lands and minerals which have yielded the Canadian Pacific Railway very, very handsome returns. So, that case.

And nobody, I think, needs to hear yet another litany of how much money the railway companies have made. But I will just give a couple of figures which startled me . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, these I think will startle you. These are figures from Nesbitt Thomson, which is a bond company — a Nesbitt research paper talking about the years 1975 to 1980 and what companies made money in Canada. And everyone says, well, those were the great days of the resource companies. Nobody made more money than the resource companies in those five years. And you'd be wrong because transportation outperformed resources in earnings growth. Transportation earnings grew from \$54 million in 1975 to \$220 million in 1980, a compound annual growth rate of 32 per cent. And the largest increase within the transportation group was achieved by CP Rail. The net earnings rose from \$14 million up to \$61.4 million, an increase of more than 50 per cent. That's obviously a good deal more than 50 per cent.

Now, that's what happened to the CPR. So enough of all those stories about how tough things are with the CPR and how much money they're losing. In fact, the transportation sector outperformed the resource sector, and the CP Rail outperformed almost every other firm in the transportation sector. So that is a case to be made. I won't belabor the House further, but I think we know that. And that case can be made to those people who were saying that the railway companies are losing a great deal of money.

Another point that was made — I think by the Minister of Agriculture and others and certainly by the Premier — is that we need to outline for eastern urban people, particularly, the effect on western farmers of dismantling the crow but the effect on eastern farmers of dismantling the crow and the effect on eastern industry of dismantling the crow, and the point made by several others that the adverse impact upon eastern farmers cannot fairly be compensated for by further grants to eastern farmers designed to protect them from the additional costs which are being shifted to western farmers. Now that point was very strongly made.

I don't agree with the idea that farmers should necessarily pay a compensatory rate. I don't agree that that is a fair or a logical position to take, having regard to the Canadian economy at this time. But if western farmers are to pay a significantly increased amount to get their grain to market, and if this would adversely affect some consumers of that grain, namely the consumers of feed grain in eastern Canada, then to have them sheltered against it but not us sheltered against it is really a very unfair aspect of the Pepin plan. And that point should be made. And I think it should be made by delegations or groups going to eastern Canada in the way I suggest.

Now let's lay to rest another argument which is so frequently heard, and Mr. Pepin makes it ad nauseam. It's certainly ad nauseam so far as I'm concerned. And that is that we cannot have an improved transportation system unless we pay greatly increased amounts, unless we kill the crow and restructure the whole grain handling system in western Canada. Well, we have been hearing that now for 25 years anyway in western Canada. In the '60s, many of you will recall, it was said that we couldn't keep the branch lines unless the crow went. The branch lines were in bad shape; they needed to be repaired and this required a change in the crow. Well, the crow is still here — 20 years later — and the branch lines by and large are fixed. Not all, but a great improvement has

been made in them by the infusion of government funds.

And in the '70s the next story was that we needed a great deal more rolling stock. We had to have hopper cars, and we couldn't get more hopper cars unless we changed the crow. And government rallied and provided hopper cars, and we kept the crow.

I know that the hopper cars were provided by farmers dipping into their pockets through the Canadian Wheat Board and providing a couple of thousand hopper cars, by taxpayers in this province dipping into their resources and providing a thousand hopper cars, and by the taxpayers in Alberta doing the same thing. A criticism can be made of that, but it was a practical way to keep the crow. It succeeded in keeping the crow. I think that however unreasonable it is in theoretical terms for the railway companies to ask farmers to pay for their own rolling stock, we had to do it since no one was forcing the railway companies to provide it, and this provided it, and we kept the crow.

Now we're hearing yet again that this time it's the mainlines: we cannot get improvements in the mainlines unless we change the crow. Well, that's the poorest argument of all. At least hopper cars carry grain — and hopper cars carry only grain, substantially. The branch lines carry grain and substantially that's all they carry; 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the traffic on the branch lines is grain. With respect to the mainlines, it's only 20 per cent, and probably declining . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. So, the argument that we cannot get a pass through the mountains because the shippers of 17 per cent or 18 per cent of the goods are not paying enough is not a very convincing argument.

It may be that something would have to be done by way of an ad hoc arrangement of governments putting some money into that tunnel for the CPR. I certainly would not wish it, but if it had to be done to keep the crow, then perhaps it could be done. It certainly would not be my first, second, third or fourth choice, but if you're right down at the bottom of the barrel and have to do something to keep the crow, then that might be done.

We have talked in these terms before. We have said that we certainly wouldn't hand over provincial government money to the CPR; that's going a little too far. But if we had to do, and Alberta and the federal government had to do, what we did with hopper cars — put up the money and keep an asset — then we might do that with respect to the CPR mainline, and we'd expect some equity back. That's not a good arrangement but it's better than losing the crow.

In any case, there are many, many things we could do to advise Canadians outside the House of Commons of the importance of keeping the crowrate and seeing whether we could mount some case that the federal government would listen to. No government that is as far behind in the polls as that one is, is impervious to all public concern. Even though they're not expecting to win any seats in western Canada — and their expectation is very well-founded I may say — they still cannot be impervious to all public opinion in western Canada. So, there are lots of thing we could do outside the House of Commons and we have tried in our amendment to list some of them.

Turning now to what we could do in the House of Commons, I think there are some things that could be done. I think we could, first, try to see that all the western MPs are on-side, with the possible exception of the two Liberals from Winnipeg. I think that that might be possible.

You will have seen Mr. Broadbent's statement on behalf of the New Democratic Party MPs — western and eastern — that they would oppose the Pepin plan. And that's 30 or so, and that's a good start, and I think we must accept that as being a fair concession, particularly for MPs from Ontario and British Columbia who may feel some pressure from their constituents because of the prevailing public views there in British Columbia and Ontario which we have not yet straightened out. And I think that we will need to do the same with respect to the Progressive Conservative MPs, many of whom will oppose the Pepin plan out of hand, but many of them will have to be talked to because it will be presented as a freeing of the economy and making it more competitive and the rest. And we know that that is hardly an effective argument when you're dealing with a monopoly, but none of the less I hear that argument and I know that that has attraction for MPs who share that economic view (and I'm not now here criticizing it), and who do not know the facts with respect to the crowrate.

So, we would urge members opposite — and we say this in no belligerent tone — to see what could be done with respect to marshalling all of the Progressive Conservative MPs. It is our suggestion that Premier Devine, who has very good relations with Joe Clark, we are led to believe, could meet with Mr. Clark and Mr. Nielsen and see whether or not a common front could not be welded there in opposition to the Pepin plan.

We do not now have to have a common front as to what's going to be put in its place. That is tomorrow's problem. Today's problem is to untrack the Pepin plan, and we would invite members opposite to use all their influence with the Progressive Conservative MPs to see whether that can't be done. We would also invite them, in the same vein, to speak to their colleagues in Alberta and Manitoba to see whether or not support cannot be gained from the Progressive Conservative parties in those two provinces and the Progressive Conservative leaders in opposition to the Pepin plan.

Turning back again to the House of Commons, we would invite members opposite (and we will give any help that we could, in influencing the New Democratic Party caucus) to mount a united and determined opposition to any legislation introduced to change the crowrate. Now it requires legislation. You can't change a statutory rate without changing a statute. And I say a united opposition, and that I think we could get, if you people are successful with the great bulk of your Progressive Conservative MPs and the determined opposition.

When it comes to a determined opposition, I am a great admirer of Mr. Nielsen. I know nobody who can mount a more determined opposition than Mr. Nielsen, and he's just second to nobody in mounting strategies which will keep things from going through parliament when he wants them not to go through parliament. And I think if you have any chips to call in, I invite you to call them in now, because this is a very, very important issue for Saskatchewan farmers. I think we saw a very determined opposition mounted to the Canagrex legislation, and I'm not now dealing with the merits or otherwise of that legislation. I just say that no one can deny that a determined opposition was mounted. And we would certainly expect that there would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, indeed we weren't. And just imagine how much more could be done if all opposition parties were opposing the introduction of the kill-the-crow legislation and that that opposition was pursued with the same diligence that it was in the Canagrex case so far as the Conservatives are concerned, and pursued with equal diligence by the NDP. So I think that that is the sort of thing that we should try to mount. We have attempted to outline this in our amendment.

We talk about a plebiscite, a media campaign, and we don't pretend that that's our idea. The member for Weyburn, Mr. Hepworth, suggested that some time ago, I believe it was in June. In June 28 *Hansard* he talks about money that would have been better spent convincing the rest of Canada, especially central Canada, about our position with respect to the crow. There is merit in mounting whatever we may need by way of a media campaign. We have in mind there the press conferences and the like, but also a paid media campaign.

There is now a crow retention group active in Saskatchewan who are going about with petitions and getting very, very large meetings. I was at one in Prince Albert where they had close to 600, and I know there was a large one in Shellbrook, and this is, so far as I can see, a non-partisan group. The meeting that I say was chaired by a former Western Canada Concept candidate and accordingly cannot be thought to be a plant for the New Democratic Party. I think you'll give me that. There were people of all political persuasions at that meeting.

We speak of a special delegation to central and eastern Canada and I've already dealt with that. We speak of getting support from the Conservatives and the NDP in parliament and the Alberta and Manitoba governments, and we speak of such other things as may be necessary. Now if you feel that this plan is not a good plan, obviously we would welcome any other suggestions, but basically we think that our suggestions are sound. They're sound in order to engender more public support for opposition to Pepin, sound in impressing upon the government in Ottawa that there is no consensus to change the crow, and sound in laying out a strategy for opposing the crow legislation in parliament. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion which starts us along the way, I will be supporting the amendment which I think lays out a plan of attack.

I join with the member for Melville in saying that we are, in fact, in a battle. We have laid out our proposals for a battle plan. We think that they are reasonable proposals. We invite members opposite to support the amendment and we will certainly be supporting the motion because we support your endeavors to kill the Pepin plan.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I sense that the Leader of the Opposition has endorsed the nine points that we have made and the motion to deal with the Pepin plan. And I just want to touch briefly on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, before I encourage all members to vote against the amendment. But just before I get specifically to the amendment, I want to deal with a comment or two that was made by the member for Pelly who unfortunately is not in his seat at this time. But he talked about only now are we stating the cost and the impact that the Pepin plan would have to the province of Saskatchewan? And why wasn't this done months ago? Why wasn't this done way back when? Well, admittedly, Mr. Speaker, our research people aren't of the calibre of John Burton. We did not have a great deal of idea what the Pepin plan would contain until it was announced and made public. So once the ghost was out of the closet, so to speak, then we got at our research and we decided that the impact of the Pepin plan would be indeed detrimental, not only to Saskatchewan but I think to the Canadian economy. And thus the motion before us today.

Now to deal specifically with the amendment offered by the opposition, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly further urges the Government of Saskatchewan to join forces with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers' Union, the

Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the federation of agriculture . . .

And then it's silent. And I am rather offended by that particular portion of the amendment, not for what it says but for the groups that are not included in it. And the reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're trying to leave Saskatchewan with is a consensus, not more division. And so, Mr. Speaker, we would, as we have been since the Saskatoon conference . . . We have been talking with all farm groups and all farm leaders. I've maybe missed one or two — I don't know. But we certainly talked to the vast majority of them and came up with the nine points that we put before you today, to organize a plebiscite for the Saskatchewan grain producer with the participation of other producers, to allow them to choose among the Pepin plan, the Argue plan, the existing crowrate.

Well, by the Leader of the Opposition's own admission, as he was standing up just a moment ago, he said, "Well, that may kind of clutter it up." And I tend to agree with him. It may kind of clutter it up. I don't rule out that a plebiscite may be necessary. I don't think it is, because I think the vast majority of people out there today would want us to defeat the Pepin proposal. And I think if we have the resolve to do that, we don't need the plebiscite. I don't rule it out. And the Leader of the Opposition said, "Well, even better would be a prairie-wide plebiscite." Well, I don't think we would have any problem with Manitoba. I don't know where we would go with Alberta because I haven't raised that particular question with them. But I don't want it to be enshrined in this resolution because it denies us the flexibility to work on that if we choose to go that way.

To organize a Canada-wide media campaign to inform Canadians of the implications of the Pepin plan. Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the former premier, the Leader of the Opposition, while he was in his seat today listening to the Premier would have heard that that's one of the things he would propose. And in fact this very afternoon he left for Ottawa and is, today and tomorrow, meeting with our federal counterparts, meeting with the media, meeting with anybody else he can meet with, to explain our position. And it won't end there.

I'm sorry that the agriculture critic, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, missed that speech today because I'm sure, had he been listening to it, he wouldn't have brought this amendment forward.

To encourage the signing of a petition to show the members of parliament and other Canadians the concerns Saskatchewan people have about the Pepin plan. Well, it's not that long ago that we saw a petition tabled in the House of Commons that was a roll that deep. It had to do with the metric system. And you know the impact that had. I won't discourage it. If anybody wants to take a petition down there, let them. I won't discourage it. I would encourage, rather, a letter-writing campaign to members of parliament and ministers of transport. In my view that would have far more impact on the federal government than a petition, because we all recognize the impact that probably the largest petition in the history of the world had on them. It's just so much paper to them, whereas a letter demands some attention.

To organize special delegations to central and eastern Canada to explain the position on the crowrate and negative effects, etc., etc., etc. Not a bad idea, but we've already got one down there. They left this afternoon. We will have more. I may invite you to come to Quebec City with me. I don't know. I haven't made that decision yet. I'm not sure

I could put up with you that long.

To seek the support in writing. Well, take other such steps. Well, I've touched on it generally. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and since most of them were touched on by the Premier when he spoke and some of them by myself when I spoke, and since I sensed from the opposition that they do in fact recognize the principles of a statutory rate for grain as a must, and they recognize that cost protection for farmers is a must, and they recognize that grain is sold on a competitive international market, and all of the other points that are on this, I think that the amendment offered by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg does more harm than it offers good. That attempt . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We're doing it anyway in some instances. In some instances you'd be . . . I'm sorry I work you up. In some instances, Mr. Speaker, this amendment would, in fact, deny us the flexibility necessary to get the co-operation of other groups. For that and all of the points previously stated, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members to vote against the amendment and vote for the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am pleased that the debate is before the session on the opening day. I agree with one statement, at least, made by the Minister of Agriculture, where he said today that the Pepin plan will be a lethal blow to the farmers of Saskatchewan. As others have said today, it is not only a lethal blow to the farmers; it is going to be a lethal blow to many of the small towns and villages in Saskatchewan. I think this breaking of the crow, of the Pepin plan, would have the most devastating effect on Saskatchewan of any event in the history of this nation.

I want to say that it is interesting, and I think it's important, we come clear as to what is the Tory position. Today, we have motion with nine points. I want to say that as one reads the statements made by some of the leading Tories on the federal scene — the former minister of transportation, Mr. Mazankowski; if one wants to look at the position taken by Jack Murta — we clearly know that Tories are taking different positions throughout this country.

I want to say that if we really want to stop this Pepin plan, the Tory party unequivocally has an opportunity and can achieve it. I say that because they present provincial governments in eight provinces in Canada. I want to say that they represent the official opposition in Ottawa, and I want to say that the polls indicate that there is a strong possibility that they could form the next federal government.

I want to say that if this Pepin plan could be stopped, it's within the confines and the power of Tories across this country. But, I'll tell you what we have here, in my view, is perhaps a mild public relations presentation to present to the people of Saskatchewan a feeble attempt by this Devine government that they are fighting for the crow.

But I want to say that if they join together and get their colleagues to support the defeat of the Pepin plan, no federal government could possibly move on it. I want to say that we have a Premier in Alberta, and that his government and several members of the Alberta legislature are indeed supporting the Pepin plan.

I want to say that if you go to Manitoba, where the Premier of Manitoba submitted a resolution in the House asking for a stop to the Pepin plan, the former premier, Sterling Lyon, refused to support that position.

So let us not be confused as to what is happening. A group here in this province would not take up any action when the former minister of agriculture was in fact using some of the treasury to inform the public at the outset of the initiation by the federal government; they refused to partake and to participate. I want to say that one of the outstanding members and a long-time member of the Tory party, Mr. Justice Hall, did participate in the meetings that we held throughout this province. I want to say that he saw the need for meetings with people, and he participated with the former minister of agriculture. But we were criticized that it was a political game that we were playing. Then, in saying that, they're saying that Mr. Justice Hall was a party to a political game.

I want to say that they had an opportunity to join with us in several resolutions we put before this House to solidly indicate that both political parties in this province represented in this House were against the Pepin plan. In every attempt that we've made to debate a motion in this House they watered it down and refused to take a position.

I want to say that the Minister of Agriculture made another statement. He said the provincial government action has just begun. Well I agree with him because he hasn't done anything up to now. So he's right again — just begun. And I am convinced that "just begun" cannot lead us to a very significant accomplishment by the Devine government.

I want to say that the Minister of Finance, who spoke briefly before adjournment this evening, indicated that really what we have to do here is treat this as a non-political issue. He says it's a non-political issue. When we were government fighting for the retention of the crow, he had the audacity, he and his party, to indicate when we were doing it, it was political. But now that they're doing it, it's non-political.

I want to say that he and also some of the speakers indicated that what the federal government has done is to go out to the various farm groups and to divide and rule. Now, I would say that in order to prevent the divide and rule concept which has been put forward what we should have been doing right at the outset, as soon as it was raised that there was a threat to the dismantling of the crow, that that was the time that action had to be taken. Because you have to mobilize. You wait until Pepin has done all of his lobbying and as you have indicate yourselves, the process of divide and rule. And now you're saying that you're going to come in at this late date.

I want to say that while I certainly treat this issue as a very significant issue to all of Saskatchewan — it will be a lethal bill, I say, to the farm community and to the business community of Saskatchewan — the impact of this can be illustrated fairly easily as many of my constituents demonstrated. You take a point, like in my constituency, of Englefeld where they purchase about 850,000 bushels of grain in that community, increase the cost to the farmer of \$1 a bushel . . . (inaudible) . . . eventually increase to, and you take \$850,000 out of that small community's purchasing power.

If you just go down the road seven miles, you get to another point — Watson. Combine the total grain that is there and increase it by \$1 a bushel, and you will find that it is from \$1.6 million to \$1.8 million out of those two communities. This is the devastating impact that this Pepin proposal will have. So while I welcome the opportunity to participate and to examine the seriousness which this proposal will have, I am also very sceptical as to the total commitment of the government opposite. I want to say that they

talk about their co-operation with the federal government and that was illustrated today by the Minister of Agriculture. They co-operated in job creations and they co-operated in other ways.

Here they have eight Tory governments across Canada. I ask them and the federal opposition party to take the opportunity of joining together that support. And I will tell you that that is one of the essential means of helping to prevent the implementation of this program. But I want to say that that is not going to happen. One needs only to look at the events in the political arena. Recently the leader of the federal Tory party, who was a Westerner, who I suspect would be under grave pressure to support the western position, has been effectively dismantled from the leadership of that party. And I suspect that if they choose another leader, he will represent the eastern interests. Because if you look at the proposal here, those who are going to benefit most are in eastern Canada.

And, I want to say while the Premier has indicated four or five points which he indicated as a line of attack. He indicated, first of all, that he is going to stick to the nine points as set out in the resolution, and I hope that he will tell all of his members to stick to it because my interpretation of some of the comments made in the debate would indicate that they not all are totally behind sticking to the nine points set out in the resolution.

Also, he has indicated that he's prepared to go to bat for agriculture — use the treasury if necessary. He spelled out no details as to how this might be achieved. Obviously if he's going to bat, he must have a plan, but apparently, even though they raised that as an emergency debate, we received no details, because I suppose, better not to set it out and then be caught in a position — better to make a position which can be changed at any occasion. Talking to other jurisdictions, the Premier indicated he would be doing that.

As I say, 10 months have passed and apparently now they have only thought of talking to other jurisdictions. Because certainly, the Minister of Agriculture had an opportunity this afternoon to demonstrate in what way he had been working and what concrete actions he had taken in order to defend the crow for the western farmers. Also, he indicated that he intended to commence a lobby. And I want to say that, fair enough — I don't disagree with the proposals put forward, but I want to say that on the actions of this government today, I find it difficult to believe that they really have their heart in it.

Certainly, we in our party have consistently, both provincially and federally, taken the position of the retention of the crow. Our position has been clear; our position has been consistent. In other words, we feel that any party cannot legitimately on an issue of this nature, have one provincial Tory government taking one position, and to the west, have another Tory government taking a different position. Really what is happening is that Tories are across the nation taking an opportunistic position in respect to this major issue which will affect western Canada as no other issue has done.

In closing then, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am pleased to participate in this debate. I want to say that, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated clearly, we have set forward some specific points for an approach, an action plan, and unfortunately the Minister of Agriculture again is not going to be pinned down with any specifics. He wants to be able to change his course. In other words, in my view, Mr. Speaker, he hasn't quite made up his mind yet.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of the farmers, the business

community, the people of Saskatchewan, that we as New Democrats are prepared to lend every assistance in order to forestall and in fact prevent the implementation of the Pepin report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 7

Blakeney
Thompson
Engel

Lingenfelter
Koskie

Lusney
Shillington

NAYS — 32

Muller
Birkbeck
Berntson
Sandberg
McLeod
McLaren
Garner
Klein
Katzman
Currie
Smith (Swift Current)

Boutin
Hampton
Weiman
Bacon
Tusa
Hodgins
Sutor
Sveinson
Sauder
Petersen
Glauser

Parker
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Martens
Rybchuk
Young
Domotor
Maxwell
Dirks
Myers
Zazelenchuk

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a few words to say with respect to the crow debate and the Pepin proposals. I hope not to redefine “few” as was done earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. He said he had a few words to say as well, and it took rather a lengthy time.

My comments, Mr. Speaker, whether they were of a lengthy nature or a very short nature, could not say any more than has already been said by the Premier and by the Minister of Agriculture. Our position, Mr. Speaker, has been well set out in those comments. With all respect to members of the House, any discussion and speaking on the subject of the Pepin proposals, the crowrate, freight rates generally, is not really going to be any better placed nor any better accepted by the people of this province than was set out by the Premier today.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that all those that are so concerned, and they should be, take the time to get a copy of *Hansard*, and read what the Premier had to say. It seems interesting, Mr. Speaker, that after 11 years in office, the official opposition today in some way finds it fair to say that we have not taken a position, or that we are not establishing a position, or that we have not done anything to stop the Pepin proposals. They had 11 years in office and the crowrate was discussed every year of those 11 years in one way or another. I know of nothing positive that ever came of any actions of the previous administration.

It's very unfortunate too, Mr. Speaker, that when we move into the debate on this issue, that we have their official agriculture critic, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, stand in the House and talk about the supposed lack of funds that the people have to buy stocks in CPR. What the relevance of stocks in CPR is to the crow debate is difficult, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to understand how that had any relevance in today's debate. I don't know about the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, but I can speak for myself, I do lack the funds to invest in CPR stocks. But my point, Mr. Speaker, is this: that is not the issue in rural Saskatchewan among farmers as to who has stocks in CPR. Now if you do, fine; that's wonderful; but I don't. I don't know of any farmers that do. There may be a few of them, but it's not the issue. I say that to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg because he is the agriculture critic.

He talks as well of how the CPR is the main culprit, and this has been going on for as long as I've been a member in this House, where you people talk of the CPR, but you have no condemnation for the CNR. They, too, haul grain; they, too, make the same claims as the CPR. It makes no difference, does it? You don't learn, you obviously don't learn.

Mr. Speaker, he demands action, an action plan from the provincial PC government. As I said earlier, the question in that comment is: what was your action plan in 11 years in office? You had no plan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, we know where it got you, we know where it got you.

Mr. Speaker, the member wants to know what our federal counterparts in Ottawa believe. Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly know what his counterpart in Ottawa believes and how he had the audacity, the political ignorance, whatever terminology you would like to tag to it, to indicate to Canadians that yes, he was responsible for putting the Liberals back in power and that he did it in the best interest of Canadians. Now how the Leader of the NDP in Ottawa could come to admit that publicly is beyond me. Now if the agriculture critic for the opposition wants to deal with an issue, there is one to deal with. You can concern yourself that we should talk to our official counterparts in Ottawa, but I can assure you, member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, you want to talk to your official counterpart in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue: freight rates, agriculture in Saskatchewan, and how it's best to be handled, not only on the short term but in particular on the long term. That, Mr. Speaker, was well identified in the Premier's remarks today. We like to look at these matters in a broad perspective and not in the narrow perspective that the members of the opposition find it so easy to view matters through.

The other frivolous argument that that agriculture critic made, Mr. Speaker, was the political contributions. Does it really matter to the farmers of Saskatchewan on this issue whether the CPR and the CNR made donations to any one of the three political parties or any political party in this country? Is that really the issue? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the issue.

So, those are the very few comments that I have to reply to to the agriculture critic. That was the sum total of his contribution today on this vital issue — the sum total. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has gone. The other member knew not well enough to stay. He left earlier. The member for Quill Lakes — yes, you stay because you weren't here all day; you have

to learn and pick up because you weren't in on the debate.

The member for Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker, suggests our position on the crow debates in the House has been watered down. May I remind the member that the last resolution on the crow debate in this House, introduced by their minister of agriculture, the Hon. (at that time) Gordon MacMurchy, was refused to allow to come to a vote — not by us in opposition but by you in government. You wouldn't let your own minister of agriculture's resolution come to a vote.

I just raise that so you can brace yourselves because I believe the member for Rosthern may have some elaboration on that subject.

Now the member for Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker, asks for Tory governments to support the opposition in Ottawa to stop the Pepin proposal. Again, one has to go back to that basic argument of who put them in office. Who put them in there? It was the NDP that sided with the Liberals to put them back in power and put the Clark government out. Now you want the Tories all to band together in opposition to fight the very people they put in office.

It's because of that kind of action, Mr. Speaker, by NDPs throughout this country, that has this very Pepin proposal before the farmers of Saskatchewan. It's the very reason that we have this debate in the House today. It's not a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of the Tories — not at all.

So, very quickly, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the positive aspects as we debate the issue. We as a government, and we when we were in opposition, identified clearly that the farmers of Saskatchewan must not have to pay a cent more for the movement of grain. We said that. Now, how many more times one would have to say that to convince these people in opposition is hard to say. It may be a long time. We are looking at substantial increases, possibly in the neighbourhood of 500 per cent increase in rail rates. True, that cannot be a matter that would be very easily upheld by farmers in this province, with input costs rising all the time. Certainly it would have its reflection on small communities in particular. We understand that, and for that reason stand in support of farmers in saying that we do not see how they can, at this time, at ever time, absorb increases that are being proposed by the Pepin proposal. The Minister of Agriculture has said that. I don't know how many times he's said that. I've heard him say it in the House. I've heard him say it on the radio. I've watched him on the television saying it, and I've read it in the newspaper, and he's identified it.

Well, what do you choose to do? You choose to take the whole day with dribble and debate, talking about matters that we've already touched on I don't know how many times over how many years. You talk about plebiscites. We have elections. We had one on April 26. People delivered their verdict at that time. We had one yesterday. Now, I don't know what more one would want to do. Our proposals were well identified during the campaigns, both campaigns. The farmers obviously accept those proposals. They seem to understand, and yet because of you people debates like this are necessary, rather than having some unanimous consent in the House, which is all that we ask for today on the opening day of the House. That's all we ask for — your unanimous consent.

The Premier spoke today and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in that speech he identified one of the greatest concerns that western Canadians have. He spoke of trust. Can we trust federal Liberals? Highly unlikely. It's highly unlikely we can trust federal Liberals or the federal NDP or the provincial NDP, because they're one and the same. They talked of how they would not give us wage and price controls but they gave us wage and price

controls. The hon. member for Weyburn identified how we were suggesting at one time, federally, 18.6 cents a gallon increase in gasoline. Oh, no, they'd never do that, but they did. They gave us 68.5 approximately. Those are the people that you support — federal Liberals.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for my part and for my view and my opinion on this subject, western Canadians have been asked to pay for enough. We have respected two official languages in this country, Mr. Speaker. Through that respect we have prepared ourselves and we do pay for the cost of two languages in this country. We, Mr. Speaker, in western Canada, have against our objections (and I remember that well, Mr. Speaker, against our objections) opposed metric in this country. I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, as I sat over there as a part of seven members standing in my place and sincerely opposing metric at that time, while you people were government over here, and we had the Liberals sitting on our right, and what did you tell us . . . and what did the Liberals tell us? Not just us, they told me personally, "You're politically naïve — what do you know?" Well, I know one thing — that it was a tremendous cost to Canadians. And you talk about having to have metric to export products. Well, I'll tell you the Japanese don't do bad in exporting cars into Canada. Never had any problem there, did they? Where was your position on that? No way . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, they have an excellent vehicle there for you, Ned. I won't discuss with you what it is — well, not here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the national energy program is another federal program that we have had to absorb as a cost to western Canadians. And as the Premier identified today as well, the tariffs, eastern tariffs. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the federal government does not want to support Saskatchewan. And clearly in my mind, neither does the NDP want to support Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate as well some indications that the members opposite might learn from the speech of the member for Weyburn, when he, as well, went through many of the clippings going back over a year, identifying what the then premier, now Leader of the Opposition, had to say with respect to the crow. And those are well identified now and documented in the *Hansard* of this legislature. So for any person in this province who is unclear as to what the position is of the Progressive Conservative Government of Saskatchewan, I suggest that any of those who are capable of reading might bring themselves up-to-date. And maybe the member for Regina Centre might want to do just that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to just say, and say it very quickly, that the members on this side of the House, the Progressive Conservative Government, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that I wouldn't have to say this many more times, are clearly behind the farmers on this side. We are clearly behind Saskatchewan as it relates to agriculture in this province.

Now what, Mr. Speaker, is expected of us? I don't know whether we are supposed to lay ourselves down before the first CPR train coming down the track and commit some kind of suicide, or what it is we are supposed to do to more vehemently oppose the Pepin proposals. I don't know, Mr. Speaker. But I really do feel that we have done all that we can to set our opposition out to the Pepin plan. And, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've been restraining myself from getting into my usual junkets with the opposition. And that's about what it amounts to now. But if they would like, while you people went out to decide whether or not you are going to support your own blooming amendment, I took the opportunity to go to the washroom. While I was in the washroom, Mr. Speaker, I had none other than the member for Shaunavon in the washroom when I was in there. It struck my mind, Mr. Speaker, that I should say something to him, but as I don't know . . . I'd never go that low, not in there. I'll save that

for the House. So, if you want one, Ned, I'll tell you. In the members' washrooms you have a situation where we're effective in reducing your numbers by 50 per cent, there'll be personalized, got this now, personalized urinals for each of you because there's only four in the members' washrooms.

Now, as you well know, I could go on all night doing that, but that isn't what this debate is all about. This isn't a joking matter. It's a very serious matter and I've set it down, Mr. Speaker. The comments, as I've said, couldn't be better said than the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture said it today. That's in the *Hansard*. We've had some other good speeches today, and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that at least we're prepared to allow our own motion to come to a vote. I would like to just challenge the members of the opposition to try and stop us from having this motion come to a vote.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I want to come to a vote, I'm going to take my place and just say that I obviously support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I thought I might get in the debate a little earlier in the day and spent some lengthy time preparing a text that I was going to use on this important issue.

Basically what the federal Liberals have tried to do is rape the wealth of Saskatchewan by an insidious method. They are attempting to change crow.

The member for Moosomin referred to a debate that took place in this House, Monday, March 22, 1982. The mover of that motion was the Hon. MacMurchy. (He's now the mayor of Semans.) And the motion had to do with the crowrate. It was interesting. The moment the Conservative opposition stood to their feet and made sure that the former government, now the members of the opposition, knew where we stood, they didn't want to have a vote. They didn't want it on the official record of *Hansard* and this Legislative Assembly that the Conservatives were in favor of the benefits that the crow gave the farmers of Saskatchewan. They didn't want that to be in an official document of the House, and they didn't let us vote on it. No, they stood the motion. They adjourned the motion. In fact, they had the member that used to sit in this chair stand up and adjourn the motion — Mr. Mostoway — and of course, he's not here anymore either. It's just a crying shame that the both of them aren't here anymore.

You know, the way you fellows are going, I think you've got a death wish. You must have. The Minister of Agriculture has been saying since we became government that the farmer can't pay any more. But I think you've got plugs in your ears, because it never got in. He kept saying "sitting on the fence." How more blasted straight can he be? He said "no more." You guys just don't understand that lingo and you go with your false rumors and vicious you-know-whats. You never want to tell the truth.

You know, I also remember just prior to the election there was a little pamphlet flying around. It was called "Eating Crow." Had something to do with the former government who are now eating crow. They are not the government because they played games and the people didn't trust you. Our minister and our leader have said point blank where we stand. And we've said in all the other things that the federal Liberals will try to defuse the issue. The point is, number one, the farmer doesn't pay another red cent. You try to turn it all over the place. The fact is, the Premier has spoken today, the Minister of Agriculture has spoken, and let's see if you fellows have got the intestinal fortitude to

stand on your feet and support this motion as we were prepared to support your motion to protect the farmers of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, time is limited. I will be supporting the motion.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join in the debate with my colleagues on the crow issue. An issue, Mr. Speaker, which, if allowed to go unchallenged by our government, will certainly negatively affect the direction of agriculture in our province as a whole for generations to come.

The Pepin plan, Mr. Speaker, is one which is a direct assault on the livelihood of Saskatchewan's farmers. It is a massive grab into their pockets and is in fact tantamount to outright theft. Under this proposal freight rates to farmers will increase by 400 to 500 per cent within the next 10 years. Obviously, it is not a plan which will benefit Saskatchewan agriculture.

It is important to take note, Mr. Speaker, of the many negative aspects of this proposal.

Firstly, farmers are being asked to pay the rate increases up front. Then sometime later, perhaps as long as a year later, they will have a portion returned. That in reality is an interest-free loan to the federal government.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we should note the rapid escalation of freight rate costs over the years. In 1983, the crowrate amounts to approximately 4.89 per tonne. In 1986, it will be 8.86 per tonne, and by 1991, this will have leaped to \$27.45 a tonne, about 5.5 times crow. It should be noted that Saskatchewan will be paying significantly more than Manitoba or Alberta, because according to the Pepin formula, the crow difference rapidly increases as the multiple of crow increases.

Another negative feature, Mr. Speaker, is that farmers are being asked to pay the full freight costs over 31 million tonnes of grain shipped. This will add enormously to the total cost back to them.

Mr. Speaker, a further aspect of this proposed legislation is one which rubs salt in the wounds of western Canadians. Originally, the railroads got everything they wanted and more, and now they are getting everything they want and more again. According to the Pepin plan, the railroads will be guaranteed 100 per cent of their costs plus 20 per cent. Which farmer would complain if he were to have those returns on his operation — 100 per cent of costs plus an additional 20 per cent? No farmers would complain, Mr. Speaker, none at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they tell us there will a further review in 1985-86 with a possibility of further changes. What changes will come out of that and subsequent reviews are unknown. The federal government is asking the farmer to give up his only known cost for an unknown rate structure which is then subject to further revision and more uncertainty in future years. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to see that the Pepin plan does not propose to do any favors for Saskatchewan's farmers. But may I remind the hon. members opposite that this plan which they so loudly condemn is on the table today and hangs like a guillotine above the heads of Saskatchewan farmers due to the actions of none other than the NDP. This plan, which strikes at the very livelihood of Saskatchewan farmers, has been made possible by none other than the co-operation of

the NDP with the Ottawa Liberals.

I should like to remind the hon. members opposite, and the people of Saskatchewan, of that fateful day in 1980 when five NDP members of parliament from Saskatchewan, who held the balance of power, voted with the Trudeau Liberals against the Conservative government, and in doing so gave the Trudeau Liberals another opportunity to wreak havoc on our people. Mr. Speaker, while the hon. members opposite may have chosen to forget that night in Canada's history, let me say that the people in Prince Albert-Duck Lake did not. The people in Prince Albert-Duck Lake remembered yesterday, and loudly gave their answer to that discredited and withering party.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that our government and our party has consistently opposed any crow change which places any additional financial burden on our farmers. Our government has pointed out to the federal government that in the past export year Canadian farmers shipped out more than 2.7 million metric tonnes of grains to overseas markets and earned this nation \$6 billion and badly need export dollars. In fact, our grain shipments are one of the few bright spots in an otherwise ailing economy.

The federal government should be promoting the expansion of this market, not making it more difficult for our farmers to compete on a world grain market. Unless we compete our customers will go elsewhere. If the Saskatchewan farmer is forced to pay higher freight charges he will have to build those charges into his selling price, and in so doing, we will lose our competitive edge and our markets. Every dollar Ottawa invests in our grain transportation system is an investment in the economic future of Canada for all Canadians. It is not a subsidy that keeps an unviable operation running; it will return its investment many, many times over. The federal government's obligation is to promote our grain sales overseas, not hinder them.

In short then, it is our government's position that the crowrate should remain unchanged and that the federal government should be responsible for paying any crow shortfall. Our government recommends that the federal government assure western grain producers that the future burden of rail costs will be borne by Ottawa on behalf of all Canadians, and our western grain producers will not be subjected to any disincentives regarding additional grain production. Mr. Speaker, because the Pepin plan does not meet this criteria, it is incumbent upon me to support the motion which has been introduced in this House by the Minister of Agriculture today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOMOTOR: — Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate in anticipation that the federal government will eventually listen to reason and forget about its short-sighted policy and look at long-range planning that will affect both the western and eastern provinces for the good of all Canadians, rather than just for eastern concerns.

The crowrate, which is a major concession to the Prairies, is one of the few benefits that we receive. This commitment was made by the railways for value received in the Crow's Nest agreement many years ago. Marine transportation and air transportation have been subsidized. The negative impact of abolishing the crowrate would mean a drop in personal income in the West. It would also need to translate into less money to buy goods manufactured in central Canada. Those that supply goods to the West, in the final analysis, would suffer losses.

While the farmers, through the export of their grain sales, help the country, in general, by the balance of payments to the treasury, the federal government wants to place an excessive increase in their transporting of that grain. A further increase cannot be permitted at this time when the prices of grain are dropping or are in a weak position. Without the significant control of the rate, the price could go up to a point that it would mean, in today's costs and net return, the family farm would have difficulty surviving.

The grain prices depend on competitive world markets. No guarantees are present, Mr. Speaker, to maintain freight costs. After the federal review, after 1985-86, they could simply withdraw any subsidy and the farmer would immediately be looking at approximately \$1 per bushel. I prefer to use bushels, Mr. Speaker, and as you are well aware, the metric system was one day proclaimed by the wise men in Ottawa. Now we not only have to eat metric but possibly eat crow, as well. There is no guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that the price of wheat would be \$4.50 a bushel, or \$6, or \$7.

Let's look at the OPEC cartel. The price demanded for oil reached outlandish proportions. The result led to unprecedented inflation and unprecedented interest rates. The result led to businesses failing — jobs being abolished as businesses went bankrupt. Was there any control there? Will there be any control in inflationary increases in the freight rate? Not likely. If wheat were \$6 a bushel and the freight rate were \$1 a bushel, then the farmer would receive approximately \$5 per bushel. However, with the fluctuation of grain prices and overproduction in any country, a dumping on the world markets of grain by the other exporter, or a withdrawal of buyers from the market, can bring the price down to \$4 a bushel or \$3 a bushel. The result of this would mean that, in effect, the farmer would only obtain \$3 or \$2 a bushel after the freight rate is deducted. In reality, in the early 1900s, the price of wheat had hit the high of \$2 or \$3 a bushel then. Their costs, you must realize, then, of course, in fuel, fertilizer, and repair bills were much less than today. It becomes a very tight margin with increased costs today, Mr. Speaker, and will only result in less income to farmers, in general. Mr. Speaker, we must address this problem and emphasize to the federal government that the farmer cannot accept, nor can pay inflated costs that he does not know will end.

As I mentioned before, we have subsidies for large corporations in the way of tax write-offs, or whatever. Then surely, Mr. Speaker, we can give some of this back to the farmer. It is high time the federal government understood that there are provinces past the Ontario and Quebec borders. The way it is set up now, the only people to gain would be the railways and not anyone else. We pay freight out of Saskatchewan. We pay freight for everything we get back into Saskatchewan.

We must also look at some of the advantages that central Canada has enjoyed. It has protective tariffs to protect industries in the East, and one item that protected farmers in the West, the crowrate, is being loosened up to the point that this benefit will eventually be taken away. We don't know what inflation may do in the future as the costs of railway operations go sky-high. And the only loser will be the farmer in western Canada. Oil subsidies have been used to give the eastern consumers a minimal cost. The difference between the export price of oil from the West to the United States and the Canadian price that the producing provinces get has been used to subsidize the cost of imported fuel. Why hasn't the Pepin proposal taken this into account, Mr. Speaker?

Another point that the federal government fails to understand is that the farmer spends

a considerable amount of money on taxes and wages. The fertilizer, machinery repairs and fuel already mentioned extend into the billions of dollars. The total sales of prairie agricultural is in the billions of dollars. The result is that the agriculture supplies a considerable contribution to the economy of this country. If that income is reduced, and the farmer can no longer operate and compete in world markets, then, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, the big loser will be the people in Canada and the extra unemployed that will be caused when farmers are no longer able to purchase equipment. The manufacturing companies will be losers also in this system.

In 1925, the then Conservative leader, Arthur Meighen, in a parliamentary debate stated:

The maritime provinces are separated from the mass of our population by a very considerable stretch of territory, along which little or no business is done. The western provinces are likewise separated from the same central provinces of Canada. These are two wide chasms fixed by nature, against which Canada has had to struggle through the whole course of her history.

I think it is an inevitable conclusion that the burden of transport chiefly comes upon those further removed from the centres of population. It would, in my judgment, be good national policy for the whole dominion to bear a share of that transport cost. There is no reason why the whole dominion, not just the shippers along the lines of our roads, should not carry whatever percentage seems fair of the cost of bridging these two great chasms between the extremities of our land.

The principle advocated then by Meighen is consistent with the retention of the crowrate, and this principle advocated dates back to the time when Sir John A. Macdonald assisted the CPR in that the general thrust of the debate is that the imposition of the new federal policy will wreck Saskatchewan's economy. In fact, not only Saskatchewan stands to lose if this policy is imposed unchanged but the federal treasury will suffer the consequences of an economic slump in the West and eastern Canadian-based manufacturing industries will see the drastic reduction in demand for their products.

There is a general air of disbelief that Ottawa could be so short-sighted in proposing policies that will severely damage one of the brightest areas of economic activity in this nation. On the one hand, Prime Minister Trudeau has been urging the various regions of Canada to build on their individual areas of strength, while on the other hand the federal transport minister, Jean-Luc Pepin, is about to undermine Saskatchewan's economic backbone.

All MLAs feel that our agriculture potential is limited, but we are a long way, Mr. Speaker, from reaching that limit. Saskatchewan farmers, businessmen, and workers can help us reach that potential and contribute to the national good, but what we can't do is reach the potential if artificial hindrances are put in the way. Removal of the stabilizing and safeguarding aspects of a statutory rate will throw our agriculture economy into turmoil.

The federal Liberal government appears blind as to what the dismantling of the statutory rate will do to our agricultural base. It seems to ignore the fact that grain prices have fallen drastically to around \$3 a bushel from a recent high of \$5, and that

farmers need all the incentives they can get if they are to battle back to health in the world grain markets. Instead of incentives, our farmers are being penalized for their efforts. Our farmers are willing to grasp the challenge and to put new lifeblood into the economy, but they can't battle a government that has rejected them and doesn't seem to care whether they grow grain and sell it at an inflow of 6 billion export dollars a year or not. The federal government doesn't appear to recognize that when our farming community is healthy it builds new strengths all across Canada. Farm equipment, farm fertilizer, irrigation systems, and secondary processing operations all build up manufacturing enterprises in eastern Canada as well as western Canada. When farm incomes die, as they will under these proposals, jobs will disappear not only in the West but on the big manufacturing production lines in the East. When the jobs go, Ottawa will lose vast amounts of tax revenue and see its costs soar for unemployment insurance benefits and welfare payments.

Not only that, but once we lose our export markets our customers will not likely return to us. Our competitors will move in quickly and fill the gap. There is no made-in-Canada price for grain or any other commodity. Either we compete or we lose our markets to those who can sell for less. A new huge transportation bill for western Canadian farmers will mean farmers will have to try and recoup their costs by price hikes. When Canadian prices rise, we will price ourselves out of the market. It's a vicious circle. That vicious circle doesn't start and end in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It will spread coast to coast and rebound coast to coast as well.

There will be no security in Saskatchewan, Ontario or Quebec once the sledge hammer is given to our farming industry. Ottawa appears to have taken only a haphazard, short-sighted view to solving the problem of giving the railways more money for freight costs. It hasn't rationalized the long-term effects of the policy. In a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, the political aspects of the policy say one thing in Quebec and another in western Canada. This has upset our MLAs. They are simply bewildered by the economic miscalculations of the policy. Political favoritism and one-upmanship they can understand. What our MLAs can't understand is this outright move to kill the goose that lays the golden egg for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of support from all members in this House I want to express my thanks for their participation in the debate and their support for this resolution. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 36

Muller	Weiman	Domotor
Berntson	Tusa	Maxwell
Thatcher	Hodgins	Dirks
McLeod	Sutor	Myers
McLaren	Sveinson	Zazelenchuk
Garner	Sauder	Blakeney
Klein	Petersen	Thompson
Katzman	Glauser	Engel

Currie
Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin
Hampton

Parker
Martens
Rybchuk
Young

Lingenfelter
Koskie
Lusney
Shillington

Nays — 0

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — With leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That the motions relative to the Pepin plan debate in this House on February 22, 1983, along with the debate on those motions, be transmitted to the federal ministers of transport, economic development and agriculture, the officer of the Leader of the Opposition and the office of the leader of the New Democratic Party.

I so move, seconded by the Minister of Education, the member for Regina Wascana.

Motion agreed to.

CONDOLENCES

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would ask leave of the House to move two condolence motions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Regina Elphinstone:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a member of this Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contributions he made to his community, his constituency and to this province.

John Duncan MacFarlane, who died on December 8, 1982 at the age of 90, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Melfort from 1934 to 1938. Born in Scotland in 1892, he came to Saskatchewan in 1910 and worked on farms in the south of the province before enrolling in 1912 in the first agriculture class at the University of Saskatchewan.

After serving with the Canadian Army Engineers and the Royal Air Corps during the First World War, he returned to Saskatchewan and settled near Aylsham. He was very active in agriculture and community affairs, and was for 21 years a director of United Grain Growers Ltd. He was an active member of the Masonic Order and the Shriners and served as president of the Aylsham branch of the Canadian Legion.

In 1963, he sold his farm at Aylsham, and moved to Nipawin. In 1979 he had the honor of being inducted into the Saskatchewan Agriculture Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, although I did not know the man personally, I understand by his record and by indications of his many friends that he did in fact serve his community, his family and his province well. I offer the condolences on behalf of our side of the House, and would ask that the Leader of the Opposition in seconding this motion would speak likewise for his.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. MacFarlane served in this House from 1934 to 1938 and accordingly none of us who are here now will have served with him. It is clear from the record of his accomplishments that he was a remarkable man. There weren't too many people in 1912 who were going to an agriculture class at the University of Saskatchewan. He had what appears to be a distinguished war record, serving with the Canadian Army Engineers and the Royal Air Corps, yet another instance of a rather pioneering nature because not too many people were joining the Royal Air Corps in World War I.

He then became active in agricultural and community affairs as the Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Premier mentioned. He served as the director of the United Grain Growers for many years, and his contribution to agriculture was fittingly recognized by being inducted into the Saskatchewan Agriculture Hall of Fame, just shortly before his death, in 1979. I would, on behalf of the official opposition, join with the Deputy Premier in extending our condolences to the family, and our appreciation to Mr. MacFarlane for his substantial contributions to the government and the agricultural life of this province and for his service during World War I.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SAUDER: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to also tender my condolences to the family of Mr. MacFarlane under the circumstances, a man that I didn't know all that well personally, although I did know him somewhat, a person that set an example for some of the younger people of the community as was brought out by the two former speakers on this. He was a professional in whatever he did. In his agricultural endeavors he did an excellent job. And some of his outlook on life, I think, was transmitted to me. The reason that I have a personal interest in this is because, in the years that he spent as a member in this Assembly, my father was a hired man, if you will, that worked on the farm for him. So it's indeed with a certain amount of sorrow that I heard of his passing, and I also would like to extend my condolences to the family through this Assembly. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of an officer of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, **Major Donald Scott Calder**, who died on January 30, 1983 at the age of 90; he was the Sergeant at Arms of the Legislative Assembly from 1966 to 1971. Born in Medicine Hat on August 31, 1893, he lived in Manitoba and British Columbia before serving as a teacher and vice-principal in Saskatchewan. A veteran of two world wars, he served with the Strathcona Horse during World War I, and with the Regina Rifle Regiment in World War II. He later became the official historian

for the Regina Rifle Regiment, now the Royal Regina Rifles. He was an active sportsman and a lover of music, serving as a member of the Regina Male Voice Choir and of the Regina Operatic Society.

The Legislature avails itself of this opportunity to record its tribute of respect to a former officer of the Assembly.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I would like to add my words to those of the Deputy Premier in paying a tribute to Major Scott Calder. I served in the Legislature during the entire period when he was Sergeant at Arms, and he was a colorful Sergeant at Arms. He had a military bearing, coming from his service during World War I and World War II, and I think he added that dimension to our Legislature.

I have known him for a good number of years in circles in Regina. He was prominent in military circles, was to be seen on November 11 going about the various levees, will have been seen on many occasions at the Royal Canadian Legion and the Institute, which now has a new name — the United Services Institute is the name that I recall it as, which is effectively the officers' mess and I have seen him there on many occasions. He took a great interest in matters military, was proud of his service and rightfully proud of his service. And as was indicated, he recorded the service of people who served in the army, navy and air force in Saskatchewan with a good deal of interest and was the official historian for the now Royal Regina Rifles.

He was, as indicated, an active sportsman. His contribution to the military life of our province was I think amply demonstrated at his funeral when all of the pallbearers were military people and when the senior officers of the various commands here in Saskatchewan were there in great numbers. There was a guard of honor, generally an indication of the respect in which he was held by his colleagues in the forces.

I wish to join with the Deputy Premier in extending my condolences to Mrs. Scott Calder and to other members of the family and to record our appreciation for his service to this legislature.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 18

HON. MR. BLAKENEY moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 18 showing:

- (1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Energy during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Since I'm caught here tonight without my support staff to tell me which of these we can answer in the present form and which ones we can't answer in the present form — we don't intend to unduly delay these — I'm going to ask leave to adjourn debate on all of these at this time. You will be getting information as soon as I'm assured that we can answer them in this form. I ask you to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 19

HON. MR. BLAKENEY moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 19 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Finance during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate and while I'm on my feet, if it's procedurally possible to deal with these simultaneously, that is in accord with the wishes of this side of the House. We were suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that they all be simultaneously moved and all be simultaneously adjourned.

As I understand the problem, those that are on the order paper in the name of a member who is not here cannot be moved on his behalf. So with the exception of the resolutions in the name of Mr. Yew, we, with leave of the Assembly, agree to simultaneously move them and adjourn debate on all motions for returns (debatable). Okay? Thank you, sir.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the procedure proposed by the House Leader that each of those resolutions standing in the name of any one of Messrs. Blakeney, Lingenfelter, Engel, Thompson, Shillington, Lusney or Koskie be taken as moved, that we will sign the original motion so as to have the records complete and the House will regard them as moved, and regard them as being adjourned and standing in the name of the Deputy Premier, Mr. Berntson.

Debates adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly I would move first reading of Bill No. 62.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly the bill ordered to be read a second time later this day.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this is merely a duplicate with the names and constituencies changed to two previous similar situations, one being in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and the other one being in Estevan in the 1980 by-election. The purpose of this bill is to simply facilitate the seating of the apparent victor in the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election yesterday. In discussion

with the Leader of the Opposition earlier today, although admittedly he hadn't yet seen the bill, he seemed to be in accord, so I would urge all members to support Bill No. 62.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and by leave of the Assembly referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 4

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, we have the assurance of the House Leader that this bill is in the same form as the ones that we have previously passed.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — That's my understanding and if it is not I will take whatever action is necessary to make sure that it is.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time, and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 p.m.