

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature  
31st Day

Tuesday, March 30, 1971.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Members of the Legislature the following groups of students and others in the galleries; from the constituency of Regina North East represented by Mr. Smishek, 18 students from St. Pauls School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Hartnell; from the constituency of Bengough represented by Mr. Mitchell, 43 students from the Mossbank School, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Jane Grey; from the constituency of Moose Jaw North represented by Mr. Snyder, 64 students from the Lindale School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Skorobohach; from the constituency of Milestone represented by Mr. MacDonald, 30 students from the Rouleau School, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Sanborn; from the schools of St. Agnes and St. Mary's in Moose Jaw South, represented by Mr. Davies, 85 students under the direction of their teacher, Mr. E. Segal; from the constituency, again, of Moose Jaw South, represented by Mr. Davies, 17 student from the Victoria School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Ken McMillan.

I am sure that all Hon. Members would wish to extend to these students and other people in the galleries an extremely warm welcome to the Legislative Assembly in the Province of Saskatchewan, to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here educational and informative and wish to every one of them a safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**CORRECTION OF QUESTION IN REGARD TO PHASING OUT PSYCHIATRIC  
NURSES TRAINING PROGRAM**

**HON. G. B. GRANT (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct a statement I made in the Legislature last Thursday. It is in connection with the question raised by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw yesterday.

The error was brought to my attention last week by departmental personnel. The answer was in reply to a question raised by the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). At the time I said there were no plans to phase out the psychiatric nurses training program at the mental hospital in Weyburn.

I should like to point out today, although there are no plans by the Government to phase out the training of psychiatric nurses, the conversion of the mental hospital to an extended care hospital, will mean that the new facility is not as suitable for the training of psychiatric nurses as it has been in the past. Therefore, it has been decided that a new class will not be taken in this fall at Weyburn.

I should like to emphasize that psychiatric nurse training will continue at the Training School at Moose Jaw and the mental hospital at North Battleford. It is quite possible that some of the nursing students from the Training School will go to the Psychiatric Centre at Weyburn for their clinical training. This is because although the Mental Hospital is being phased out at Weyburn, the Psychiatric Centre will continue to serve the region. The Extended Care Hospital will continue to have a large number of psychiatric nurses on staff because of the substantial number of patients who will have psychiatric symptoms. After the conversion, the Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital will be about the same size operation at the existing Mental Hospital.

**MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would give us some indication as to the intentions of his Department with respect to the expansion of the training program at the other psychiatric institutions in the province in order to keep pace with the need for registered psychiatric nurses.

I think the Minister will recognize that the retention of these nurses has not been as good as it might have been. Some of them are lost by virtue of the fact that some of them get married, others leave the province. I think in the past it has been a continuing problem and I wonder what the Minister can give us in a way of assurance that the need will be met in terms of graduating a sufficient number of psychiatric nurses to meet our requirements.

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall report at a later date on that. I am not going to have to correct any statement that I might make and I shall check with the Department on it.

## **STATEMENT**

### **RESIGNATION OF MR. HEALD**

**HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement before the Orders of the Day.

I wish to announce that I will not be a candidate in the next election. I make the announcement at this time because our Party's nominating convention in my constituency is being held next Monday, April 5th, at Lumsden and you are all invited.

I notified my executive earlier of this decision. Mr. Speaker, I have not taken this decision lightly or hastily, as a matter of fact it has been much in my thoughts for some time. This is a very difficult decision for me because the past seven years in this Legislature and as a Minister of the Crown have been the most rewarding, challenging and fulfilling of my life.

To be given the privilege and responsibility of representing one's constituents in a Legislature, and in the councils of government, is the highest honor that members of a free democratic society can confer upon any man.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never, as long as I live, forget the friendship and the support and the many kindnesses extended to my family and myself by literally hundreds of my Lumsden constituents, many of whom are in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon. We shall always remember and cherish these most rewarding

friendships established over the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, the man or woman who is privileged enough to succeed me in this Legislature, as the Member for Lumsden, will be a fortunate and honored Member indeed. In the event that this turns out to be the last Session before an election, I should not want the opportunity to pass without extending my sincere thanks and appreciation to all the officials and staff members of the departments and agencies for which I have responsibility. Their loyalty, devotion and dedication is deeply appreciated and warmly remembered.

I should also like to extend to our distinguished leader, Premier Thatcher, my Cabinet colleagues and my caucus colleagues, my heartfelt thanks and appreciation for their co-operation and support. And to all Members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, whether they sit to your right or to your left, I express my sincere thanks for their many kindnesses and their friendship.

And, before I sit down I should like to thank the members of the Press gallery and the members of the media of this province for their co-operation and kindness to me over the past number of years. And lastly to you, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the distinguished and dedicated way in which you have conducted, and are conducting, the affairs of this Assembly. And I thank you for your friendship and understanding.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could say one word. I think no one will regret the loss of the Attorney General more than I shall. However, we have hopes that he will be called to other duties which will be equally as important as the one that he has filled in the last few years.

I think that Members on both sides of the House would agree that the Legislature is losing a Member who has been dedicated to the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A. E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Premier and with the other Members of the House in expressing our best wishes to the Attorney General in whatever endeavor he may decide to pursue.

I know that my words will not be misunderstood when I say that we heard his announcement with mixed feelings. We undoubtedly regret that the House will lack the services of someone of the calibre of the Attorney General. We, from a partisan point of view, are somewhat pleased that we shall not be met with a contender in the Lumsden constituency who is quite so formidable, we trust, as the present sitting Member for Lumsden who commanded a very wide measure of respect in the constituency, not only from loyal supporters of his party but from people of other political persuasions. I think our problem in that regard, has been a measure of the calibre of the man who now represents Lumsden.

We express keen regret that this House will not have the

services of a person of the calibre of the Attorney General. He has given very able service, not only to his constituents, but to the people of Saskatchewan. In many ways he has a distinguished record as Attorney General and Provincial Secretary. I think particularly of the record in the field of consumer legislation. Many pieces of legislation were introduced which commanded support on both sides of the House. And without selecting any one, one thinks of, for example, the compensation for victims of violent crime, which was a new idea in Canada and in North America. In many other ways he has given leadership in the field of law enforcement. It is not easy to get people of the calibre of the Attorney General to serve in the Legislature. And when one decides that he has served his time and is no longer able to continue to offer his services, there must be real regret.

We join with the others of this House in expressing our thanks to the Attorney General for the services that he has rendered and our best wishes for the future.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **SPC BONDING HOG PRODUCERS**

**MR. E. I. WOOD (Swift Current):** — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that last week I asked a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Estey). He had just stepped out at that time and I believe the Premier indicated that he would have the question carried to him.

It was to the effect that: is it the policy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to require large hog producers to be bonded at a cost of some \$20 or \$30 a year in order to assure payment of their power bills?

I was wondering if the Hon. Minister could give me the answer today.

**HON. C. L. B. ESTEY (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret that this question was not answered before. I was prepared to do it a day or two ago only the Hon. Member was not in his seat at that time.

It is not the policy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to require a hog producer, large or small, to be bonded. But for 25 years the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has had a policy where (a) if the construction costs were very high we did require a bond varying in premium between \$10 and \$20 in order to guarantee a minimum supply being taken by the customer. At the present time, of these 500 bonds, approximately 80 are what you might call a farm-type enterprise.

Over a period of 25 years, we have now accumulated approximately 500 bonds, so you can see that this is not an extensive business we are involved in.

**MR. WOOD:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary if I may. What would be the cost of installation that would be the approximate break off point of where you would require a bond of this type?

**MR. ESTEY:** - I shall find out for the Hon. Member.

### **WELFARE NOT PAID TO STRIKERS**

**MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, some time ago I had a question for the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) concerning the welfare situation in my constituency.

I have now, a specific case of a certain Mr. Lawstrom who is in dire need, a family man who made an application for social aid to the Department. He was refused. On March 3rd there was a hearing of the Board consisting, I think, of Mr. Simino and Mrs. Jasper and another person. It was decided that he had a just case and he was placed on social aid because he was in need and also because of the arguments used, that Ottawa did not make any distinction whether a person was on strike or not.

Apparently on the 15th of March, this Government passed some kind of Order-in-Council and I am not sure what it was. But anyway it did result in removing this man from welfare and he is in dire need. This is not the point. The point is this: is this legislation or change of regulations retroactive to the 3rd of March?

**HON. C. P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member's question. Anytime a welfare client has an appeal automatically that person is put on welfare or receives his allowance until the appeal has been concluded. In other words when the person appeals the case, he automatically receives his allowance until such time as the appeal had been heard. That is a basic part of the regulations and that is the reason he was immediately put on the case load. However, the amendment in the regulations was not a change, it was an attempt to clarify a policy so that there would be no misunderstanding. When the original appeal was heard the legal representatives of the appeal board brought up the fact that because there might be some question as to legal interpretation, it was important to clarify the policy. There has been no change in policy. It has always been the policy of the Department of Welfare and the Government of Saskatchewan that welfare would not be paid to strikers.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask a supplementary of the Minister of Welfare.

As I understand the facts put forward by my colleague of Prince Albert East-Cumberland, the case in hand went before the appeal board and at the appeal stage of the proceedings this person was in fact granted welfare. Subsequently an Order-in-Council was passed that said that strikers are not entitled to welfare assistance.

The question that I think still remains unanswered, that the Member directed to you, that I should like to put again to you, Mr. Minister, is whether or not that Order-in-Council is retroactive as far as that particular individual is concerned and others who may have been affected at that time, retroactive to the decision of the appeal committee.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Yes. In other words all that was done in this individual case is that it was further referred to the provincial appeal board to make absolutely certain that they were correct in their interpretation.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 3 - LABOR MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government labor-management legislation designed to protect the public interest which incorporates the principle of the use of Independent Labor Courts and awards binding on all parties as a means of settling all labor disputes in Saskatchewan.

**MR. P. SCHMEISER (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate on this Resolution, I think the time is long past due that we consider the principle of Independent Labor Courts in Saskatchewan. This I believe, would truly protect the public interest and would be a means of settling all labor disputes. It is time to end the misuse of people like farmers and workers who are continually being used to further the ends of the power struggle between labor organizations, their ruthless labor bosses and ruthless employers.

I think this Resolution is necessary at this time for the farmers of this Province now, more than ever before to have labor courts. When it appears that we have some orderly marketing of grain, we must not wait until trouble starts again and both sides are deeply involved in a strike where bitterness and hard feelings run rampant. The people of this province are expressing a deep concern in regard to crippling and lengthy strikes that continuously have occurred in the past years. We, as a government share this concern with them and it is our duty to reflect in our policies and legislation the opinions of the people. Canadians today believe, more than ever, that stricter laws are needed to regulate labor unions. I believe also that the rank and file union members share this same belief.

In the past several years, Canadians have experienced the worst strike record in Canada's history. Today the farmers again may be faced with a strike against them. If we consider our labor record of strikes relative to labor forces in other countries of the world, our record is one of the worst. When the labor record of the United States, Italy, Australia, England and Japan are far better than ours, we realize not only how our economic growth is slowed but also how our trading position is placed in danger.

Governments, management and labor have to sit down and discuss the problem. Can the public be expected continually to put up with management and labor's use of strikes and lock-outs? As I have said before, it places an unnecessary strain on the economy. It is time that there is a radical change in labor laws. A labor court, Mr. Speaker, may at first have difficulty in

operating efficiently, but surely the proposal offers a superior and much better system of solving disputes. A labor court as a basic principle should and must have total independence of government. A court such as this would be similar to other courts in the country. If they are to be successful, they should and must be presided over by legal officials who are known to have knowledge in labor laws. They also should know the history of disputes and other matters of labor. To obtain such qualified personnel at first might be difficult, but eventually they could be obtained and educated in matters concerning labor. Labor courts have worked well in other countries of the world and in some countries only a minor number of strikes have occurred in the past 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have to take a careful look at the past history of collective bargaining. Up and until the past few years, collective bargaining has worked fairly well. There were sometimes strikes and bitter arguments and disagreements, but in most cases things were settled without serious inconveniences to the general public or serious harm to the parties involved. But what has happened in the past several years is that there has been quite a change developing as we again see today what has happened out on the West Coast.

In collective bargaining the strength of both parties, the union and employer, should at least be reasonably equal. Real and honest bargaining will not take place if one party is considerably stronger than the other. The stronger group, whether it be employer or union, will simply demand a certain settlement and the side that is weaker will have to agree or be destroyed. Employers were obviously a great deal stronger when collective bargaining legislation was first adopted. Laws were then designed to offset this advantage. If unions were to be freer and not destroyed or weakened by legal actions, they were not required to become legal entities. Unions were not made responsible for actions by their members. Many provisions favored the unions, such as the combines and anti-trust legislation. Regulations and other procedures favored unions and so offset the greater power of employers at that time.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the situation today, it will be found that the power between the parties is again unequal. The situation is now that most unions' strength is far greater than the employer. Use of power by one side cannot be tolerated and conditions that now have arisen indicate that another look at labor laws will have to be taken. Mr. Speaker, in a highly unionized country a person would expect that a free collective bargaining feature to be the main characteristic of industrial relations. This, however, is not the case. If we look at various compulsory arbitration systems of the world, we find that in Australia it was not the purpose of the government to do away with collective bargaining by introducing compulsory arbitration legislation. It was introduced to make strikes unnecessary or at least to reduce the number of them. Granting of legal protection to unions and providing them with the opportunity to grow and be strong, the government expressed its desire to see that collective bargaining would flourish and that compulsory arbitration would be a last resort. The Australian compulsory arbitration system has proven to be quite successful and it appears that management and unions have adjusted quite well to the system where an impartial third party accepts the responsibility of most of the decision-making in industrial relation matters.

**March 30, 1971**

Mr. Speaker, strikes hurt both employees and employers through lost wages with no side winning. We have to accept that where the interests of the parties conflict with the overall interest of the community, the interest of the community must prevail. This interest must prevail and be established in areas where the health, safety or welfare of the community may seriously be affected by the conduct of organized groups. This applies whether they be unions, business groups or other associations. If the parties disregard the public interest then we must have legislation that will protect the public interest.

The labor courts that are in use in some of the countries of the world are working quite successfully. It is time to have them here in this country if farmers once again are faced with not being able to move their grain. I believe both unions and management have adjusted well in other countries where labor courts are used. They are quick and efficient in settling disputes and they have produced a uniformity of wages and working conditions. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. M. BREKER (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I noticed yesterday the Opposition wanted a debate to be placed before this House as a matter of utmost urgency. But did you notice that they didn't want to get into any partisan debate whereby we could remedy the cause of the situation that arose with the engineers.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Otto Lang said that.

**MR. BREKER:** — Oh no, he didn't want to get into any debate.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Otto Lang said that . . .

**MR. BREKER:** — Very good, very good. You are going to get it again, Roy.

They wanted to pass a resolution unanimously to get the unions and employers back to work. A lot of good that resolution is going to do, Mr. Speaker. What if the Government did order them back to work, they don't have a Bill like Bill 2 to put these fellows back to work. They didn't say that the method of strikes was outmoded to settle disputes in today's labor difficulties. They didn't say that the work-to-rule was short changing every farmer in the West. They didn't say that every bushel of wheat, rape and rye that isn't sold now may never be sold by the Canadian farmer. They didn't say that the exporters may look at Canada as a very dubious supplier of barley, flax and rape in the future. They didn't say that every export dollar that we take from other countries generates three or four more dollars. They didn't say that the Federal Government didn't have courage to put men back to work by introducing a Bill similar to Bill 2, because that is the only way that they will get these men back to work. The only other way to get these men back to work is to offer them a wage that is unwarranted, unearned and unjustified. They didn't tell us that an excess wage demand would only add to the debt of the nationalized CNR. They didn't say that as the costs of transporting wheat went up, the chances of retaining the Crow's Nest freight rates goes down. There is increasing pressure now from the East to do away with



this concession, one of the few concessions that the West enjoys.

What about the farmers on that side of the House, what about the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), where does he stand? How would he get these men back to work? What about the labor leaders, like Mr. Smishek, Mr. Davies. How would they get these men back to work? It is nice and easy to say, we'll pass a resolution which will ask the Government to ask the trade unions and employers to get back to work. But they don't have any teeth in any legislation to put them back to work, Mr. Speaker. I support the Resolution moved by Mr. Hooker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I note that the last two speakers practically all the time they were speaking were out of order. One of the rules of this House is that you can't refer to a previous debate, I didn't bother challenging them because really all they said wasn't worthwhile challenging.

In rising to take part in the debate on this Resolution, moved by the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) I find myself at variance in much that the Member had to say when he introduced his motion. He talked of all the problems that the Federal Government had in 1969 with crippling strikes and said that it would have invoked legislation prohibiting strikes. I disagree. I want to suggest that through the enlightened attitude of their Federal colleague the Minister of Labour, an attitude in which he brought about conciliation and arbitration he was able just recently to settle a grain handlers' strike at Thunder Bay without tough legislation. In fact, in the last two years Mr. Mackasey has had a fairly good record in dispute settling. For many years Australia . . . If the Hon. Minister of Public Works would talk standing up instead of talking from sitting down, it would be much better. I notice that he didn't take the chance to talk . . .

**MR. CODERRE:** — You walked out of the House when I was on my feet speaking.

**MR. MEAKES:** — You adjourned, then you never picked it up.

For many years Australia has had anti-strike legislation. I want to suggest to the Hon. Member, I believe it was the Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser), who said that their record was good in settling strikes. I should violently disagree with him, the answer is not so. They have not been able to stop strikes. Their record is one of high incidence of long, hard strikes.

Let us take British Columbia. They too have hard legislation in regard to strikes. They too have been having strikes, long strikes, like the one a year ago last summer that lasted over five months, when the workers went on strike against Imperial Oil. I challenge the Members across the way, and I say there is no place in the Western world where anti-strike legislation has been successful in stopping strikes.

**March 30, 1971**

The Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch, and I regret that he is not in his seat, said and I quote from Hansard:

I feel no one has the more right to withdraw his services at the expense of their fellow man.

My answer is the words of the statement of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "The only difference between the free man and slave is that he can withdraw his services." I am like the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch in two ways. One is that we have spent most of our lives on the farm, second we have both spent some time in the labor market. One main difference is that I have learned something about laboring people's problems and about labor unions, and apparently he didn't. I say this because of his remarks. He has no conception of the construction of unions or the work. If he did, he wouldn't talk about union bosses exploiting the membership, or about the power struggle going on amongst the giants in the labor union movement. These remarks completely prove his complete ignorance of how unions work and perform.

Surely the Hon. Member must realize that before a strike is taken there is a vote of the membership. Surely he knows that each member passes his opinion by that vote, and only when the majority vote for a strike that there is a strike. In negotiations more than one negotiator has lost his job by accepting a settlement which the membership would not accept. There are thousands of cases of negotiating teams having accepted the latest offer only to have it refused by the membership. To say that the union bosses force strikes on the membership is to show a complete ignorance of the facts.

He went on to rave about the supposed facts that labor unions are bed partners in the New Democratic Party. His remarks are really in a sense too stupid even to answer. But I do say this, that at a separate convention of the CLC in 1957, the membership there through democratic process decided to support officially the then new proposed political party, later to become known as the New Democratic Party. This did not or does not mean that all labor union members can be made or will necessarily vote New Democrat. I ask the Hon. Member, does he think that some union boss will stand behind and look over the shoulder of every union man that goes into the poll to vote? How ridiculous can the Hon. Member get.

He then went on to talk about the undesirability of American unions in Canadian affiliates. In a way I agree with him. I should like to see all Canadian unions, and I believe they will come in time. For example, the union that the Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) represents became disaffiliated last year from the American head office. I don't want to be dominated by the United States, period, whether it is unions, or large national motor corporate enterprises like General Motors, or Parsons and Whittemore or Standard Oil or any other corporate giant. I do say though that as long as we have these giants, national motor corporations, operating both in the United States and Canada we shall have international unions. The employees of these companies found that these international companies played Canadian unions against United States unions. The unions were forced to join together to protect themselves. Let me remind my Hon. friends that the companies became international first and then came the international unions. I suggest that he study history before he opens his mouth.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see strikes any more than the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker). But I say that compulsory arbitration outlawing strikes, bulldozing basic human rights, will not settle disagreements. All that happens is that both sides are driven into rigid, tough positions. Look at the records. There have been more man-days lost in Saskatchewan through strikes in the last five years than was lost in the 20 years from 1944 to 1964. Let us look at the years from 1960 to 1970 taken from the Department of Labour reports: in 1960 there were 7,650 man-days lost; in 1961 there were 4,728 man-days lost; in 1962 there were 3,360 man-days lost; in 1963 there were 5,618 man-days lost; in 1964 there were 4,620 man-days lost; in 1965, the first year of this Government across the way, it jumped from 4,620 to 19,770; in 1966 it jumped again to 24,474 man-days lost; in 1967, it was election year and they were a little easier on the labor fellows, there were only 15,027 man-days lost; in 1968, I believe that was the first year of Bill 2, I'm not sure, it jumped from 15,000 to 45,369 man-days lost; in 1969, 32,391. These figures, Mr. Speaker, tell a story. The last year under the CCF to the latest year under the Liberals - 1964 under the CCF 4,600 man-days lost; 1970 about 46,000 man-days lost. The time lost on strikes is over 650 per cent under this Liberal Government. Why this giant increase? I suggest it is because of Bill 2 and six per cent guidelines and the bulldozing methods of the Premier and this Government. This Government foments strikes.

The Hon. Member moving this motion had so much to say about strikes - strikes are bad. The fact remains though that there are 13 times as many man hours lost each year by industrial accidents than by strikes so why doesn't the Government do something about this? The fact that there are 117 times as many man-days lost by sickness than by strikes, why doesn't the Government do something about this? There are 190 times as many man-days lost by unemployment than by strikes, why doesn't the Hon. Member put a resolution on the Order Paper on unemployment? No, the Hon. Member has really only one reason for moving this motion and that's politics, cheap politics. He wants to embarrass us over here. Well let me tell him he doesn't embarrass me. If I voted for this motion worded the way it is I should hang my head in shame.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAKES:** — In this new technological and automated society we live in we must find new ideas and new ways to answer the problems facing us. I believe that we must consider labor-management legislation designed to protect the public interest. Legislation that would empower the Government to have vigorous and improved mediation and conciliation. There must be publicly assisted and encouraged management-labor consultation. There must be ongoing research and fact finding to find out how to prevent the problems of industrial relationships which are often the cause of disputes. I am convinced that most strikes could be avoided if properly trained men could sit down months ahead of a contract expiry and bring both sides together. Men who could bring both sides together before feelings are tight, before lines are drawn and get both sides negotiating in a peaceful atmosphere. Presently we have very few men capable of this.

I was once asked to chair an arbitration board between a union and employer. It was a great experience for me. I found

**March 30, 1971**

out that as a mediator I was able to bring both sides together. Sure there was disagreement but patience and reason prevailed and the strike was avoided. If I had shouted and screamed like the Premier often does trouble would have exploded. One has to remember, Mr. Speaker, that all human beings are sometimes capricious by nature. All have problems of their own but if both sides can be made to see the other fellows' problems common sense will prevail. I suggest a club-like policy of outlawing strikes would solve nothing.

There are disputes outside the jurisdiction of Saskatchewan which can be detrimental to us like the strikes we have been talking about yesterday and today, and it's detrimental to all the citizens of the province. Disputes between transportation workers, grain handlers, dock workers that are particularly annoying and costly to the farmer and indeed, I say again, to all citizens of the province.

Take, for example, the slowdown that's going on right now. I don't know all the details but from press reports the withdrawal of services is due to the workers claiming that there has been no willingness on the part of the two railway companies to sit down and negotiate with their representatives. Be that as it may, I believe that in this kind of a situation it is a duty of government to bring the two parties together long before the feelings got tight and this was over a year ago. They should have been brought together long ago before frustration sets in.

I suggest that this Provincial Government should propose that a special committee be set up representing Saskatchewan and Federal departments of labor that would function and act in such a manner as I suggested for provincial strikes. I believe there is every reason why Saskatchewan should be able, indeed have a duty, to be involved in disputes and strikes that can be detrimental to the people of this province. Mr. Mackasey in the past has proved that conciliation and mediation and arbitration can be successful. He has in these strikes through well trained able negotiators got the two sides together and made them face one another across the table, and I think Mr. Mackasey's methods have been progressive and modern. I suggest that the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch consult his Federal Minister of Labour and perhaps he would become more enlightened as to what is going on in the modern world today.

Because I believe that the motion moved by my friend is detrimental to achieving industrial harmony and because I believe the methods I just suggested - methods of mediation on management-labor conciliation and arbitration - are much superior to his suggestions, I therefore move that Resolution No. 3 be amended as follows:

That all the words after the word "interest" in the second be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) by vigorous and substantially improved mediation and conciliation, as well as publicly assisted and encouraged management-labour consultation, including ongoing research and fact-finding, to identify and prevent problems in industrial relationships which are, or may become causes of disputes, in keeping with the recommendations and findings of the Federal Woods Commission on Labor Relations and the Saskatchewan Labour Management Committee on the Construction Industry;

(2) and that, so as to further provide for the peaceful and positive development of employer-employee relations, the Government be asked to consider proposing to the Government of Canada the creation of a special committee representing the Saskatchewan and the Federal Departments of Labour that would function and act in such a manner that the management-labor disputes of particular importance to Saskatchewan such as disputes in the transportation and grain handling industries would so far as possible be prevented and avoided.

I so move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow).

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

**HON. C. P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, after reading the proposed amendment by the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) I should like to make a few comments. First of all the amendment does in no way support the principle expressed by the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker). I should like to make very clear the position of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. We believe that strikes in 1971 in the Canadian economy have reached the stage now that they are threatening and endangering the very livelihood of Canadians from coast to coast. We believe that the Canadian economy is so complex that it no longer makes sense for a few hundred grain handlers or engineers on the West Coast or a few hundred engineers or longshoremen on the East Coast to threaten and strangle the entire economy of the three Prairie Provinces. Mr. Speaker, we are firmly convinced that it is time in the history of Canadian labor-management relations that new and different techniques and methods of solving labor disputes are found.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know of a single situation that brings this more to the forefront, that gives it a greater degree of emphasis, than the situation that is now presently going on in the West Coast and in the Province of Alberta in the tie-up of grain from the prairie Provinces to the West Coast. First of all, we have found that there is a dispute between the labor and management that is over a year and a half in duration. Surely that in itself indicates that there is something basically wrong with present techniques and methods. Second, in order to resolve this dispute union members or employees have sought to-work-to-rule. We are aware of what has happened as a result. We find that thousands of boxcars are backed up in British Columbia and on the prairies. That the movement of prairie wheat to the elevators in the West Coast has practically come to a complete standstill. That ships are now moving into the Port of Vancouver and if the wheat doesn't begin to move again we shall find that ships will be redirected to other ports in the world and there will be serious loss of grain sales to the Western Canadian farmer.

Let's for a moment examine the situation that does exist on the Prairies. Let's have a look back over the past few years and see what has happened in the marketing of our Prairie grain. A few years ago there was a five-bushel quota, last year there was a four-bushel quota, and if any man can tell me how a farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan can operate his farm on a four-bushel quota, pay his taxes, pay any debts that he has for

**March 30, 1971**

machinery or lands, pay his operating expenses, and still provide food for his family. I should like to know how. Here, in 1971, for the first time in a number of years, the prairie farmer is beginning to look forward with a little bit of optimism. Indications seem to point to the possibility that we shall move something in the neighborhood of 700 million bushels of grain. In the first time for the last few years we found that there were major sales in coarse grains. We find that wheat was beginning to move and at this time of the year, the quota was substantially higher than at other times over the past few years.

Rape, flax and other grains were beginning to be sold and moved and the farmer was optimistic. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan when a farmer suffers it isn't only the farmer. It is the implement dealer down the street, the garage man on the corner, the grocery store operator and every other business in the Province of Saskatchewan. We know that in Saskatchewan, in order to prosper, the farmers must prosper. It emphasizes again that this is an emergency situation on the West Coast. It emphasizes again that it is a crisis and that we don't have the technique, we don't have the machinery today to handle this kind of a crisis and this kind of an emergency.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in this House we debated a resolution that demanded - demanded - that the Federal Government interfere immediately because both sides of the House recognized that it was a crisis. Both sides of the House recognized that this was an emergency. This resolution originally was proposed by the NDP. It originally generated with them. And they, in fact, stated that the present method of solving labor disputes in this country are inadequate and we, therefore, demand that the Government take emergency action. They demanded that they go over and above the present procedures. And they called upon the Prime Minister and they called upon the Minister of Labour at the national level, to interfere.

Mr. Speaker, I think in this resolution here, sponsored by the Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), we have the opportunity for every Member of this House to stand up and tell unions and management in the Dominion of Canada, how they feel about that emergency situation on the West Coast.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — They have the opportunity to stand up and tell unions right across this country that the economic climate in this nation cannot tolerate this kind of work-to-rule action which will threaten the very livelihood of every citizen in Western Canada. I think that we have the opportunity to stand up in this House this afternoon and point out the weaknesses in present labor-management relations, present in labor-management techniques, in labor-management methods in 1971, that they are completely inadequate.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was rather interesting yesterday that we only had one farmer stand up and he spoke for approximately one minute and thirty seconds, where he tried to justify that he was concerned about the present situation. But how did he express his concern? He didn't tell us what they should be doing. He didn't propose a solution. All he said was there is a need for federal interference to get this crisis stopped.

The only people who did stand up and speak were the two city lawyers. Well, I should hope this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that we shall hear from the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). I hope we shall hear from the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), from the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), or shall we hear from the city lawyers again. As the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said, it is a motor mouth. It keeps going all the time. I hope that we shall hear from some of the farm Members this afternoon and they will tell us exactly what they would recommend in order to settle this kind of emergency and this kind of a tragedy. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that farmers in this province are having their very livelihood threatened because of an emergency crisis where we don't have the techniques and the methods of finding that solution.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the amendment and I will support the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take much time on this matter. I know that the country is in very bad need of industrial peace. I know, also, that every time the Liberal Government has touched anything, you didn't have any peace you had war, we might say. I will use the example that was laid before the House yesterday with the teaching profession.

Under the CCF Government you had 20 years of teaching peace in our schools. Look at what we have had since the Liberals are in. In the little time that the Thatcher Government has been in we have seen this develop in our province. We have had labor against farmers. This has been fermenting right along. Everyone that gets up tries to put labour against the farmers. No matter what they do even in their own party, they demonstrated the very same thing. They don't know anything else. It is their philosophy to divide and rule.

They had the teachers against the trustees; the hospital workers against the hospital boards; one province against the other. Why we have to get Schreyer fighting against Saskatchewan! Schreyer is looking after his own business and it is about time that we started looking after our own too.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THIBAUT:** — I can remember when the opening of the pulp mill took place. It was a very peaceful atmosphere that day, but the Premier could not resist and he said, "I dare labor to go on strike." Out of the clear, blue sky!

I don't understand a man who has a hatred so deep that he has to try and foment trouble wherever he goes. What this country needs is industrial peace. What this country needs is to treat everybody in every walk of life the same way. If we are going to have control on our labor let's have price control right across the board for machinery, for prices on the shelf. There is nothing said about the high price of tractors. That is quite all right. Then they come along and say, we want tax concessions for big business, because they are the ones that finance their coffers. That is why they want these concessions.

**March 30, 1971**

I get a bit annoyed as I sit here and listen and sometimes one wonders what we can do about it, because they are sick. You can't talk to them and you can't change their minds. Yesterday they blamed us because a few farmers did not get up and speak. The point was well put by the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and I think that was enough. Let's ask Ottawa to get down and settle this strike as soon as possible.

I can remember when Mr. Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister and we had a railroad strike coming upon us. He asked the people of the railroad to go back to work and they did. Why can't this happen today? No, because you have a group of people in the Government that want industrial unrest.

When we start blaming labor, what we are doing is that we are blaming our sons and daughters for trying to make an honest living. As I said before, if we want to control one group let's have price review and price control and I would support a move of that kind, the kind of move that the Liberal Government would never do unless they went to war. They can find ways and means of making everything worse.

I can remember when McKenzie King said, "What is physically possible, will be made financially possible." We are in the depth of depression and we cannot make anything physically possible any more. Not a bit. We are busy at work dividing our people. Hatred! Yes, hatred is what they work on. Yes, and not giving them social aid. I am telling you that you wouldn't need half the social aid if you would find jobs for your people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THIBAUT:** — Well I hope that they now know that they have heard from the Member for Kinistino and with this I shall say that I support the amendment and will not support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words that I should like to contribute on this Resolution, particularly on the amendment and likewise to comment to some extent on what the farm Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) had to say.

I listened very, very carefully to see if he would mention just once - not twice - just once how this strike in British Columbia may be a detriment to Saskatchewan farmers, or if there is a possibility of losing some sales. Not once did he mention the farmers. Oh, he talked about things all over the world. How we should have peace in the labor field and how the lamb should lie down with the lion and be peaceful together. Tremendous . . . He didn't say one word about Saskatchewan farmers and whether or not they are going to be able to deliver their grain. No, and he didn't answer the question as to why.

The amendment comes forward and says, "Well you know we should have a fact-finding committee. We should look to some way to encourage the labor-management consultation. We should have some way to improve the industrial relationships which are, or may become causes of disputes." This is what they are talking about, when every farmer in Saskatchewan is concerned about his inability to deliver his grain to the West Coast. These sales



once lost will not be recaptured. They say, in view of this, we should set up a fact-finding committee which will spend the rest of the summer looking at ways and means by which we could cause the lion to lie down with the lamb.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time that we in Saskatchewan began to speak out on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan. We have seen too many instances of every time the crop is ready for sale, something happens at the docks, or something happens on the railroads. Right at home this grain is piling up unable to move. Oh, the condemnation that I have heard of Ottawa in this House, the condemnation that I have heard about Otto Lang and I am going to have something to say about Otto Lang. And all the horrible things that the Liberals are doing to prevent the movement of grain.

Today we have been able to see policies enunciated which the West has been crying for for years. Our grain is now beginning to move to market. The farmer for once is beginning to see some credibility in what Ottawa is doing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — When the farmer's hopes are raised and when he is looking east to Ottawa and now sees coming to Saskatchewan, those things for which he has been fighting, he then sees that in the West Coast his grain is shut off. We are asked to stand up here in this Legislature and give support to a motion which says we should set up some sort of committee and we shall analyse what causes these industrial disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I have some very strong feelings on this and I haven't had time to prepare too much material, so I should ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough) that Bill No. 45 - An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Embalmers and Funeral Directors Association be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by Mr. T. M. Weatherald, Member for Cannington, that the order for second reading of Bill No. 45 - An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Embalmers and Funeral Directors Association be discharged and the said Bill withdrawn.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I should very briefly like to say that we on this side of the House will support the motion put forward by the Member from Bengough.

**March 30, 1971**

I can say, speaking for myself and I am sure of the Members here, that I received many representations from concerned citizens about the proposed Bill that was to be introduced. I think the biggest criticism that could have been levelled against the proposed Bill was that it just didn't seem to provide adequate safeguards for co-operative movements that were interested in other forms of burial services.

I think the motion taken by the Member is a good motion and we will welcome it and will be supporting it.

Motion agreed to.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 5 - PRAIRIE GRAINS CASH RECEIPTS STABILIZATION PROGRAM**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the proposed Prairie Grains Cash Receipts Stabilization Program does not provide Saskatchewan farmers with a minimum acceptable net income that would have continuing relation to cost of production;

And that this Assembly favours a program, based on a minimum guarantee of net income, that is flexible enough to provide for sound land practices and that gives incentives to the Federal government to reduce costs of farm inputs for Western grain producers.

**MR. G. G. LEITH (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution now standing in my name came up last Friday. I must say that at that time I was prepared to speak except that I was physically not prepared to speak. I wish to thank the House for allowing me to adjourn the debate and pick it up in the House again today.

I regret any misunderstanding that may have occurred because of my disability.

I listened with great interest to the address of the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) when he introduced the Resolution. The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) followed him and I must say that I was disappointed to hear from him nothing but the tired old Socialist clichés that he trots out for us every time he rises in his place. However I do want to give him credit for one thing. He did admit that the \$100 million payment to be made shortly to grain farmers in Western Canada will be very acceptable and I quote: "Very agreeable and appreciated by the farmers."

Mr. Speaker, he not only said it once but he said it again and I quote: "and again I say that the \$100 million will be very welcome."

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Member who introduced the Resolution was a new one, at least, to this Legislature. The speech of the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) was an older speech I thought. The speech of the Member for Riversdale (Mr.

Romanow) was, at first, amusing, but it turned into what I thought was a minor tragedy. The tragedy is that it is obvious that the Member for Riversdale hasn't read the report that he talks so much about, the report of the Federal Task Force on agriculture entitled, "Canadian Agriculture in the 70s." It is obvious that I don't think he has found time yet to read the details of the Prairie Grain Stabilization Plan. I recommend both of these to his earnest study as soon as possible. I don't think he knows that, far from encouraging the takeover of Saskatchewan farms by large corporate holdings - these are his words - this Plan will pay out only on a maximum of \$15,000 of grain sold per farm unit. He doesn't understand, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that farmers will be asked to pay only two per cent of their grain sales up to the \$15,000 maximum and that the rest of the taxpayers of Canada will pay double that amount. So I don't think we should have any more of this reaching for motives, this, I think, deceit about some sinister plot to use the Stabilization Plan to further some kind of devious action that he thinks to get farmers off the land.

I think it is time that somebody said a word about the Federal Task Force on agriculture and the repeated references to it that were made by Members opposite. This report was commissioned in 1967 by the Federal Minister of Agriculture and it was presented to him in December, 1969. I'm not going to trouble you with the names of the Members of that Task Force but if you want to check their achievements and their reputations you will find them to be leaders in their respective fields. I quote in part from the letter of transmittal to the Minister:

Our terms of reference were to analyze the problems of the Canadian agricultural industry and to make recommendations to Government with respect to public policy. The most important objective was to outline policy measures which would lead to developing a viable industry over the coming decade. We have attempted to accomplish this task.

Mr. Speaker, nobody who takes the trouble to really read this report could have the effrontery to say that it had been developed to serve a particular point of view. The research for the report, in my view, is absolutely objective. But the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) time after time says in one way or another that - and I quote:

The main thrust, the main theory behind the Federal Task Force is corporate farming.

He says, and I believe I quote him correctly, that:

The Task Force says two out of three Saskatchewan farmers will be taken off the farms if the Liberals have their way within the next 20 years.

Again he says:

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that this Federal Task Force Report sets out at length, chapter after chapter, page after page, an absolute case for large corporate farming.

Mr. Speaker, this report has 475 pages. Nowhere in these pages, Mr. Speaker, does the report advocate and urge Government policies which will encourage large corporate farms. It does advocate and it does suggest courses of action that will, in the

**March 30, 1971**

long run, as well as in the short run, help to maintain agriculture as a viable industry in Canada. Admittedly the report is largely oriented towards economic problems in agriculture and to their solutions. And why not, Mr. Speaker? Our problems are mainly economic problems and if these economic problems were to be solved, the social problems that go with them would be relatively easy to solve. This report, although mainly economically oriented, is not exclusively so. It does examine the impact of the economic problems and their possible influence on the social and psychological aspects of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Task Force Report on agriculture is good reading. I recommend it to the Member for Riversdale, to the Member for Melville and to every other Member of this House who is interested in agriculture. I think the Member for Riversdale should particularly look again, look through the report, word by word, and find those references to large corporate farms that he makes so much about. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate several speakers have mentioned the Hon. Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. His programs have also been mentioned. The Member for Riversdale referred to him, rather enviously I thought, Mr. Speaker, as that Saskatoon corporation lawyer. I believe that the Member opposite was a student in the law school about the time that the Hon. Federal Minister was a Professor of Law at the University of Saskatchewan.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Any deficiencies I now have can be blamed . . .

**MR. LEITH:** — I really don't believe this but perhaps some of the remarks that he makes now about Otto Lang can be traced back to their relationship during that period. I think we all know how ambitious is the Member for Riversdale. It must gall him to see his former professor as head of one of the most important portfolios in the Government of Canada . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LEITH:** — . . . and at the same time to be in charge of the most important Canadian commissions, the Canadian Wheat Board. It must especially gall the Member for Riversdale to sit over there and play second fiddle in a third-rate orchestra.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LEITH:** — The Hon. Otto Lang has had the will and the courage to bring some long-needed changes to the Canadian grain system. Members opposite know very well, and even the Member for Riversdale knows very well, even if he hasn't got the grace to admit it, that the Canadian Wheat Board, indeed the whole grain gathering and marketing system needed a shakeup. Not one of those people, Mr. Speaker, would say a critical word about it even though they knew that our whole grains economy was being threatened by increasing inefficiencies and increasing carelessness. They thought and they still think that any criticism of the Board's operation is an attack on the Board itself or on the Board principle. Mr. Speaker, their criticism of the Hon. Otto Lang is based on a misconception of his ability and a distrust

of his motives. He has had the insight to recognize the need for change in our grains policy and he has had the courage to implement these changes. Do the Members opposite object to the new quota system? Do they object to the announcement that the Canadian Wheat Board will accept a minimum of 388 million bushels of wheat, 230 million of barley and 45 million of oats at the next crop year? Do those members object to the new grading system for wheat which will be in effect after the 1st of August this year? Do they object to the announcement now of 1971 initial prices for wheat, barley and oats? They don't object to those things very seriously because they know very well that these are improvements which were very long overdue. These forward prices and the announcement of minimum demand by the Canadian Wheat Board will assist us all in our plans for seeding this next crop.

Mr. Speaker, if Members opposite were truthful they would also admit the success of the LIFT program. That program was designed to discourage wheat production in 1970 and to provide some much needed cash income for prairie farmers. That program was successful. Not everybody took advantage of it but the great majority of farmers in my area, at least, were able to pick up some extra cash by reducing their inventory. The present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) had some unkind things to say about LIFT as I recall. He attacked it at a speech at Star City, reported in The Leader-Post dated the 2nd of April, 1970. This is the present Leader of the Opposition speaking. He is reported to have said among other things that, and I quote:

It is a policy of defeatism because it says we cannot find a way to sell Canadian wheat. It says we cannot find a way to get our wheat and flour into the hundreds and millions of hungry bellies in Asia, Africa, or South America. And it says we cannot find a way to diversify agriculture except at the expense of farmers.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are frustrated at the apparent contradiction in hungry bellies over there and full granaries here but perhaps we ought to remember, like most problems there is no sure or easy solution to this question. Professor Thair puts it very carefully and succinctly. I want to quote out of the much maligned Task Force report, page 24 and 25. This is Dr. Thair speaking:

An understandably popular goal with farmers is that of feeding the starving millions of the world. The logic is simple: match up the problem of surpluses in this country or North America with the problem of hunger in many parts of Asia and lo, both problems would be solved. In this way farmers' humanitarian instincts would be fulfilled at the same time as their incomes would be raised. Unfortunately instead of being the answer to both problems, such food gifts in perpetuity would be the answer to neither problem. Implementation of policies always has to begin from where you are at and where these hungry nations are at is in peasant farming. What these people need is to have their own productivity raised to the point where overall economic development can occur. Continual imports of free food would wreck the price structure and incentives for their farmers and permit their population to grow still faster on the free food, thereby creating still more hungry people. What these countries need is complete economic development assisted by temporary judicious food relief

and accompanied by population control and education. And when this has been accomplished they may well become competitors of ours as food exporters rather than importers. If a man is hungry do you give him a fish or do you teach him how to fish?

The Leader of the Opposition, when he calls the LIFT program immoral as he has done, should ask himself: if a man is hungry do you give him a fish or do you teach him how to fish?

Mr. Speaker, I have drawn the attention of the Legislature to the changes in the quota system, the changes in the grading of our wheat and the LIFT program. I mention this because the way that they were proposed and implemented has a bearing on the topic of the Prairie Grain Stabilization Plan. The most vocal critics of the LIFT program opposed it because of their belief that our present problems are short run. They think that these problems will be solved by finding new or larger markets for our surplus production. Mr. Speaker, the real problem of agriculture in Canada is the low net income realized by more and more farmers. In 1966, the Canadian net farm income was \$1,978,000,000 or \$4,594 per farm for the 430,000 farms identified in that census year. Fifty-five per cent of these farms with gross sales of under \$5,000 accounted for only 14 per cent of the total sales, yet about half of the Canadian farm labor force and 29 per cent of the farm capital in that year was used on those farms. In 1966, across Canada, 80.5 per cent of all Canadian farms were less than 400 acres in size. But here in Saskatchewan, 45.6 per cent of the farms were still in this size range. An eminent farm economist said recently that a survey showed that only 174,000 of Canada's 430,000 farmers could live adequately on the \$4.3 billion that form the annual cash receipts for farmers. This belief, and it's a very widely held belief, that the farmers across the board need more money, is the basis of the sharpest criticism of Mr. Lang's policy proposals.

I want to say a word about the Stabilization Plan before I go further. It is going to begin on August 1, 1971 instead of from August 1 of last year. The Prairie Grain Stabilization Plan is not a welfare plan, it is not designed to be a welfare plan. It is designed to help stabilize cash receipts for prairie grain farmers. It will add a minimum of four per cent to cash receipts by payments from the Federal Government and rather than just adding this four per cent to receipts every year, this Plan will make substantial payments in years of low receipts and no payments in years of high receipt. The special payment of \$100 million already mentioned by the Member for Melville and others will be made to the 1970-71 Canadian Wheat Board permit holders. This is a transitional payment for the crop year in which neither the temporary Wheat Reserves Act or The Prairie Grain Stabilization Plan are in effect. The special payment will provide a cash sum of between a \$1.40 and \$1.50 an acre to a maximum of 640 acres for any individual. Now under the new proposals farmers are going to contribute two per cent of eligible receipts, that is, on their sales up to \$15,000. The Federal Government will contribute four per cent of the eligible receipts or double the producer's contributions. For example, on \$15,000 of eligible receipts, a farmer's contributions will be \$300; Federal Government contributions will be \$600. Total payments from the plan would be based on the difference between total eligible receipts for the year and the average of such receipts for the preceding five years. This

total payment will be divided among eligible permit holders in proportion to their previous year average of eligible receipts. I might say again that the maximum eligibility for individuals has been raised to \$15,000 from the originally planned \$10,000. As Members will know, the new proposals call for payment of pool losses from the Stabilization Fund instead of recovery from the next year's pool account. Mr. Speaker, these changes from the original proposal are the result of consultations with farm organizations and the Provincial governments. I believe that this Assembly should congratulate our Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) on his energetic representation to the Hon. Otto Lang for these changes.

The new Grain Stabilization Plan has generated, almost universally, favorable action from the responsible farm groups. There has been strong endorsement of the whole market thrust, that is, for the proposal for market development and research. There has been almost unanimous support for continuing the forage incentive program and for providing price and quota predictions prior to seeding time. The critical comments regarding the discontinuance of the temporary Wheat Reserves Act have come mainly from the elevator companies. But we should remember, Mr. Speaker, that storage payments under the Act were not paid unless there was more than 178 million bushels in commercial storage. The latest proposals by the grain groups suggest that a minimum of bushels be kept in commercial storage and that only about 250 million bushels will be adequate for farm storage. In the past we have tended to fill all the commercial storage as quickly as possible and to keep it full as long as possible. This has had the effect of clogging our grain handling system. I believe that it is proper to keep the line open and to keep stocks only at a good working level. Of course the elevator companies will not be able to continue to build and fill storage and turn a rather quick profit on this storage. Personally, I think that they have done very well over the years. Certainly it was to the grain companies' advantage to store grain rather than to move it. At my delivery point at Glasmis, one annex had in it on January 1, No. 1 Northern wheat that was put there five years ago. If we figure the cost of storage as one cent per month, per bushel, then that grain has cost the farmers at least 60 cents in storage charges alone. I don't think we can afford that kind of drain on our wheat dollar any more.

So, Mr. Speaker, I endorse the changes in the grain marketing and the handling systems that have been made so far. I believe that other changes are necessary and that they are inevitable. When they come or when they are proposed, we owe it to the whole agricultural industry to examine them carefully and to accept the changes that will help to make us more competitive producers of an internationally traded commodity.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that is before us was lifted directly from the proposal by the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture inspired by the feeling that farmers need more money. If the Government of Canada is to try to meet that need, it should be done in other ways than through this so-called net income stabilization plan. The Uskiw Plan (Manitoba Minister of Agriculture) has serious drawbacks. Mr. Speaker, nobody has ever done a study of family farm income in Canada. There have been a lot of studies of farm income but I emphasize that, nobody, in this nation knows the total of family farm income. Further, nobody has established any correlation between farm size and family income. Forty per cent, I should guess and I

**March 30, 1971**

think this is a fair estimate, forty per cent of all the farms in a 30 mile radius from the cities of Saskatoon and Regina have substantial off farm income. This may be from the father or the mother holding down a full-time job in the city or from the mother working as a nurse or a teacher, or from either parent working part-time.

I wonder if the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) thinks that these farm families need the kind of reward that he has suggested. Mr. Speaker, if the benefits of the Manitoba Plan are to be restricted to farms of 500 acres or less, it would almost certainly increase production. The returns per bushel will be high on those first 500 acres and correspondingly lower on acres over 500. Every step taken to boost income on farms up to 500 acres will almost certainly guarantee that any acres over the 500 will not be so profitable.

Members should realize, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal will inevitably mean more encouragement and more arrangements to divide up farms, either by fake sales or by tenant relationships. I believe the Manitoba scheme would mean more and more absentee ownership whether by large corporations or by the growth of a landed aristocracy. Does the Member for Kelsey favor this kind of agriculture for Western Canada? Does he believe that every farm should be 500 acres in size or less with a net income of \$5,000 or less? Would he reduce his farm to 500 acres?

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the \$5,000 net income that I speak of would be returned to labor and to the investment in land. How could a young farmer ever hope to buy land and pay for it on that kind of income? The Uskiw (Manitoba Minister of Agriculture) scheme propounded in this Legislature by the Member for Kelsey is a typical Socialist scheme. It would be extremely costly. It would be extremely costly. It could cost as much as \$318 million, he says so himself. It ignores the real low income sector of Canadian agriculture which is centered in Eastern Canada, not in the West. It is in no way related to family farm income and in my opinion it would exacerbate the long-term problem of Western agriculture instead of alleviating them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Resolution as it now stands. Accordingly, I move, seconded by the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker):

That all the words after the word "Program" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

will assist farmers in adjusting to changing farm conditions and will provide a degree of stability in years of low production and limited markets; and particularly that the 100 million dollar payment to farmers, expected this spring, will be welcomed by the agricultural community at this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Member a question before he takes his seat while the Speaker is considering the amendment. Would the Hon. Member who just finished



taking his seat agree with me that the Task Force suggests that the better future way of financing farms . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale has now entered the debate.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm intending to ask a question. The question is whether he and I am asking the Hon. Member from Elrose whether or not he agrees with me that the Task Force suggests that the future way to financing . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. T. M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, you have just ruled that the Member is now entering the debate. That Member has already been in this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — You're right. I didn't notice that. Well, if he is going to ask a question he had better make a pretty brief one. Did the Member (Mr. Leith) indicate that he would accept a question? Now, if he expects to enter this debate and make a speech, he has already spoken. I was going to say that he was now speaking.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — No, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to enter the debate. The question is: would the Hon. Member from Elrose agree with me that the Task Force says the best way for future financing of farms is through equity financing on the stock market.

**MR. LEITH:** — No!

**HON. D. G. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely evident now that the Member for Riversdale knows absolutely nothing about farming. In fact, his display in the House the other day when he went through a great deal of semantics and gyrations and one thing or another, reminded me of some of the reports I got from the meeting he was talking about down in Kendal. He said he was down in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and four farmers attended his meeting. And he blew up and stormed about one thing or another down there, so do you know what the farmers told me when you were finished? They said it was just like those old storms we had back in the thirties - it clouded up and stormed and it was all wind and no rain. And so that was about the extent of the contribution he had to make there. But the contribution he made in this House the other day indicates, beyond a doubt that he knows absolutely nothing about farming. He has never looked at the Task Force Report - maybe he leafed through some of the pages - and certainly he has never studied the Grain Receipts Stabilization Plan or he wouldn't have made some of the statements he did.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief this afternoon because I want to beg leave later on to adjourn the debate. I want to say at the outset that I was very surprised at the Member who introduced this Resolution taking all his guidance and

instructions from the Government of Manitoba, because if ever there was a kooky plan ever adopted, ever presented, to Western agriculture it was the Uskiw plan and he didn't take the time to do a little bit of research into the reasons that Uskiw had brought this plan in or some of the repercussions. And he didn't realize what he was getting himself into or getting the farmers of this province into if the Uskiw plan were to be adopted. Because before the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba announced his version of a Stabilization Plan, when he was speaking to the agricultural committee of the Manitoba Legislature in Portage la Prairie, he said that if farm income was to be supported under a stabilization program it was only right that land prices would be frozen. Now, it is nice to know that there is the agricultural critic (Mr. Messer), the man who outlines the agricultural policy for the Socialists to your left, Mr. Speaker, who is now advocating to all the farmers of Saskatchewan that land prices should be frozen. Well, this doesn't surprise anybody on this side of the House. It doesn't surprise the farmers of Saskatchewan because they turned down that policy some years ago and now it's in their - the NDP's - new deal for agriculture. This is the policy they are presenting complete nationalization of farms.

All right, so land prices are to be frozen, and then he goes on from there to come out with his income stabilization plan for that province. Now, I suggest to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason why the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba ever promoted that plan in the first place. It was to try and embarrass the Federal Government and the Federal Minister in charge of the Wheat Board (Mr. Lang) for coming out with the type of stabilization program that he did. The Manitoba Minister of Agriculture knows now that it was probably one of the biggest mistakes that was made.

I want to indicate too, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member for Kelsey was introducing this Resolution into the House he quite conveniently took the farm cash receipts from the years 1964 on and for one very good reason - because these were the years of the highest cash farm receipts in the history of this province by far. There were only two years under that period in 1969 and 1970 that were low and the farm cash receipts for those years were about \$722 million. But then it is interesting to note that in our best years they were almost up to the billion dollar mark - of well over \$900 million. Let's go back to 1953, the best year in the history of the NDP regime in this province. And how much did the farmer in Saskatchewan receive that year? In 1953, your best year, which was still below our worst, \$6,500. In the worst year we have had in Saskatchewan under the Liberals, the receipts for farmers in this province was \$8,400 - \$2,000 more to the farmers of Saskatchewan and the worst year under the Liberals compared to the best year under the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to have something more to say on that but that's something that the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) very conveniently shied away from and then I want to deal with some of the other statements that he made later on in this debate.

I listened to the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk), well if ever there was a political dog's breakfast presented to the

Member of this House, it was the speech that he made because he was contradicting himself, he'd say one thing and turn around and then retract it and come up with something else.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Members opposite yesterday and I listened to them today - two days in this House and not once have they ever come to the defence of the farmers of this province. It was a crying shame the misrepresentation of the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) made this afternoon. It only indicates to me this: we go back to an NDP convention down in Ottawa or Toronto not too many years ago and one of the young fellows had just come out of the paddling pool and they were still sucking their political thumbs, like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Romanow) on the other side, what did he say? He got up and said, "To Hell with the farmers. They are a fading force anyway." And that's the attitude that has been taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Regina North East, the Member for Regina North West, the two Members from Moose Jaw . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — On a point of order!

**MR. McFARLANE:** — . . . the whole attitude of the whole NDP opposite.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — On a point of order!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I perhaps was not listening but did the Hon. Member quote me as saying, "To Hell with the farmers?"

**MR. McFARLANE:** — No, I said that was one of your fellows down East, a little older than you are, now you probably have forgotten all about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:** — So, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many more remarks that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Romanow) made here this afternoon and I'm going to deal with them at a later date. And I am going to indicate to him some of the things that are in the Task Force Report that he is condemning now, that he is going to throw out. I am going to indicate to him and to the Members of his party and to the people of this province some of the things that are in the Grains Receipt Stabilization Program that he is prepared to do away with because this was another program that was recommended by the Task Force Report on Agriculture.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

## MOTIONS

### ADDITIONAL HOUSE SITTINGS

**HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, March 30, 1971 . . .

(Well, that's academic so far as that's concerned but anyway this is the motion):

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall, commencing Tuesday, March 30, 1971, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day, and that there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual Resolution that we pass at about this time in the Session. I give my undertaking to the Members of the House that we won't be enforcing this until we finish the Committee meetings. I think that there are still quite a few meetings of the Crown corporations Committee and of course it won't be practical to start 10:00 o'clock sittings until that is over and any other committees that are still meeting in the morning.

I should remind Hon. Members that so far as this Saturday is concerned, that was contained in the previous motion and it is the intention of the Government to sit on Friday night and Saturday starting at 10:00 o'clock until 5:30 on Saturday, but I would think that so far as this motion is concerned, it couldn't come into effect to be used until next week.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have nothing really to say except that we would very much appreciate the Government keeping in mind the commitments which have been made by attempting to arrange the order of business in a manner so that while the House can sit the maximum number of hours, individual Members can meet previously made commitments. It's the same point that I raised earlier. It arises particularly with respect to Wednesday night - and I realize the comment is not strictly in order - one week from tomorrow night.

With respect to the meetings or the Assembly commencing at 10:00 a.m., I am supporting the motion on the understanding that it will of course not sit at 10:00 a.m. until the major committees have concluded their business, or at least the House and the committees will not overlap. I don't suppose they have to conclude but they should not overlap.

**MR. HEALD:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to give that undertaking. That will be arranged and discussed through the usual channels and we shall not be proceeding with morning sittings while the major committees have not finished their work.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.