

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**31st Day**

**Thursday, March 8, 1973**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce two groups of students that are here with us this afternoon. Firstly we have a group of 55 students from the Cochrane High School. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Brandt, Mr. Quinn and Mr. Bell. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. The other group of students that are here from my constituency are from Imperial School, 80 in number and are seated in the Speaker's Gallery as well as the west gallery and accompanied by their teachers Mr. Meyer and Mr. Wittner. I should like to extend an invitation and a warm welcome to the students and express the hope that so far they have had an enjoyable visit. I hope also that their stay this afternoon with us will be an educational and informative experience and that it will help them in their social studies. I hope they will be able to remember this day as a pleasant experience.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Pioneer Village Level Care Rates**

**Mr. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. I have in my hands Sir, two letters from the Administrator of Pioneer Village Limited, Regina, Saskatchewan, directed to the guests in Pioneer Village. The first one begins:

We have been instructed by the Department of Social Services announcing an increase on January 31st, for Level III care from \$310 to \$391.

Then, Mr. Speaker, less than a month later on March 1st, a second letter, where Level I care was increased from \$180 to \$200, an increase of \$20, without any government subsidy. Level II care from \$258 to \$267, an increase of \$9 with a government subsidy of \$58. Level III care, a second increase from \$310 to \$411, an increase of \$101.

I should like to ask the Minister if this is accurate and is this the way this new program of grants to senior citizens is being applied to nursing home costs across the province?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, the Member has asked a question which contains a few inaccuracies. The grant in Level II, I thought he knew, was \$54 not \$58 unfortunately. He is also quite aware

that the Department of Social Services does not establish the rates in these homes, but approves the maximum rate which they may charge.

**An Hon. Member:** — Same thing.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Not quite the same thing. There are at least two homes in the province where the municipalities are providing a subsidy. There is nothing to stop the Regina municipality from doing the same. The Member asks about the increase in two months. This may be true, I would have to check and find out. It is possible since the fiscal year-end is April, the grants went in the first of March. It could be that in the fiscal reporting of the home, the new rate for the coming year for a 12-month period would take effect in April. I might say that the Member had his facts fairly accurate on the amount of grants except for a few dollars. If he subtracts the \$144 that will be given to senior citizens in Level III he will find that the senior citizens in that category will still be saving a considerable sum of money with this type of grant system.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately that is not the case in Level I, for example, the promised \$18 increase in pension from the Federal Government is now being eaten away entirely by an increase in Level I care.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister if he would table for us tomorrow the approved rates for all the nursing homes in the Province of Saskatchewan and all the special care facilities so we could see exactly what this great new program has done for senior citizens in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the Member that I can table it tomorrow because the budget review has not been completed for all the level care homes in the province. I certainly have no objection to tabling it when I have it available, I should be glad to do so at that time.

## STATEMENT

### Purchase of IPSCO Shares

**Hon. Mr. Thorson** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I undertook yesterday that I would make a statement about InterProvincial Steel and Pipe Corporation. I should like to do that now before the Orders of the Day are called.

The Government of Saskatchewan has always held shares in InterProvincial Steel and Pipe Corporation Limited. Recently the Government has purchased additional shares. I wish the Legislature to know the circumstances surrounding the most recent acquisition of shares of IPSCO. The additional shares were not purchased with a view to gaining majority control of the company and the Government has no desire to have the present company ownership and operation changed. Therefore, the Government does not now intend purchasing any more shares.

March 8, 1973

We have the utmost confidence in the management of the company. We believe the company has a very good future. We are pleased that it has just recently expanded its production capacity at Regina and has also acquired the assets of the Canadian Phoenix Plants in Alberta and British Columbia.

The company paid dividends to the province (commencing in 1970) which has so far totalled \$250,250 or 55 cents per share. These facts alone make the shares in IPSCO a good investment. There are other significant facts.

The company has an authorized capitalization of five million common shares, of which 3,435,317 have actually been issued and 111,000 are reserved. Prior to November 1972, the Government of Saskatchewan held 455,000 of the issued shares and held an option which expires at the end of 1973 to purchase 60,000 shares out of those reserved. The 455,000 shares made the Government of Saskatchewan the largest shareholder in the company.

On November 2, 1972, Slater Steel Industries Limited offered to purchase 886,000 shares of IPSCO at a price of \$17.25 per share. The offer was made to all shareholders. The offer remained open until November 23, 1972. In the event that more than 886,000 shares were deposited with the company then the shares were to be taken up on a pro rata basis. As a result of the offer Slater Steel accepted approximately 35 per cent of the shares deposited. This resulted in the acquisition of 886,000 by Slater Steel which is 26 per cent of the issued shares of IPSCO. Slater Steel Industries Limited is located in Hamilton, Ontario. Approximately 50 per cent of the company is beneficially owned by British Steel Corporation, a British Crown corporation.

Since the time of the Slater offer and up to March 3, 1973, the Province of Saskatchewan purchased 288,200 shares of IPSCO. The average cost was \$15.75 per share for a total of \$4,540,062.50. As a result of the recent purchase the Province of Saskatchewan now holds the following shares: The original holding was 455,000; our purchases have been 288,200; the total is 743,200. These 743,200 shares together with the option to purchase 60,000 shares means that the Province of Saskatchewan controls 803,200 shares or approximately 23 per cent of the shares outstanding and reserved.

In the past the share holdings and the interest of the Government of Saskatchewan in IPSCO have served as a shield to protect the company from outside takeover. This threat was real in the early days of the company and there is always a potential that such a threat will arise. We believe it essential that the Government be in a position to provide protection. While there is no present threat, the Government wants to be able to guard against contingencies. We want to ensure that there will not be a time when this major industry in Saskatchewan can be closed or removed and the people of the province are not able to prevent it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that the major concern of the Government of Saskatchewan is that IPSCO continue to grow in the future as it has in the past, with the same management and sound business practises. We want IPSCO to continue to provide employment as a major part of the industrial sector of Saskatchewan and Western Canada. We believe that

such is the prospect for the company. We believe that we have made a sound investment on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could just ask the Hon. Minister a question before I make a comment.

In all the figures that he gave us, I believe that he stated that the recent purchase of shares amounted to about \$4 million, was that right?

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — The exact price at \$15.75 per share is \$4,540,062.50. I may say, Mr. Speaker, I am arranging for copies of my statement to be distributed to all Members of the Legislature immediately.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it good that the Minister has cleared the air, because the rumors were all over this province, certainly all over Canada about what was happening to the shares of IPSCO, they turned out to be well founded.

Again, this is within a short period of time. We have an announcement that this Government has invested \$4.5 million in an on-going company that \$4.5 million is the taxpayers' money — not one new job produced, not one new cent of revenue for the province. They have invested it in a company that is very viable, that has had a very difficult history but in these last few years, thanks to strong management and thanks to the advent of a great deal of pipe line construction, has become a very strong company. In fact, the announcement was in the newspaper just two nights ago that they have acquired either the controlling interest or all the interest in two steel mills in Alberta and British Columbia.

The question has to be asked by the public, just what exactly this Government is up to, \$14, almost \$15 million of the taxpayers' money has been invested in two on-going businesses, viable, we are told, strong — in the case of IPSCO — we know it is strong because their statements are public. We know it has been a very strong company (it has increased its strength in the last few years) and every indication is that it will continue to increase its strength. Now I am pleased by the statement of the Minister that they don't intend to interfere in the management. Because I think if they did interfere in the management it would be a disaster. They have excellent management at IPSCO and they have an excellent future, with the future promising tremendous new pipe line development to bring the gas out of the Arctic and the Northwest Territories, a great deal of it will probably cross Saskatchewan to get to both Eastern Canadian and possibly Eastern American markets. With the process that IPSCO pioneered some years ago, with the help of our government, incidentally, of spiral weld, they are in a most excellent position to take advantage of this great opportunity. But the Government still has not answered the question, they have waved some vague threat of foreign takeover or an outside provincial government takeover, yet here is a company that has shown a tremendous strength and has in fact,

March 8, 1973

added millions of dollars worth of assets to its holdings right here in the city of Regina. For this we are all, I am sure, very happy and very grateful.

I should like to ask the Minister a supplementary question. I don't know what the Government is up to, I don't know what the point is. I don't take very seriously the fact that the Minister gets up and casually says that there is a threat that this company might have been taken over and moved out of Saskatchewan. I don't think that is good enough to invest \$4.5 million of taxpayers' money to produce no new jobs, no new revenue. We have got thousands of people walking the streets looking for jobs, that would take new investment and new industry, to casually say we did this to protect our people against some takeover that he doesn't mention. I think he should say who was threatening to take this company over, exactly what the details are and give them to the Opposition, give them to the public. I should like to ask him as well when he stands up to tell us what companies were threatening to take this steel plant over and what plans they had to move it out of Saskatchewan, if in fact such plans existed? Does this have anything to do with the development of the Choiceland Iron Mine?

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — May I respond more briefly to the several questions implied and explicit in the Leader of the Opposition's statement.

Perhaps the simplest and easiest way for him to understand this and for everyone to understand is that the Government has made no change whatever in its policy with respect to IPSCO. But the facts, as I outlined in my statement, did alter in terms of the shareholdings of the company and the significant fact is that while the Government of Saskatchewan, up to November 1972, was the largest single shareholder in IPSCO, after November 23, 1972 Slater Steel was the largest single holder of shares in IPSCO. We didn't change our policy. We altered our position because the position of the shareholders had been altered in IPSCO and we think that is in the long term interests of the company and of the people of Saskatchewan.

I think it inappropriate for me at this time to try to make any comment about the last statement of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the Choiceland Iron deposit.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked the question . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — This was a Minister's statement and we can't debate.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I am not debating, I am just asking if he might have overlooked the fact that I asked a question. He said, one of the reasons they paid out \$4.5 million of taxpayers' money to invest in a private business over which they don't have control incidentally, was to avoid some takeover by someone else. Was there in fact someone in the wings who was bidding for this, or do you have knowledge of someone you could name who was in the process of taking this company over?

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the words

which I used in my initial statement as follows:

This threat was real in the early days of the company and there is always a potential that such a threat will arise. We believe it essential that the Government be in a position to provide protection. While there is no present threat, the Government wants to be able to guard against contingencies. We want to ensure that there will not be a time when this major industry in Saskatchewan can be closed or removed and the people of the province are not able to prevent it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald** (Cannington): — The Minister refers to the company . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I can't allow this statement to be debated now.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I'm not debating. It is a question I am asking . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — They can be asked when he comes with his Estimates on Industry and Commerce . . .

**Mr. Weatherald:** — It is a portion of his statement which I am sure he would wish to clarify.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I can't permit a debate. The Minister makes a statement. We allow one of the Opposition to make a reply to this statement. We must proceed then we can't allow cross questions.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has stated that 55 cents a share was paid for IPSCO . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I can't allow questions on his statement.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I will ask a question then, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I could do but I won't.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the point here is . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — We can stretch the rules. But I am not going to stretch the rules at this time. We have had the statement. We have had a reply from the Leader of the Opposition. I allowed him to ask questions. I allowed the Minister to rise twice to further clarify the statement. We cannot continue to discuss the statement that way.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mr. Speaker, with due deference, Sir, I don't think that the statement is up for debate. I think the Hon. Member for Cannington just wanted to ask a question for clarification on a line on the first page of the statement. And surely that doesn't contravene the rules or the principles of the Minister making a statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that further clarification should be taken up with the Minister or wait until his Estimates come. Because I don't think we can debate statements back and forth this way.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, surely we haven't got anything more important in front of this House this afternoon than the fact that the Government has within a week or ten days invested \$16 million or \$15 million of taxpayers' money in on-going businesses. And surely to God we haven't got anything so important this afternoon that we can't spend 10 or 15 minutes on this subject trying to clarify this statement so that when he does come up in his Estimates we can have some idea of what this statement means. I can't think of anything more important in front of this House. The very fact the Minister stood up before the Orders of the Day and announced and it has gone all over this country, all over this nation. Surely a \$4.5 million purchase of shares isn't something we should just brush under the table. We haven't asked three questions today.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). What was the dividend payment made by IPSCO in the last fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I don't have the exact figure he is asking in those precise words but I am sure that information is readily available in reports published by the company.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The statement is made that 55 cents was paid in the last three years. Now surely the Minister knows the dividend payment made in the last fiscal year by IPSCO.

**Hon. Mr. Thorson:** — Mr. Speaker, that after all is not Government business. That is the company's business what the payment will be. But my information is that the total we have received by way of dividends on the shareholdings of the Government in IPSCO has been the figures I have given. Now the exact amount in the last fiscal year I do not have with me. I have some recollection, but I would rather not guess at it unless I have the figures before me to verify it.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Byers that Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Air Pollution Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like this afternoon to direct a few words to the Act which has been before this Assembly for some days now. And I believe that there are two particular questions that I wish to relate to the Minister at this time. I think I mentioned them in my original remarks. And I hope that in closing the debate that he will bring the information to this House.

Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that all Members in the Assembly favor a continuing attempt and I say 'continuing' because much legislation has been over the years put on the books. Particularly regarding air pollution around many of the mines existing in Saskatchewan. That we are continuing to attempt to improve the quality of air which is our good fortune or lack of good fortune to breathe throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

Much of the pollution control legislation I think in the future will be a compromise between the necessity of being able to create jobs and work for individuals and the necessity of trying to provide a good and clean environment for the citizen of not only our own province but all of North America.

I suggest that this will be a compromise because often the maximization of jobs would certainly not be conducive to having a good clean environment for all of us to live in. However, we are confronted with the need of creating work and, therefore, this compromise between having a satisfactory environment or the best possible environment and the need for industrial development is a compromise.

This Bill I think is an example of need for that compromise. And I hope that — I would suggest that much of the good which can stem from this Bill will depend upon the way in which the Bill itself is administered.

Two particular questions, Mr. Speaker, that I would refer to the Minister that I would think are certainly important questions for us to have answers to, if not immediately, certainly in the very near future.

The first question I would ask is that under the new legislation, how much time will the various industries affected be allowed, before legal action is taken against them? The legislation provides for the licensing of many or all the industries as far as air pollution standards are concerned. The licensing aspect is a new aspect. But it is fairly obvious that a number of industries in Saskatchewan will not probably be able immediately to qualify under the pollution aspects as far as the regulations proposed here. Now the question is how long are these industries going to be given to be able to adapt to the new pollution control standards which will be coming into operation? Many of these standards have already been in operation for some lengthy period. But still I believe there



March 8, 1973

will be new industries which will be required to put in new equipment before they will be able to obtain this type of licence.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, is how many such industries currently exist? And what industries currently do not qualify under the licensing requirement?

There are, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a number of industries which are concerned about meeting this standard and how long and how much money it will take them in order to be able to qualify for the licence which the Minister has suggested they will be needing.

Another important principle of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it apparently allows different standards of air pollution in different areas of our province. And again, while this is laid out in the Bill, I think that I and my colleagues would like the Minister to explain precisely what he has in mind as far as this aspect is concerned. It seems like a desirable step forward because it is fairly obvious that a standard of air pollution over an extremely large city may have to be much more stringent than what the standard over a very, very wide geographic area in the country. It may well be desirable to have two sets of standards because it could be that the necessary cost or the dislocation of industry in the country is not desirable when one realizes that the problem of air pollution out in the country may not be nearly as important as the heavily settled areas of the cities. This appears to be a step in the right direction. But once again, I hope that the Minister would give us some indication as to how he intends to implement and make work the setting up of areas that will probably, as I understand the Bill, have different standards as far as meeting the licence requirements concerned.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I think that the Bill is a step in the right direction. But I do believe that much of its ability or desirable features will depend on the judgment decisions and will require compromise by the Government and the Minister involved in making the necessary compromise between trying to create a relatively clean environment and at the same time maintain job creating enterprises that are so badly needed.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister will present us with more information. While I believe, while I am sure that we in the Opposition will support this Bill, we will certainly watch for the manner in which the Bill itself operates and the manner in which the Government administers the new procedures that they have put forward.

**Hon. Mr. Mostoway** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I fully support this motion. I support it because I know of the pollution which can be caused by industry in this province. I support it because I am aware of the pollution caused by some of our potash mines. And it is in this last area that I want to make a few remarks. But before I go on I do want to say that I appreciate, along with others, the fact that the potash industry has been beneficial to this province.

I want to say that I think the Department of the Environment should be commended for taking this precautionary action before the situation gets out of hand as it has in many other areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this department take a serious look at the situation as it now exists near some of our potash mines. I know for a fact that near one mine in Hanley constituency air pollutants are causing hardships for some farmers. One farmer I know whose farm is located on the leeward side and adjacent to a potash mine has shown me the effects of these air pollutants on his machinery. The result is that this machinery has been eroded to such an extent that he has lost very heavily through terribly high depreciation. This situation is known to mine officials but no compensation has been paid in this case, and I doubt if it has in other similar ones. So it is with this in mind that I say I want to see some sort of agency of Government set up to deal with matters such as these so that those who cause such damage will have to pay their rightful share to those who bear the brunt of such practices.

For those who may question my remarks in this regard, let me give you an example of an incident which will prove my point. A few years ago in the vicinity of the potash mine that I mentioned, a horse was tied on a long rope to a power pole. So heavy was the fallout that day, that the electric current actually reached the horse who was almost going berserk.

While I am on the topic may I also bring the Minister's attention to the practice of potash mines getting rid of liquid wastes by forced pumping at a depth of about a mile. Has any real study, Mr. Minister, been carried out as to what the effects of this practice may be in the long run? I should like to know how it may affect the water situation in the future near these mines — not how it may or may not have affected areas near potash mines in the United States. I am wondering, why couldn't our own Saskatchewan Research Council be asked to possibly make a thorough study of this practice.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this motion which shows once again that this Government is truly dedicated to keeping Saskatchewan beautiful and a healthy place in which to live.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Byers** (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close debate on second reading of this Bill, I should like to refer to some of the questions raised by the two Hon. Members.

It is true as the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) indicates that this Bill does propose to set, by regulations, standards for air quality on an industry by industry basis. These levels will be set by regulations. The regulations have not at this point in time been drafted. And one of the reasons is that we are conducting and will in the months ahead conduct a more extensive program for monitoring air quality. There is a substantial amount of data that we want to collect before we draft the regulations that will apply under this Bill.

As a general rule, it will be our intention to endeavor to pattern regulations more or less along the lines of the emission standards or objectives for air quality that are presently accepted by the Federal Government. These objectives have been worked out in co-operation with the Federal Government and the various provinces. There may be cases where we will insist upon a higher standard for some industries than the Federal objectives suggest. There may also be instances where we would, because of our particular province, agree to go along with lower standards. We do have some regulations at present with respect to air quality. And as a general rule these follow the objectives set by the Federal standards.

May I comment upon a couple of questions that the Hon. Member for Cannington has raised. And I think his questions can be stated:

1. Will permits or licences be issued to companies that do not meet the required levels, and;
2. How much time will these industries be given to comply with the requirements to obtain a permit?

First it is our intention that once the levels are established that new industries will be expected to meet these required levels at start up. With regard to existing industries I don't think it will be our intention to set down firm standards and require immediate compliance. It is intended that existing industries would be granted either an interim or a conditional permit which would permit that particular industry to exceed the required level of emission at least for a specified period of time. We would likely require a commitment from the company that it would commit itself to a program over a given period of time to reduce emissions so as to comply with the regulations. We expect to work out an agreeable time frame between the Department and the industry concerned. We would certainly take into consideration such factors as the financial implications that extensive emission equipment might have for that particular company. On the third question, will there be any industries that may not qualify under the proposed regulations?

First, the regulations have not yet been set. We are continuing to gather more data through our monitoring program. I think you will recall the remarks I made about the proposed expansion of our monitoring system in the Budget Debate. Our mobile lab was ordered last fall, a mobile air monitoring lab, and it has not arrived as yet and, therefore, we are a bit handicapped in not having the equipment to do the required monitoring at this time. So our regulations are not fully set and they will not be until we have gathered in more data than we have at present.

On the basis of the information that we now have collected through our limited monitoring program, we do not believe that there will be a substantial number of plants that will be unable to meet the regulations which we intend to draft. There may be some industries in the province that will be required to clean up their equipment but we do not anticipate that there will be many.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that answers some of the questions raised by the Hon. Members. We will provide more information if it is required during Committee. I move second reading of this

Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services) that Bill No. 62 — **An Act respecting Family Services** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, at the time when the Bill was introduced for first reading I wasn't in and I don't know what the Minister said. The Minister is not in at this time. I should like to direct my words to the Minister because he will close the debate and I should like some answers. There is lots of time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Family Services Bill as it is spelled out, it only deals with one aspect of family life and that is whether or not the Minister will take care of a child or the family as a whole, one or more children. Surely, Mr. Speaker, family problems usually are not the children. As a matter of fact it has long been recognized and established that the children are the greatest blessing in a home and here when we read about family services the Minister is more or less just concerned with taking the child away from the parent. There is really nothing in the Act that spells out what the Minister will provide in certain kinds of services to help maintain a family setting. I find it hard to understand why the Minister does not spell out in detail what he intends to do in order to maintain the family setting.

In Clauses 5, 6 and 7, three very short clauses, the Bill more or less states that the Minister may do such things as he considers advisable, that is, in maintaining a family setting. But there are some 80 clauses, maybe not all of them dealing with the same principle, but there are 80 clauses in the Bill which deal with measures after the child or children have been taken from the parent at one time or other. One of the major shortcomings of this Government is not putting into legislation or regulation in the welfare system spelling out clearly what are the responsibilities of the parents. Don't encourage young people or older people, alike, to have children and then ask the taxpayer to foot the bill.

There are many areas of concern that I have which could assist us in keeping the welfare budget down to a minimum, but if this Government believes and will adopt most of the Liquor Commission's report, family life will definitely deteriorate. There is no argument about that. If this Government believes that lowering the drinking age to 18, which indeed they have done, then I can assure the Minister that there will be more problems. I should like to see the Government embark on an educational program which would be aimed at showing the responsibility to mothers in particular, be they wed or unwed, and parents that to have children spells out grave and sincere responsibilities, and that the Government should not always respond as a godfather at all times. I believe what the Minister is trying to do is to rectify a problem once it exists. We should try to prevent the problem but if there is a problem that does exist then I do not see much wrong with what he intends to do. I personally will not object to the Bill but certainly, as I said in my opening remarks, this Bill is a new Act that calls for family services and the only thing that it deals with

is dealing with children where parents are unable and unwilling to care for the child, or are delinquent. I certainly cannot see that for solving family problems this Bill does any more than deal with one family problem.

**Mr. Rolfes** (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I was trying to gather a few things together here when the Member from Rosthern was speaking. I have also read the Act and I want to say that I think the Member from Rosthern speaks with sincerity on the Bill. I have also read the Bill and studied it in some detail and I read into the Bill that this was going to be a Bill that would prevent, and give the Minister authority, to prevent family breakdowns. If you read the old Child Welfare Act, and I am sure that the Member from Rosthern has, since he was the Minister of Social Services for some time, he will note that there is a difference. The emphasis here is on prevention. There was nothing in the old Child Welfare Act that gave the Minister the authority to try and assist families when they were in need, not when a crisis has occurred but when they were in need so that they could go to agencies, could go to the Minister, could go to the Crown for some help. I think there is a real change in the emphasis in this particular Act. The reason I was not prepared was because I was going through the Star-Phoenix a little while ago and I think one of the reasons why so many of our families are breaking down was mentioned by the Member opposite and I have to agree with him — it is drinking. I want him to note also that last year we had a free vote, and I know he would have been more accurate if he had said, if this Legislature believes that we restore family unity, family standards, by lowering the drinking age, then this Legislature is wrong and not put the full blame on this side of the House. I voted in favor of lowering the drinking age and maybe I was wrong. I know you opposed it and maybe you were right. The Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) opposed it and maybe he was right. Yes, he opposed it.

**Mr. Boldt:** — No, he didn't.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Yes, he did. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to the Member from Rosthern what a Federal Minister has said about welfare payments, entitled, "Welfare Pay Disgrace."

Welfare Minister, Marc Lalonde, said Tuesday, the level of welfare payments in some provinces is a disgrace. Mr. Lalonde said that 150,000 mothers deserted by their husbands receive less in welfare payments than the elderly get in Old Age Pension benefits.

We know the low financial standards of our elderly people and if the Member from Rosthern is saying that because this Government believes in raising the welfare benefits of our welfare family above the poverty level, if that creates family breakdowns, then I don't follow his logic. Because one of the serious problems that families have, I think, if you will check, is poverty. But one of the things common to most welfare families and I am sure that if you will check (you must be aware of this and you simply can't close your mind to it) that the majority of the people who are on welfare are people who originally were below the poverty line. One of the reasons

indicated by the Senate Committee's Report on Poverty and the Real Report on Poverty why we perpetuate poverty in our society is the way our economic system is set up from one generation to the next. We perpetuate, we make certain that these people will have family breakdowns by the fact that we permit poverty. Now you might not agree with that, but that, in my opinion, is one of the reasons.

Mr. Speaker, this particular Act, if you read through it carefully, you can't help but note that the Minister is attempting to assist families before the breakdown occurs. And as I said before it gives the Minister authority to establish support programs and services to assist parents. That's what the Act says, "To establish support programs and services to assist parents in maintaining a healthy, vibrant and viable family life." That is the purpose of this Act. If the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) did not read that into the Act then I think he misread the Act. That is what the Act is intended to do. All the other things simply state the means and ways which the Minister can use if there is breakdown, and how he can help a child.

The main difference, in my opinion, between this Act and The Child Welfare Act, is that The Family Services Act emphasizes the importance of assisting a family to keep their children in their own home, rather than starting at a point of family breakdown and removing the children from the parents. If you listened to the Member's speech from Rosthern and mine, you must conclude that we are not talking about the same Act.

The Family Services Act assumes that the family is the most fundamental and essential unit in society, therefore, it is of interest to society that governments assist parents in maintaining a sound family environment. Greatly increased demands are being made on the family unit and its traditional family often resulting in complete family breakdown. Unless services are made available to these faltering families we can expect the percentages of divorces, separations and common law marriages to continue to increase. A Saskatoon lawyer recently indicated that one in two marriages in Saskatoon end in disaster. In my opinion I don't see any improvement in this area unless we are prepared to provide more preventative services, unless we make premarriage courses compulsory and unless we can halt the present permissive attitude which is so prevalent, not only among our youth but among people of all ages.

We're convinced that saving the family unit is a worthwhile object. I believe this Government says, yes, and we have as an alternative, presented to this House, the new Family Services Act. This Government, in my opinion, is heeding the warnings and is acting now. As I have already indicated family breakdown is at an unparalleled high rate. Incidents of delinquencies have skyrocketed. Children and parents are at odds when the child is still dependent on them. Tremendous increases have occurred in illegitimate births in a population of unwed mothers whose average age is always decreasing. Ever increasing numbers of 'so-called' therapeutic abortions are taking place and we are witnessing a high incidence of experimentation with drugs by the upper and middle class children. The warnings are here, we must act now.

March 8, 1973

The community, its agencies and individuals are deluding themselves in thinking that they are honestly trying to cope with the problems facing the family. In reality families with problems, and here in my opinion is the main problem, families with problems are despised by the rest of society. They are ridiculed because they are unable to bear up under society's demands. They are faced with the lack of appreciation of the problems of the underprivileged, the abused and the poverty stricken. We treat them with the attitude that families get the kind of life they deserve. I wonder how many of us, had we not been born in the circumstances in which we were born, wouldn't be the ones that are abused today. It is not to our credit, it is because of the circumstances in which we were born. Until now, we have placed too much emphasis on remedial services, rather than preventive measures.

It seems rather strange that society is quite prepared to foot the bill for remedial and rehabilitation services which are not only very costly, but their success has been rather small. However, society seems not willing to provide more preventative services. We don't seem to mind paying for the high rehabilitative costs of such centres as Ranch Erhlo, Roy Wilson Centre, Boys School and penitentiaries, but we don't seem to be willing to make those changes in our society and provide those services which could prevent many of our people from ending up in these institutions.

I think that this Family Services Act is one step in the right direction. As I mentioned to this House two years ago, it costs this society about \$11,000 a year to have one boy at Ranch Erhlo. \$11,000 and we are willing to foot the bill after we have put the child through the mill.

This Bill, in my opinion, could go a long way in remedying some of the difficulties that beset a family with problems. The Bill will enable the Department of Social Services to provide preventative services to families in order to forestall family breakdown. It will provide the Department, where breakdowns have occurred, to provide assistance to re-establish a family without placing the parent or the family in an adversary position. It will provide for protection and care of children when parents are unwilling or unable to provide adequately for them, and it will provide machinery for streamlining adoption procedures.

I think we have, Mr. Speaker, to face reality. There are certain parents who will not accept their responsibility. I think the state is obligated to do something for these children.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides more humane methods of bringing help to families where the removal of children for their protection is required. In The Family Services Act, however, the latter is a last resort, not a beginning point as with The Child Welfare Act.

The Bill presupposes that the children can best be protected by supplying services to their parents rather than having the Department merely protect the children from their parents.

Mr. Speaker, The Family Services Act places heavy emphasis on prevention, whereas The Child Welfare Act's main thrust seems to be on the remedial and rehabilitation services.

In my opinion it is better to give assistance before a family breakdown. Prevention is financially cheaper than rehabilitation and it should result in maintaining more sound and robust families, which are the essential units required to build a viable and healthy society.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I support The Family Services Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to direct to specific sections of the Act and what I regard as a weakness particularly in Section 52 of the Act, which is in part III under “Adoption of Children”.

The part that I refer to, Mr. Speaker, is the requirement that no order of adoption of a child shall be made without the consent to adoption in writing of, in the case of an unwed mother, the mother only. The provision states then that the adoption order requires only the consent of the mother if the child was born out of wedlock, even if that mother should be under the age of 18 years.

There is no provision under this Act for the consent of the real father of the child, regardless of the circumstances. Now in this day and age there are many people, in fact a large and increasing number of common law unions, where a man and a woman have lived together, in some cases for many, many years, who have children which, of course, are born out of wedlock. So if this Act is passed without any amendment the natural father might find that he was supporting a child for a number of years, but would have no voice of any kind if the woman, the mother of the child, suddenly decided to put that child out for adoption.

I have sent to the Hon. Minister of Social Services a copy of a judgment. I prefer not to name the case, but for identification, it is No. 55 in the Court of Queen’s Bench at the judicial centre of Melfort. It was not a case that I had anything to do with, but it is a case that was drawn to my attention. In that particular case a man and a woman had been living for a number of years together out of wedlock, as a result of which two lovely girls were born.

These children were brought up in that situation. The mother then decided to leave the home and took up with another gentleman whom she subsequently married. The Court of Queen’s Bench awarded custody of the children, not to the mother, but actually took custody away from the mother and gave it to the father. This is the situation whereof I speak and which I wish to make representation to the Minister and to the Government to alter.

This father has, in fact, some responsibility with respect to those children he fathered despite the fact that he fathered them out of wedlock. This father actually tried to, and I believe, was successful in discharging his responsibilities. He went to court and got an order, giving those children to him and those children were not allowed to stay with the mother.



March 8, 1973

Mr. Speaker, this situation has been recognized in Ontario. In the case that I have given the example of, the mother, presumably under Part III of the Act, would have the power (the only authority) required to consent to their adoption, where the real father who showed far more responsibility than the mother, would have no voice whatsoever. This is recognized and rectified in Ontario.

I refer the House to the Ontario Act, the Child Welfare Act of that province, chapter 64 of 1970, as it is amended, and which reads this way:

An order for the adoption of a child under 18 years of age who was born out of wedlock and who has not been married shall be made only with the written consent of the mother, given after the child was seven days old, and where the child resides with and is maintained by the father with the written consent of the father.

So the Ontario Act has attempted in a way to give recognition to the fact that there is a real father who may have real concerns for the child and whose consent may be required.

The Manitoba Act says this (this is the Child Welfare Act) and I refer the House to Section 85 (iii), again enacted in 1970 and it provides this:

A person applying for an interim order of adoption shall give notice of the application to the director, to the person whose consent of adoption is required, and, to such other persons as the judge may direct notice to be given.

So in the cases where a common law union has occurred and where a father has accepted responsibility for a child this gives authority to the court to direct that notice be given to the father. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is this: It may well be that of all the people in the world the natural father may be the one who properly should be given a notice and maybe should be given the opportunity to apply for the adoption of these children.

I am not suggesting to the Minister or to the House, and it would be unrealistic to suggest, that every father should receive notice. Quite apart from the fact that in many cases there may well be considerable doubt as to who the father might be. There are many cases where the real father has never acknowledged the presence of the child, has never really willingly accepted any responsibility with respect to the child and consequently ought not to be assumed would want to assume responsibility for a child that he had never even recognized or taken care of.

On the other hand it is quite improper not to give some notice to the natural fathers who have, in fact, been supporting their children for many years, or who have been required or have willingly paid maintenance for those children.

I recognize that it might be easier for the Minister of Welfare and social workers to have the Statute the way it is. But I suggest that it would not be difficult for the Minister to propose easy amendments, which would firstly give notice to the fathers who have been real fathers to the children, and secondly,

to give full consideration to those fathers who wish to assume responsibility.

The situation is very similar in common law relationships with that of regular marriages. A couple may have lived together for years and they have separated, the wife taking the children away, the father going his way, the wife going hers. Some time later the wife may decide that she cannot, nor maybe does not want to carry out responsibilities with respect to these children. If that should occur, the first person who should be given consideration and who should be consulted and who should be given notice is the real father who may decide that if the common law wife is not going to carry out her duties, then he should assume them, and he may well do so.

I would suggest, of course, that in dealing with the father, the real father, the same considerations would apply. The court would be just as careful in selecting him as a parent, as an adoptive parent, as it would towards any stranger. But what I wish to make clear is that the Court of Queen's Bench in this province, has clearly recognized the right of real fathers, even though they are not husbands, to have custody of the children even over the right of the wife to have custody. It is unrealistic not to deal with them in the same way when it comes to adoption.

There are several other comments which will be very brief. That is, my regret that the Act does not advance with respect to other people interested in children. Nothing is more unhappy to a solicitor than to have a grandmother come to the office and tell how she knows very well that her grandchild is being abused, perhaps because her daughter isn't strong enough to hold off an angered husband. But every lawyer in the province at one time or another has had one or more cases of a relative coming to the lawyer and saying, 'I know that child is being abused; I have seen it, in some cases, with my own eyes', and the lawyer has to say, with considerable unhappiness and frequently without any further productive work on his part for the rest of the day, that the grandmother or the brother or the sister has no real rights with respect to that child.

I fully understand the problem of the Department when they receive notice of these cases. Which is the best for the child? I do suggest that the Department of Social Services might well consider recognizing the possibility that other people do have concerns about those children, because they care.

The technical points that I draw to the Minister's attention are, of course, that it is possible that you can be adopting a child up to age 18, you can get mothers who are under 18, giving children up for adoption. I observe that in Part III the adoption age is 18, whereas Section 2 says that in this Act a 'child' means a boy or girl under 16. I don't push that further. I do suggest that there is some lack of recognition in this Act of the powers contained in the Queen's Bench Act.

In this Act a judge is a judge of a District Court. In the Queen's Bench Act, of course, the judge is that of a different court and the Act gives to the Court of Queen's Bench — and I will quote as closely as I can -

The power to make such order as the court sees fit regarding the custody of an infant.

March 8, 1973

Now that is almost an exact quotation of the sentence as it appears in The Infant's Act, giving unrestricted power to the Court of Queen's Bench to give custody to such person as the court sees fit. It is pretty hard to imagine wider powers than that

I invite the Minister to consider the dovetailing of those two separate substantive powers. Of the things that I have remarked upon today, the one that I regard as most important for today's consideration is that the notice to natural fathers is important and the one that I would like to see put into the Act, if not here at this stage, then certainly in Committee stage.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins** (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to rise for one moment on a Point of Privilege, if I may.

I think when the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) was speaking he made the remark that I had voted against a certain portion of the Bill related to 18 year-olds one year ago. And the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had indicated that I had not.

I will read from the record:

I think that I have some very severe reservations in my mind in relation to 18 year-olds being able to enter beer parlors and, therefore, in terms of the basic principle of the Bill, I will support it but on that particular portion of the Bill in Committee of the Whole I will oppose it.

And I did.

**Hon. Mr. Mostoway** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief in speaking on this Bill.

First of all, I would prefer to look at this as an optimist on this Bill, rather than as a pessimist. The reason for this is because I think that we have a reasonable Minister of Social Services. I believe that we are going to continue to have reasonable Ministers for that particular Department regardless of what political party is in power.

I like this Bill in particular because it gives more leeway to the Minister to take preventative action in regard to families. Now I know that in travelling with the Welfare Committee this past summer and fall, that this was brought to our attention numerous times. There should be some provision for more participation by the Department, by the Minister, in regard to helping families before they completely break up altogether.

I notice that there are situations where the present legislation or the regulations make no provision for this leeway. I think that it could help to preserve family units. I notice that there is provision for aid to families where there

could possibly be a temporary disruption. It might be due to illness, physical or mental and in this way, parents could get their children back after a period of time.

The Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned something about common-law parents having children and the father having no say. In all probability the Member has a very good point there. I am just wondering what some of your colleagues may say to that, and I say this in all sincerity because I don't think the Minister would want to be accused of promoting the break-up of families. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) mentioned something about drinking. I think if drinking is a problem at 18, it is my opinion and again with much sincerity, I think it is an indication that there was something deeper involved in that family prior to that age. In talking to various people in Hanley constituency, and particularly to clergymen, I can honestly say that I haven't run across one that wasn't completely in favor of the principle of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, May I say first just one or two words concerning the remarks of the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I have a great deal of sympathy for what he has said regarding the natural father in the case of an illegitimate child and can only say to him that I will take this under consideration and see if there is any way that we can be of assistance in this regard.

Some of his other comments regarding the Queen's Bench and so on I would have to get more technical advice on and will certainly take them under advisement.

He spoke of child abuse and the need of the Department to recognize that those other than the parents might have a real concern. He mentioned grandparents, brothers, sisters. I agree with him. I think it would be very difficult to see just in what way he wanted a department to recognize this concern since any friend of a child has the right to report abuse. And the Department, of course, is then by law compelled to investigate and take whatever action is necessary. If there are other ways we would be glad to hear of them.

Some of the other comments I think we can look at during the Committee of the Whole and we would be glad to do so.

I was somewhat surprised at some of the comments made by the Member for Rosthern, not overly surprised but somewhat surprised. One comment was that the Family Services Bill does not solve all the problems. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to discover any government that has reached the stage of total perfection. We may be close but not quite there where we could say that any bill would solve all the problems. I, for one, would not want to give that impression. I think I said during my original comments on this piece of legislation we did not believe it would solve all the problems in society. But we felt it was a large step in the right direction. Indeed if it solved all the problems it would be quite an omnibus bill which would cover far more than just family relations. The Member also said that there were only three sections of the

March 8, 1973

Bill relating to the family, Sections 5, 6 and 7. I commend him on noticing that these three sections relate to the family. Section 8 also says any parent who through special circumstance of a temporary nature is unable to make adequate provision for his child or unable to provide services may enter into an agreement with the Minister.

I suggest this also relates to a family. Section 17 which speaks of provision of services to the child within the family home in lieu of removal surely speaks to the services being provided to a family. Section 47 which speaks of the power of the Minister to enter into certain contracts is directly related surely to family situations. And Section 50 and one could go on and on. Section 50 is how the Minister may assist parents. Now surely parents are family — and there are other sections related to the family. I should like to suggest that much of the rest of the Bill is there because of legal and technical situations which the Members on the other side and on this side must surely be aware of. We are told that when it comes to court one must spell things out very clearly and very carefully. And this we have done and this amounts — we admit readily, to a large part of the Bill.

The Member from Rosthern tried to encourage us, and I certainly accept his sincerity in this, and I join with him to encourage us to protect family life and to provide services to the family.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is what Bill No. 62 is all about. As I said it is probably not perfect. But it is a large step in the right direction. It seems to us on this side of the House that the family is the basic unit of society and a good society cannot be built on a bad base or foundation. It seems to us we have to do all within our power to assist the family. To help the family to grow and to develop and to become strong. We are trying to do this. The Act speaks of the Minister being able to provide grants for research into family life and this type of thing. This will be one way in which we attempt to try and deal with many of the problems in present day society.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do have to face reality and part of the Bill does just that. Whether we like it or not there are families that have reached the point of no return, where a crisis has developed and the family has been broken apart. And someone has not only to pick up the pieces but protect the child. It seems to me that while we are attempting to work with the whole family the child who really cannot in many cases speak for himself, must be of primary importance. And the weight of the law must be on the side of that child, even if it means in the long run removing the child from the home. This I believe has to be a last resort. But it has to be a step which society is willing to take if it is to protect the long-term life and welfare of a child.

Mr. Speaker, I think we will get into a number of other areas during Committee of the Whole and I, therefore, move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to clear up one comment that the Minister said I made. I don't think I made it, I am sure I didn't. That this Bill did not solve all the problems. I certainly know that there is no Bill in the world that will solve all the family problems.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that Bill No. 54 — **An Act respecting Children of Unmarried Parents** be now read a second time.

**Mr. McPherson** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few things I should like to say on this Bill and that I would ask the Minister to consider. I know this is a Bill that we needed very badly in the province. There are several statutes covering it. But I think he has brought them all under one bill. This probably is good for the Department.

What I should like the Minister to consider, Mr. Speaker, is in the case of a pregnant woman if she is a ward of the Government, I assume that the Department as a guardian could institute filiation proceedings as provided for in item 3 (i) (c). I would ask the Minister to look at this. If the judge subsequently discharges the alleged father named in the proceedings and absolves him of responsibility then I think the alleged father should be able to claim for the expenses provided for in item 3 (1). The Department should not be excluded from this responsibility. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker. I would also ask the Minister to look at item 23 (c) this also provides for an exclusion. I think the power, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has taken upon himself is too much. I don't think the Minister should have the discretion to decide the disposition of moneys in the trust account if a child dies. This is provided in item 22 (3). I feel that medical expenses, Mr. Speaker, should be paid from the account plus a reasonable sum for the child's maintenance as decided by a judge and not by the Minister. And this is why I say the Minister is taking to himself too much power and I should like to see this changed.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that any moneys that are left in this account should automatically go to the father and not be forfeited to the Crown. If the Minister would look at this, Mr. Speaker, very carefully I feel that when we get it in Committee we can certainly discuss these items that I have brought up here today.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor** (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I shall merely say that we shall be happy to look at the suggestions which the Hon. Member has put forward and be ready to discuss them when the Bill comes up in Committee. As every one is aware I am sure there are a number of problems involved in the disposition of funds from the trust account to which the Member made reference. There are also problems regarding the recouping of expenses which he brought up. We will certainly be happy to take them under consideration. The Act is really the replacement of part 3 of the present Child Welfare Act and attempts to bring it up to date and separate it from The Family Services Bill. I think it ought to be separated. It is a Bill which deals with the situation quite different from the Family Services. I, therefore, move second

March 8, 1973

reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50 — **An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Wiebe** (Morse): — This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my remarks regarding Bill 50 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act to some of the comments which have been made by Government Members opposite. In all three cases so far the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), the Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson), the Member from Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) have refrained from talking about the contents of the Bill that we now have before us. In each case the three Members talked about orderly marketing of the products produced by our farmers in this province. Each and every Member of this House I am sure is concerned about orderly marketing. We should like to see a program of orderly marketing that would benefit all producers of this province. And as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, it should be one that has the full endorsement and full co-operation of all producers involved. And producers, Mr. Speaker, should have a say on how it will be implemented and how that commission will be operated.

The approach to operating orderly marketing is the basic difference of the two political parties which are represented in this House. A difference in philosophy, a difference in the degree of involvement of the producer and above all consideration for the individual freedom of that producer.

The Member for Pelly is correct when he states that we have had a Natural Products Marketing Act as legislation in this Province of Saskatchewan for a number of years. The Act was enforced during the CCF years prior to 1964. At this point I should like to take a look at how the two parties in this House have handled The Natural Products Marketing Act from 1964 until now. During this period both parties have sat in Government and have sat in Opposition.

Let's look at the status of The Natural Products Marketing Act under a Liberal Government from 1964 on. That Government, Mr. Speaker, believed in the freedom of the individual.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — The Government, Mr. Speaker, which believed in the right producer to have a say and a control of his own destiny. It was a Government, Mr. Speaker, which realized that the individual himself knew what direction he wanted to go. It was a Government which allowed that individual to make that decision himself.

Under the Liberal Government The Natural Products Marketing Act said the following:

Before a marketing system and all its controls could be implemented in this province, the producers of that particular product must first request that such a system be introduced. Then all producers would be informed about what that marketing system contains and how it

would operate. After this had been completed it was mandatory that a vote be held by all producers involved. A vote that required 60 per cent of the producers to be in favor of such a system before it would be implemented. Once a marketing board or commission was established after a favorable vote, under a Liberal Government, the producers themselves would be the only ones who were on that marketing board or commission. The producers themselves would have the control of that board. And the producers themselves who have the control of how the regulations would be introduced under that board or commission.

Let's look at what has happened since June of 1971, when the NDP started to play around with The Natural Products Marketing Act. First of all the NDP decided that the individual producer should not have the right to vote. That a commission instead should be implemented. A commission that in effect would take the place of a marketing board. A commission that would have exactly the same powers as a marketing board, the only difference would be that a marketing board can control production where a commission cannot. Another difference is involvement. The producer would have the say, the producer would govern the regulations. Under a commission this Government does all that. This Government takes away that right to vote. This Government takes away any producer control or any producer involvement in what the commission does. The Minister of Agriculture and this NDP Government decided that they and not the producer should have a marketing commission. That big brother would do this without a vote. They have decided what is best for the producer and they do not want to confuse the issue by allowing a vote.

They changed the Act in 1972 which denied the producer that right to vote. This Act also allowed the Government to appoint the Members to that commission.

The Minister, in his remarks on March 1st, said that he wanted to listen to the producers. He attended one meeting as I mentioned earlier, in his home constituency. He hasn't had the guts to attend another one in this province. He says that he is going to implement what the producers want and yet the meetings aren't even completed and we see Bill 50 before us which gives him all the control that is going to be implemented under that Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — So what say have the producers had as to what that commission is going to be? Going back to last March 1st, Mr. Speaker, the day that the Minister of Agriculture moved second reading of The Natural Products Marketing Act, at least that is what it said on the Order Paper. One had to wonder just exactly what the Minister of Agriculture was introducing when he spoke that afternoon. He talked about everything else but The Natural Products Marketing Act. At first it sounded as though he were re-introducing The Land Bank Act. Then he changed horses and for a while it sounded as if the FarmStart legislation was to be introduced. He went on to talk about United Grain Growers and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. We began to feel that after Premier Blakeney and the Member from



March 8, 1973

Bengough (Mr. Lange) had purchased the CPR and the CNR that possibly Mr. Messer and Mr. Blakeney were out to buy the elevator companies as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Not so much, Mr. Speaker, for providing new jobs, or new industry in this province, but rather for accumulating control and ownership. An example of this is when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) talked about Intercontinental Packers. It showed that they were not concerned about providing new industries or new jobs, but rather this Government's apparent desire to go into the meat packing process. To complement this action, they introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act to acquire the power to tell the farmer where he must deliver his products. He went on to say how this NDP Government spent \$10.2 million for a meagre 45 per cent of the company. Paid more than three times of what the shares are worth. A very good deal, Mr. Speaker, for someone, but it is becoming very apparent as more light is thrown on the subject and the Premier's refusal to answer our questions, that it was a very bad deal for the farmers and the taxpayers of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — One wonders, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister of Agriculture would neglect to talk about this Bill in light of the devastating effect it will have on the basic rights of each and every farmer in this province.

It is true that he talked a bit about a marketing commission, but that was the same speech he used last year when he introduced The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972 — an Act that was one step closer towards the NDP Government's goal to do away with the freedom of the individual. An Act, Mr. Speaker, where he misled the producers of this province. An Act where he and his Government have denied and taken away from the farmers of this province their right adequately to voice their opinion. Under that Act they have taken away their right to contribute their ideas and above all, they have taken away their right to vote for an orderly marketing system of their own products.

Again I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture talked for about thirty minutes on everything else but what was contained in the Bill before us now. Why did he, by design, refrain from talking about Bill 50? Why didn't he explain what Bill 50 contained? Why didn't he explain what it could and would do, and what effect it would have on each and every farmer in this province? Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that he was ashamed of what Bill 50 contained?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Could it be that the Minister of Agriculture, who is himself a young, progressive farmer, who knows himself of the desires that farmers have for their independence and their personal initiative and desire for freedom; could it be, Mr. Speaker, that because of this he just could not find it in

himself to talk about one of the most vicious pieces of legislation ever introduced into this House?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is an infringement upon the basic rights and freedoms of every farmer in this province.

Could it be that he could not find it in himself to talk about the strict controls, regimentations and utter power which this NDP government is building around themselves? Power, Mr. Speaker, not in the hands of the producers, but power in the hands of cabinet. Could it be that he could not find it in himself to talk about a Bill which is more devastating than the controversial Foreign Ownership Bill which he was forced to withdraw last year?

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture, who, I repeat again, is himself a young progressive farmer, knows the desires which the farmers have for independence and for their freedom. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture did not dream up the powers which this Government is asking for and that's why he couldn't talk about it, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Power which this Government is asking for can only be drawn up or drafted by the 'big four' in Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, just who are those 'big four' in Cabinet? First of all I think we have to look at an Eastern lawyer who is sitting in the Premier's chair. He is flanked by two union henchmen from Moose Jaw South and Regina Northeast, with another lawyer from Saskatoon Riversdale in the centre directing traffic. These are men, Mr. Speaker, who know nothing about agriculture and the desires of the farmers in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — They have left the poor Member from Tisdale-Kelsey holding the bag. He doesn't like what is in the bag and has refused to talk about it.

**Mr. Comer:** — What did he talk about?

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Let's just look at what the Member from Tisdale did talk about, Mr. Comer. Let me just quote a paragraph that the Minister made in his remarks:

Our first and foremost concern as a government is to enhance the farm opportunities available to rural people in Saskatchewan in order to stem and in order to hopefully reverse the trend towards depopulation of our rural areas and the decline in our farm numbers.

Well said, Mr. Speaker, but he said this, Mr. Speaker, just two short weeks after his Government called a halt to one of the greatest dreams and probably one of the greatest advancements in the agricultural industry this province could have

ever achieved, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — He called a halt and he sounded the death knell to the South Saskatchewan River irrigation project. The excuse given, Mr. Speaker, was that the rising costs were too high — 2.3 million dollars, one-fifth of the amount that they spent to purchase an industry that was already here. \$10.2 million on a processing plant that would not provide any more jobs for our people in this province. He called a halt, Mr. Speaker, to a program that would have increased the rural population of our province. This has already been indicated in the Rural Municipality of Rudy — the only Rural Municipality in Saskatchewan to show an increase in population, while all other municipalities have shown a decline.

By this Government's action the town of Outlook, alone, will lose 106 people.

If this action, Mr. Speaker, is an example of this Government's proposal to reverse the trend of rural depopulation, I sincerely hope that they put a stop to it. Any more programs like this and our rural population will be completely gone and we may as well turn Saskatchewan over to the buffalo, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister then went on to say how beneficial the purchase of Intercontinental Packers would be to Saskatchewan. His Government spent \$10.2 million for an industry that was already here, one that would not provide any more jobs. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this was money that was thrown away. If his Government is concerned about the producers of our meat products, I maintain the money could have been spent more wisely.

If the Minister of Agriculture is convinced that livestock production will have a tremendous gain in this province, then why didn't he and his Government direct this money and energy towards that industry? They could have built or made money or loans available to individuals to construct smaller processing plants throughout Saskatchewan. Instead of centralizing the meat processing industry in this province, this Government should have directed incentives and direction to locate these smaller industries in some of our rural communities throughout this province. To do this, it would help to provide and stabilize our population in rural Saskatchewan. As well, it would have been of benefit to our producers of these meat products. Trucking and hauling expenses would be much less, which would mean much greater return to the producer when he delivered his animals. In turn, the cost of shipping the finished product is much less than shipping the live animal, another saving that could be passed on to our producers and to our consumers.

Just one more example of the inability of this Government to formulate any meaningful ideas or programs for Saskatchewan, despite the fact of the huge research and planning staff which they have acquired.

The Minister, Mr. Speaker, also went on to talk about everything else, but Bill 50. Instead he went on to criticize the Liberal Government of 1970, saying that because of their

chaotic and unorganized marketing system, hog prices fell to an all-time low. Mr. Speaker, he stopped then. He didn't go on any further, he didn't go on to say that in NDP Manitoba, hog prices had fallen just as low, and Manitoba had a compulsory hog marketing commission which he is trying to put into this province. He didn't go on to say that during that time the price of hogs in Saskatchewan depended almost 90 per cent on the price that was being paid for hogs in Manitoba. So if the price of hogs in Manitoba, in Saskatchewan had dropped to an all-time low, it wasn't the fault of the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan, it was the fault of an NDP Government in Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Just one more indication where this Government has tried to mislead the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will have an opportunity to close debate on this subject, if he doesn't, which I hope, withdraw the Bill. The Minister then began to talk about the rights of the producers. I should like to quote a few more of his choice statements which he made when he introduced this Bill:

It is the belief of this Government that producers must be able to, if they so choose, to control the flow of either their products from the time it leaves their farm until it reaches the hands of the ultimate consumer.

Well said, again, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no clause or provision in Bill 50 which gives the producer the right to choose or the mechanics for him to choose that control.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — The choice, Mr. Speaker, is left up to the commission which is appointed by the Government, which means the Government is the only one who chooses.

Here is another one of his choice quotes, Mr. Bowerman:

The Government of Saskatchewan takes the position that marketing boards or commissions should be established where producers indicate a desire for such an agency.

Here again, well said, Mr. Speaker. But again his actions differ from what he says. He has denied the producers of any product their right to show their desire for a commission by refusing them that vote. He made that very clear last year when his Government amended The Natural Products Marketing Act and gave themselves the power to set up a marketing commission without a 60 per cent favorable vote. This again, Mr. Speaker, indicates the basic philosophy of a Socialist Government . . . 'Big brother' knows what is best for the little people and 'big brother' is going to ram it down your throats whether you like it or not.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — The Government Members opposite say that they have the support of the people for the actions which they have taken. I understand that there wasn't one of them that was out at Lampman the night before last. If they believe this, Mr. Speaker, then again I say they can all be compared to an ostrich, standing unconcerned with their heads and ears in the sand. If they are positive that the people are listening and they are listening to the little people of this province, then why don't they give each producer the right to vote and let him decide if he wants a commission for his particular produce.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Minister got around to talking about what the Government's real intent was and what their real purpose for introducing this legislation was. The Member from Tisdale talked about how his Government has been introducing large and fairly complex sets of legislative proposals and programs designed for agriculture. He went on to say, and again Mr. Bowerman, I quote:

Each and every one of these programs fits into the total package as an essential and integral piece.

What is that total package, Mr. Speaker? What is it that this Government is putting together piece by piece to form this package?

Let's take a look at that package — I believe it will show beyond a shadow of a doubt, this Government's real intent. The foundation piece, or the first piece of this package, Mr. Speaker, was their intention to change the land tenure system in Saskatchewan. In other words, the Land Bank. To change ownership from the individual to the state. What does this piece do for this particular package?

- 1) it changes the ownership from individual to state;
- 2) the Government decides who will farm the state-owned land;
- 3) the Government will control how much a farmer must pay for use of that land;
- 4) the Government will control how long a farmer can use that land;
- 5) the Government under Section 67 subsection (f) can make regulations respecting the management and control of that land, in other words —
- 6) the Government can tell the farmer how he must farm, what he can grow and what use he can make of that land.

The second piece in the package would have to be The Succession Duty Act. Here the NDP Government says that they don't want the young farmers to inherit too much money. 'Big Brother' knows what's best for you so we'll just take part of that money to help speed up the new land tenure system in this province. This will cause the break-up of many family farms

and help make it easier to speed up that new land tenure system.

Then came another piece for that package, Mr. Speaker. The abortive Foreign Ownership of Land Act which would have controlled just what land and what persons could own land in socialist Saskatchewan.

The fourth piece of that package was the refusal of this Government to sell presently held Crown land to needy farmers.

One more piece which they are trying to put into this package is the Federal Small Farms Program which they are stalling. They do not want to participate unless the Federal Government plan will agree to buy land and turn it over to the NDP state.

The sixth piece for the package was the 1972 amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act, which I have mentioned earlier. Another example of where 'Big Brother' knows what's best for the farmer. If 'Big Brother' feels that a commission to market a particular product which a farmer produces is best for that farmer, then the farmer is going to have it whether he likes it or not.

The seventh piece would have to be the accumulation of Intercontinental Packers, which I have already mentioned this afternoon.

The final piece for that package is Bill 50 which we have before us now. One of the most vicious pieces to be added to this package. Let's review again what is included in this last piece.

- . . . practically all products that can be produced by a farmer are included in this Act;
- . . . before a product can be marketed, the farmer must register and purchase a license;
- . . . the farmer can be told where and when he can market his product;
- . . . the farmer can be told how his product will be transported and how it will be distributed;
- . . . the farmer may be prohibited in whole or in part as to the transportation, packing, storing, and marketing of any regulated product of any grade, quality or class;
- . . . the basic principle of British law has been reversed under this Act. It says that the farmer is guilty until he himself proves himself innocent;
- . . . if the farmer doesn't comply to the above, he is subject to a fine of \$500 or imprisonment of three months, or both.

A producer under this Bill, Mr. Speaker, could be controlled, regulated and manipulated like never before. It is unfortunate the Premier and his Cabinet have asked this Legislature to give them this much power. It is quite evident that the Bill and this power is required to complete this package that the

March 8, 1973

Minister has talked about.

The completed package, Mr. Speaker, is designed to give this Government the complete control of the agricultural industry in this province. Control of the land, control of the produce that the land produces, control of the processing of that produce and by so doing it could eventually apply control to the individual who operates that land. This package, Mr. Speaker, gives this Government a tremendous amount of power. The intention of using such power when a Bill such as this one is introduced, may not be in the minds of some of the more rational Members, sitting opposite, but experience has shown that when power such as this is available that it is very often abused.

I would urge this Government, the Members of this House, Mr. Bowerman, to reconsider their position and follow the lead that was expressed by my colleague, the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and withdraw this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — If the Members of this House believe, if the Members of this House and Mr. Bowerman believe in the freedom and ability of the farmers to plan their own future; if they believe in the ability of the individual farmer and producer to make sound and rational decisions on his own, or as an organization; if they believe in the basic rights of producers to have a vote prior to the implementations of commissions, then they will again I say, join with the Member of Moosomin in asking the Minister and his Government to withdraw this particular piece of legislation.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — In closing, Mr. Speaker, especially for the benefit of Members opposite, I must again remind the Government that you cannot legislate loyalty to a program or to an ideal. That you cannot legislate efficiency, nor can you legislate viability, that you cannot legislate acceptance. This can only be accomplished by trust and adhering to the basic rights and freedoms of individuals for whom you govern.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that I can support this Bill. There is no way that I can vote for a Bill that gives the Government, the Cabinet, or one Member of that Cabinet as much power as they are asking for in this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — There is no way that I can vote for a Bill and idly stand by as the basic foundation of individual rights and freedoms of this province are eroded, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, I will definitely not support this Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, will the Member permit a question before he takes his seat?

I wonder if the Member is aware that every province in Canada has legislation with virtually the same powers as this legislation that we are discussing here today?

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly aware that other provinces have this legislation, like the Province of Alberta for example, where the producers elect the commissioners on that board, the producers govern the regulation, the producers have the entire say as to how that board is implemented.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise and enter into this debate. The honor is even more considerable as I have the opportunity to follow the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe).

I say that the least of his performance should not be too difficult to top, as once again we have seen the tired, old Liberal logic argued in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, you know the attitude of the Opposition in general and the Member for Morse in particular. During this debate it shows conclusively that the Liberal Party has still not learned its lesson.

One would think that at least since the last election, Mr. Speaker, they would have been taught a wee bit of a lesson. They should be reminded of their credibility and its bad need of overhaul. They criticize just for the sake of criticism. They are the same people that have been here for years and are at it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit though their reaction to our legislative proposals is a pretty accurate barometer to follow engaging public support and popularity. In a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals are against it, rest assured that it is a good program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — We only have to look at such things as Medicare, the Wheat Board and the Land Bank, to mention only a few, to show the Liberal Party what they really are.

It is rather ironical, Mr. Speaker, that it should be the Member for Morse who should be the one to have the audacity to accuse Members on this side of the House, to accuse Members on this side of the House of evading the issues in this debate. He accused the Agriculture Minister (Mr. Messer), he accused the Member for Pelly (Mr. Larson), he accused the Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding), and saying they were straying away from the issue. Yet what did he do? I tried — I really did — and I wrote down as many as I could of the issues that he stuck to. Do you know what they were? He stood up here and



March 8, 1973

talked about the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project, the Land Bank, Succession Duties, buffalo, foreign ownership, Intercontinental Packers, ostriches and the British legal system.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, tell me what that had to do with The Natural Products Marketing Bill? I found it difficult to find any connection whatever.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is clear, the Liberal Opposition in this House is not interested in debating the facts. They would rather resort to their old usual game of attempting to tack political points on the scoreboard. I would caution them, Mr. Speaker, that they should stop playing this kind of politics, the game is over and the score as you will recall, 45 to 15.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is understandable why Members to your left should oppose any legislation which deals with orderly marketing. We can all, too vividly recall, their position in respect to the establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board. Nobody on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, is suggesting the Opposition does not have its right to criticize. Certainly not! That is their right. In fact it is their responsibility to criticize. However, where the Opposition falls short is when it comes time to recognize and accept the responsibility, to be constructive in their opinions and offer alternatives and to be positive.

We certainly didn't see this in the speech this afternoon from the Member for Morse. The Member for Morse, Mr. Speaker, termed this Bill as one of the most vicious pieces of legislation ever brought before this Legislature. That, indeed, is quite a claim coming from the mouth of a Liberal, especially from the mouth of the Member from a party who wholeheartedly endorsed and enacted Bill 2, that inhumane piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. As he said, the "Big Four" set this one up. I would love to know which 'Big Four' set that one up.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of the big city corporate lawyers such as now Justice Heald — you know whom I speak of — the ex-Member for Lumsden, a veterinary from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) who is a big businessman and the biggest businessman of them all — and when I say big, I mean that — the Member from Regina Lakeview, Mr. McPherson.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan do not take kindly to this kind of politicking any more. The Liberals are the last people of this province who should complain about individual freedoms being eroded.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province are not fooled by this smokescreen drama which the Members opposite are trying to stage. The farmers have recognized for years that orderly marketing is absolutely necessary if farmers are to be able to capture their fair share of the national and international market place.

We have been talking about marketing commissions for years, however, what has been the result? Well while we have waited for something to develop, slowly our competitors have been capturing more and more of the potential sales which are available. The Opposition attempts to convince the people of Saskatchewan that this Government has arbitrarily decided what type of marketing structure is desirable without giving the primary producer a chance to vote.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. The Liberals to your left say farmers were not consulted. Do they deny the fact that the Minister of Agriculture consulted with all the farm organizations such as the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers' Union, were all consulted and they all approved of a Hog Marketing Commission overwhelmingly. Those are the kind of organizations, Mr. Speaker, which speak for all farmers. Certainly the Liberal Party doesn't seem to know this. For example, the National Farmers' Union president, Roy Atkinson, has said over and over again, 'we need a Commission immediately. It is long overdue and necessary.'

**Mr. Guy:** — What does he know?

**Mr. Cody:** — The Member for Athabasca says, what does he know. I am sure that he knows a lot more about farming than the Member for Athabasca ever will.

Then we have the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. What do they say? Mr. Speaker, let me quote from an article, a new release, January 29, 1973. Mr. E. A. Boden, Vice-president said:

It is about time that Saskatchewan hog producers, both commercial and otherwise, woke up and did something effective in the marketing field.

The pool official who is also the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, made the statement following the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Livestock Association, January 24th in Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say, and I quote:

We are getting somewhat tired of the very obvious political manoeuvring, aimed at obstructing the creation of a more rational marketing system. I want the actual producers of this province to know that we recognize the real motives of certain groups who want to scuttle the plan.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boden said that his association recognizes the real motives of certain groups who want to scuttle the plan. We know as well who some of these groups are. A quick glance across the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, identifies the Party and the motives are equally as noticeable. Yet for some strange reason we hear daily from our friends across the way that producers do not want a commission, that the producers are upset at what we have the foresight to bring in these amendment, that we are eroding their very freedoms and the freedoms of their choice.

March 8, 1973

Mr. Speaker, that is hogwash and you know it. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that there is a small but vocal group of people who are busy running around the country trying to stir up farmers with scare tactics. However, their ploy will not work. It hasn't worked in the past and it won't work today.

Mr. Speaker, who are these people? Are they affiliated with a group who is representative of agricultural interests? Are they friends of the family farmer concerned about orderly marketing? No, Mr. Speaker, they are not. These meetings are organized by the Palliser Wheat Growers. That is who is organizing them! And no doubt, wholeheartedly supported by the Liberal Party. Just let me read a clipping just to prove my point that they are in fact organizing it.

"Farmers protest Marketing Act".

Leader-Post of last night from Lampman, Saskatchewan a little town southeast.

**Mr. Guy:** — Are you against the Palliser Wheat Growers?

**Mr. Cody:** — I could answer that in one very short word.

200 farmers from southeast Saskatchewan Tuesday night registered displeasure at the prospects of living with the Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Act. Art Manill well-known Liberal in the Weyburn area assisted by Glen McEwan, a well-known Liberal in the Tyvan area, directors of the Palliser Wheat Growers Association were in charge of the meeting attended by 225 association members and other farmers.

Mr. Speaker, that goes to show who is organizing these meetings. The Palliser Wheat Growers are against orderly marketing and are behind this smear campaign.

It is very funny, Mr. Speaker, that when a person looks at the Order Paper you see that the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) wants this Government to give a grant to the Palliser people.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! That is a different debate.

**Mr. Cody:** — Fine, Mr. Speaker. But we certainly know that the Liberals opposite, by statements that they have been making are definitely in accord with what the Palliser Wheat Growers Association is doing by organizing meetings of this nature, to get people aroused so that they won't be in favor of this kind of commission.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has set up 28 meetings across this province to give the producers a chance to discuss these proposals.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! There is too much crossfire. Will the Hon. Members refrain from so much crossfire.

**Mr. Cody:** — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Government of this province has set up about 28 meetings across this province to give the producers an opportunity to discuss these proposals. And to date, the reaction has been most favorable. Yet it seems that the Palliser people feel that they are the ones who should be carrying out this responsibility.

I will let the people of this province decide for themselves. I am sure that they can do quite well without the pressure groups, such as the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party and the Palliser Wheat Growers.

Mr. Speaker, with the proposed amendments marketing commissions will have the same power as marketing boards, with one noticeable exception. The marketing commission will not have the power to control production. This Government takes the position that the power to control production should be reserved for marketing boards, established by a producer plebiscite.

Once again, the Opposition says and tries to distort the facts by claiming we will control production. Nonsense, that is not what we are saying at all. They condemn us for having the courage to go forward with a program to help insure that stability and prices takes place. They holler, why not a vote?

Time does not permit me, Mr. Speaker, to go into details of all the reasons but I ask Members opposite, if they were so virtuous and concerned about the right of people to vote on the establishment of commissions, why weren't they concerned when we set up the Medicare Commission. There was no vote on this Commission. There was no vote on the Human Rights Commission. There was no vote on the Alcohol Commission. Not a word was said when these commissions were established, but now when there is a Hog Marketing Commission everybody is up in arms — I mean at least 15 people in the province are up in arms.

The answer is simple, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have convenient principles. If they think they can make mileage by way of distortion and rumor mongering they will go at it full force.

We have heard from our friends across the way that this Bill is a bad Bill. Yet it is curious to note that the sections criticized, especially by the Opposition Agriculture critic, the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), are sections in the Act that were in force when they were the Government on this side of the House. They very same ones.

Mr. Speaker, sincerely, I ask Members opposite, if you are so violently opposed to areas contained in this Bill, why didn't you change them when you were in power? Why didn't you change them?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — We were no threat.

**Mr. Cody:** — You were no threat, you didn't have the guts to change them because you knew the farmers wanted them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, history records that it has been in Saskatchewan where most of the progressive pieces of legislation have been brought forward. The recognition that we pay towards the desirability and necessity of orderly marketing is borne out in the amendments currently before this Legislature.

To study this issue even further, I think it is necessary to find out who, of the Liberals, are really trying to protect. Why is the Liberal Party really trying to protect here? The farmer? I doubt it! Several speakers from the Opposition have said that if the Commission is so necessary and will solve the instability problem that relates to prices — just like the Hon. Member this afternoon said — why is it that Saskatchewan was experiencing \$18 hog prices and our friends in Manitoba, where a Commission was in operation, were going through similar conditions. That is exactly what he said.

Once again they don't tell the whole story. Without a Commission in Saskatchewan there was nothing to stop the multi-national packers from coming directly to Saskatchewan and load up hogs to be shipped directly to their plants. In open defiance these packing plants were challenging the commission concept. There was nothing that could be done. A commission for Saskatchewan will stop that practice, restore stability to pricing and ensure that the producer receives a fair return for his product. Manitoba was unable to solve all the instability problems because the commission was not in operation long enough. Security long-range contracts were needed to correct the problems. We watched with close interest, Mr. Speaker, the attempts by the big packing houses to challenge the commission concept in the courts. We viewed with interest the outcome of that legal battle. We saw the result as the final proof needed for the people of Saskatchewan to have just such a commission.

The concern of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is not with the farmer, it is with the multi-national corporations and certainly not with the family farmer. In a nut shell Saskatchewan hogs were being used to force down prices in Alberta, Manitoba and in Ontario, where hog marketing agencies have been in operation for some time. Lower prices in those provinces invariably led to lower prices in Saskatchewan. At the present time Saskatchewan is the only surplus producing province without a hog marketing agency. You would think the Liberal Party would recognize the importance of bringing in this type of program and policy which would encourage orderly marketing. Surely, Mr. Speaker, one would think that the Liberals could see the advantage of a marketing structure which would encourage fairer prices and more success in the competitive marketing place. Their present attitude is that they are not in favor of this approach and it goes to show that they have, what I referred to earlier, as convenience principles. They have the kinds of principles that they want, when they want.

What did they propose during the election campaign? Let me refer to their little pamphlet — I've got it right here. The Liberal Program, nicely decked out in green with a nice little flower on it. This is the guile of the Party that is going to vote against this Bill. I refer to point No. 11. It says, the Saskatchewan Liberal Government will support the right of livestock producers to have unrestricted access to all markets in Canada for red meat animals. Mr. Speaker, what does that

tell you? On one hand they support the efforts to give producers a bigger share of the action, yet on the other hand they oppose the only logical approach which must be taken to ensure that maximum benefits accrue.

Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to reiterate the reasons for the amendments before us today. We are striving on this side of the House to achieve: (1) Higher and more stable prices; (ii) New dependable export markets; (iii) The lowest possible spread between the farmer's return and the prices paid at the packing plant; (iv) The lowest possible cost of moving our product into domestic and foreign markets. How in the name of common sense can any rational person who purports to be concerned over the welfare of our farmers oppose this Bill in its amendments?

I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because Liberals like to oppose things. They are masters at it. All one needs to do is pick up anything any time, any issue and you can pick any little article here. February 25, 1960, as far back as 1960, in the Prince Albert Daily Herald, a Member who is still sitting in the House and now leading the Party:

D.G. Steuart last night at a house meeting of local Liberals speaking on the prepaid medical care plan said, "There are many reasons why we oppose the CCF in this issue . . .".

**Hon. Mr. Snyder:** — President up there.

**Mr. Cody:** — That's right, he was the president up there. He goes on to say:

The CCF will be ramming state medicine down the throats of the majority of the people, whether they like it or not.

Identically the same thing as he has been saying about the Hog Marketing Commission. Mr. Speaker, as I say, you can find an article wherever you look in whichever paper. I have got one here, February 26, 1946. 1946 can you imagine this! A Member who used to sit over there, from Moosomin,

"Accident Insurance Bill Labelled Greatest Hoax".

Exactly the words that the Leader of the Opposition uses, exactly the words that the Member from Morse uses. Let me quote from this:

Leading the Opposition attack on the Bill, Mr. Proctor described it as an example of socialistic paternalism and socialistic class discrimination which opens the field for the most vicious interference and political influence.

Mr. Speaker, they said it in 1946, and the Member for Morse is saying it today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — The Member from Morse should

March 8, 1973

also know better I am sure. I am surprised that he would oppose this orderly marketing, especially since it will be of immense benefit to him. I am sure he must say thanks to the Liberal Party he got a big hog barn, now he has got lots of hogs to market. I am sure that when he delivers his hogs to Intercontinental Packers he will welcome the stable prices which this legislation will provide. But maybe he won't. Because it is very difficult to find any kind of reason with a Liberal, that is for sure.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous piece of legislation. There is a tremendous amount one can say about this piece of legislation. I have a lot more that I want to say and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.